

Journal of Biblical Text Research. Vol. 18.

Published Semiannually by

The Institute for Biblical Text Research of the Korean Bible Society; April 2006

Table of Contents

• Paper •

- [Kor.] An Analysis on the Reference System of *the New Korean Revised Version* with Special Reference to Psalm 2 ----- Jung-Woo Kim / 7
- [Kor.] Some Features of Targum Aramaic Bible Translation ----- Chul-Hyun Bae / 24
- [Kor.] A Comparison of Orthography and the Relation of 4QDan Manuscripts and MT (the Massoretic Text) ----- Min-Hee Chun / 43
- [Kor.] Study of Underwood's Early Korean Bible Translations - Focusing on *the Gospel according to Luke* (1895) - ----- Young-Jin Min, Moo-Yong Jeon, Ji-Youn Cho / 63
- [Eng.] Bible Translations for Asian Audiences: Nestorian Experiment in T'ang Dynasty China and Mongolian Equivalents for Deity ----- Young-Jin Min / 98
- [Eng.] Reflections on the First Translation of Korean Bible: the Ross Version of 1887 (*Yesu-Seonggyo-Jeonseo*) ----- Hwan-Jin Yi / 114

• Report •

- [Kor.] Inner Mongolian Equivalents for Deity ----- Eun-Yi Goh / 130

• Book Review •

- [Kor.] An Introduction and Review of <CD-ROM Bible 2.0> by Korean Bible Society ----- Yeong-Mee Lee / 142

<Abstract>

An Analysis on the Reference System of *the New Korean Revised Version* with Special Reference to Psalm 2

Prof. Jung-Woo Kim
(Chongshin University)

The aim of the present paper is to evaluate the strength and weakness of the Reference System in *the New Korean Revised Version*. The present references and its system go back to the original version published in 1912 and have gone through modifications in the following revision processes. The base text of the original references of *the New Korean Revised Version* was taken from *the Revised Version of 1889 with Full References* which was published by Oxford University in 1889.

In order to attain an objective evaluation of relevancies of references found in *the New Korean Revised Version*, the writer made comparisons with several contemporary versions such as *Bible Society's Chain Reference Bible. Good News Edition* (1985), *The NRSV. Harper Study Bible* (1991), *The HarperCollins Study Bible. NRSV* (1993), *New Geneva Study Bible. New King James Version* (1995), *The NIV Study Bible* (1995), and *The Learning Bible. Contemporary English Version* (2000).

As for the strength of the reference system in general and references found in Psalm 2 in particular, the writer made several observations as follows:

(1) The four major constituent parts of the reference, such as “citation, comparison, see, and general” are very helpful compared with references of other Bibles.

(2) The reference system is found to be very strong and helpful in making connections between the OT and the NT . For example, the reference of the *New Korean Revised Version* suggest readers to compare the phrase “you are my son” in Psa 2:7 to Mat 3:17 and Mat 17:5.

(3) The overall references seem very reliable and useful, and even excellent in some occasions. For example, it suggests readers to interpret ‘to set’ (nasak) in Psa 2:6 with reference to Pro 8:23.

However, there are some weaknesses, such as (1) errors, (2) loosing accuracy, (3)

missing the Old Testament context, (4) failing to reflect the parallel word pair, (5) demarcating phrases unnecessarily, and (6) omitting references.

In conclusion, the overall references in *the New Korean Revised Version* can be evaluated as the quaint essential fruits of the 19th century biblical scholarship of England, being very reliable, useful and sometimes excellent. However, it needs an overall revision to incorporate the scholarly findings by the 20th century biblical scholarship.

<Abstract>

Some Features of Targum Aramaic Bible Translation

Prof. Chul-Hyun Bae
(Seoul University)

From the beginning of the Second Temple Period, it was customary to translate the Hebrew Bible in synagogues into Aramaic. Aramaic had been used as a lingua franca in the time of Neo-Babylonian and even more in Persian times. The Aramaic “official” letters in the book of Ezra are almost certainly composed in Official Aramaic which became the language of communication during Achaemenid period. A major reason for Targumic translation of the Hebrew Bible must have been the fact that in the postexilic time, Aramaic replaced Hebrew as the spoken language of the Jews. The Targum is not just a literal translation of the Scripture, but also a commentary. It provides comprehensive translation and interpretation that are readable and understandable to Aramaic-speaking Jews. Some of the most salient features in Targumic translation are 1) avoidance of using Tetragrammaton; 2) substitution of Tetragrammaton by מאמרא, יקרא, and שכנתא.

<Abstract>

A Comparison of Orthography and the Relation of 4QDan Manuscripts and MT (the Massoretic Text)

Dr. Min-Hee Chun
(Hanshin Univ.)

The discovery of Qumran manuscripts offers an important evidence of textual pluriformity. LXX texts, MT texts, Samaritan Pentateuch texts, Qumran texts, and “Non-aligned” texts are founded in Qumran caves. This evidence shows the period of textual fluidity.

The language shifts from Hebrew to Aramaic in 2:4a and from Aramaic to Hebrew in 8:1 of MT Daniel are attested also in Qumran Daniel. Even though it seems that MT Daniel and Qumran Daniel used the same edition, there are textual differences when they are compared.

4QDan-a and 4QDan-b which have some of the same verses are found in the same cave (Qumran cave 4). Some of the same vocabularies are found in these two fragments but the orthography is a little bit different. Also, some of the same vocabularies are found in 4QDan-a and MT, but the different orthography is found. Comparison between 4QDan-b and MT shows the same result.

4QDan-a and 4QDan-b each have their own orthographic tendencies. But they do not have a consistent orthographic system. The examination also proved that the MT has its own orthographic tendencies. But it does not have a consistent orthographic system. This implies the period of textual fluidity as well as textual pluriformity.

It has to be considered that differences between MT and other compared texts should not be dealt as simply the mistakes of translators or copiers. The differences between Daniel 4-6 of MT and LXX exhibit two different editions of chapters 4-6. Also, the differences of MT and other compared texts have to be considered as using different editions of the text. The possibility that the editions of LXX texts, Samaritan Pentateuch texts, Qumran manuscripts, “Non-aligned” texts, or other texts were different from the edition of MT has to be considered.

<Abstract>

Study of Underwood's Early Korean Bible Translations

- Focusing on *the Gospel according to Luke* (1895) -

Dr. Young-Jin Min, Moo-Yong Jeon & Ji-Youn Cho
(Korean Bible Society)

Underwood, who was a Bible translator and one of the early missionaries to Korea, appears to have reflected much on how to effectively deliver the message of the gospel to the Korean people.

Although traces of reference to Ross' and Appenzeller's translations are found in Underwood's 1895 edition of *the Gospel according to Luke*, it appears to be a new translation into Korean based mainly on the Revised Version. There are occurrences of inappropriate use of honorifics and occasional incorrect spellings in this translation, but it has correctly translated a considerable amount of texts that were misunderstood in the Ross and Appenzeller translations. In terms of changes in word order or addition/deletion of words, Underwood's translation has exercised more freedom than any other Korean translation available at the time. The choices he made then are reflected in his 1895 edition of the Gospel of Luke.

Underwood's translation of *the Gospel according to Luke* in 1895 and in 1898 was made on the basis of Westcott-Hort's New Testament in the Original Greek, which was the most up-to-date critical edition available at the time. Influences from Chinese translations can be found because even though missionaries used English translations as their texts and referred to Greek translations, they had to rely on Chinese translations in order to appropriately transfer new conceptual words that were difficult to translate into pure Korean. Various conceptual words of the Bible - including the term 'God' - that are now naturally accepted by readers who are already familiar with the Bible, are seeds sown by the efforts of early Bible translators including Underwood, and their helpers. This is also well illustrated in the translation principles and policy of the Board of Official Translators chaired by Underwood.

Bible Translations for Asian Audiences: Nestorian Experiment in T'ang Dynasty China and Mongolian Equivalents for Diety

Young-Jin Min*

This paper is dealing with the problem of Nestorian hermeneutics in its Bible translation in T'ang dynasty China¹⁾ and Mongolian Equivalents for Diety. Nestorian experiment with Bible translation in T'ang dynasty and Mongolian equivalents for Diety could be explained as an experiment to communicate the Biblical concepts to Asian audiences.

The first section of this paper is to introduce the study Bibles intended for situations and audiences other than Christian, that is, the two study Bible projects of The West Asia South Asia and India (henceforth: WASAI) and the East Asia South Asia (henceforth: EASA) text committees and their activities. For this purpose, Kenneth Thomas' paper "Study Bibles for Religious Audiences" and Gam Seng Shae's EASA report "Communicating Concepts: Preparatory Steps" will be summarized. In the second and the third sections, the problem of hermeneutics in Bible translation for Asian audience will be introduced, and specifically Nestorian hermeneutics will be investigated in Bible translation with a comparison of terms used in the Nestorian Bible and the Union version of the Chinese Bible. For Mongolian equivalents for Diety, the opinion of Mongolian Bible Translation Committee will compare with the view of Bible Society of Mongolia in the fourth section. Through this process, finally, the necessity of positive appropriation will be proposed in the fifth section.

1. A New Experiment to Communicate the Biblical Concepts to Asian Audiences

* Korean Bible Society General Secretary

1) When I visited the Amity Foundation in Nanjing with the Korean Bible Society Board members in April of 1994, Bishop Ting presented us with a rubbed copy of the Chinese Nestorian Inscription. Since then, this rubbed copy has been kept as a treasured collection of the Information Resource Center for Biblical Studies of the Korean Bible Society.

There have been a number of study Bibles, including annotated Bibles, published both by national Bible societies and by other publishers. Most of those study Bibles are intended exclusively for Christian audiences. The only exceptions are two study Bible projects within the Asia Pacific Region for situations and audiences other than Christian. The WASAI text project is intended for use by those who live in Moslem cultures, and the EASA text project is for those in Buddhist areas.²⁾

The EASA text committee is preparing study notes on the Gospel of John for audiences who are under the influence of Buddhism. As soon as Christian readers open the first chapter of John, they are confronted with the question of how the EASA audiences will understand such concepts as “beginning,” “the Word,” “existence,” “God,” “life” and “light.” All the Asian members of the committee grew up in EASA environments, but we came to the realization that our understanding of the EASA concepts was woefully inadequate. It was necessary for us to attain a better understanding of the EASA beliefs and world view, thus enabling the committee to communicate the biblical concepts intelligibly to the EASA audiences of the Christian Scriptures.³⁾ 1) The same terms mean different things in different religions. Thus there is a need to develop a glossary of religious terms with multi-religious meanings. 2) There are many EASA terms in the Bibles in Asian languages, and many of these terms are alive with EASA meaning. Therefore, there is a need on the one hand to find new vocabulary to communicate the Christian message intelligibly to EASA readers, and on the other hand to educate Christian readers regarding the Christian meaning of words borrowed from other religions. 3) There is a need for translation officers to be involved not only in the developing of model notes in English, but also to be involved in the translation of the notes into various local languages to make sure that the ideas behind the notes may be conveyed as accurately as possible in the translations.⁴⁾

2. The Problems of Hermeneutics in Bible Translation for Asian Audiences

2) Kenneth J. Thomas, “Study Bibles for Religious Audiences,” 1995 Mini-workshop Paper, 1.

3) The committee invited five EASA scholars to its May 1994 meeting for an enlightening dialogue.

4) A summary of Gam Seng Shae’s “Communicating Concepts: Preparatory Steps,” *EASA NEWS-LETTER* 6 (June 1994), 1-2.

The problems of hermeneutics are related to the fact that when the Scriptures of a religion enter into an alien country, and when they are translated into the language of that land, the translation cannot avoid borrowing terms from other religions. It is also related to the fact that when a new concept is introduced, a similar concept of the native religion or culture is used. As a result of the cultural intercourse between the two religions, the original concept of the new religion experiences a creative reduction or expansion of its meaning.

Buddhism in China is known to us as a hermeneutical Buddhism. For this reason some scholars try to find the oriental “hermeneutics” of Nestorianism in China as a hermeneutical Christianity. The concept of “hermeneutics,” and the reason that both Buddhism and Nestorianism in China are called hermeneutical religions, is well summarized by the following quotation.

The historical encounter of Christianity with the Orient started when Christianity spread into India and China through central Asia. In the process, Christianity discovered a new identity which it had not realized in the West. The Gospel of Christianity experienced the formation of its own Asian identity, different from that of the West. Nestorian Christianity in China is a typical model of Oriental Christianity. Through Nestorianism one can find the characteristics of “hermeneutics” of every foreign religion. “Hermeneutics” refers to the universal phenomenon that when the system of a religion or a culture is transferred from one region to another it can become deeply rooted in the new soil only by putting on the clothes of the culture in which the new religion will be unfolded. One can find such a typical model in Buddhism’s move from India into China. When Buddhism came into China from India in about the 4th century A.D., the Chinese people preferred to understand it from the perspective of similar Chinese thoughts and to relate the new concept to familiar Chinese concepts. Accepting Buddhism, the Chinese people understood the new religion in connection with their traditional terms and their own way of thinking. This phenomenon is in accord with the hermeneutical awareness that understanding is impossible without a concrete horizon of understanding or *Vorverständnis*. Such a Buddhism is called “Hermeneutical Buddhism.”⁵⁾

5) Seng-Chul Kim, *Land and Wind - An Attempt at Molding Oriental Theology* (Seoul: Dasan Gelbang, 1994), 193 (Korean).

3. Nestorian Hermeneutics in Its Bible Translation

3.1. Nestorian Church in Asia

The proper name of the Nestorian Church is the ancient Church of the East. “Nestorian” is an appellation dating from the fifth century. By “East” is meant those ancient territories lying east of the former Byzantine empire comprising modern-day Iraq, Persia, and the southeastern part of Turkey. By the second century, Christianity had spread throughout the East, from Arabia, through Turkey and Iraq, to Persia. In the third century, Christianity also spread to the Indian Ocean.

In the first half of the fifth century the Church of the East was rocked by a theological controversy so serious that it resulted in schism. This was the so-called Nestorian controversy. Nestorius taught that Jesus Christ had two distinct natures: divine and human. Nestorius was condemned at the Council of Ephesus in 431, but his teaching spread, and by 451 the Nestorians were almost completely cut off from the rest of the patriarchate of Antioch.⁶⁾

A very ancient tradition, given in the third century Acts of Thomas, makes Thomas the Apostle to India, so that the Indian Christians are commonly termed Christians of St. Thomas. China received Christianity in seventh century from Persia. According to the Chinese Nestorian Inscriptions (大秦景教流行中國碑) built in 781, it was in 635 that the Nestorian missionaries including Alopen (or Abraham, 阿羅本) came to 長安, the capital city of T’ang dynasty, and in 638 they built the 大秦寺 temple. At that time there were 21 monks in the temple.⁷⁾

The Nestorian Church generally prospered until the fall of Baghdad to the Mongols in 1258, when the widespread disruption in the Middle East drained its vitality. The most detrimental effect of the Muslim conquest on the Nestorian Church in the countries lying between Persia and China was that its missionary activity, begun among the Mongols, Turks, and Chinese, was cut off. Eventually the early blossom of Christianity in China died.⁸⁾

Under the Mongols, the conditions of the Nestorians were generally peaceful.

6) Information from Matti Moosa, “Nestorian Church,” Mircea Eliade, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, vol. 10 (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987), 369-372, esp. 369-370.

7) Kwang-Soo Kim, “Nestorianism,” Ki-Moon Lee, ed., *The Christian Encyclopedia*, vol. 1 (Seoul: Christian Literature Press, 1980), 597-601, esp. 594 (Korean).

8) Matti Moosa, “Nestorian Church,” 370.

Hulagu Kahan, who took Bagdad in 1268, and most of his successors favored the Nestorians. K. Kessler points out that Mongol khans favored Nestorians not only because they were opposed to the Mohammedans, the political foes of the Mongols, but also on account of the superficial similarity between Nestorian Christianity and the Mongol type of Buddhism; and Nestorianism influenced some of the khans through the Christian wives. Certain Mongol rulers are known to have become converts to Christianity, particularly in the district of the Keraites south of the Lake of Baikal.⁹⁾

3.2. Jesus' Teaching on Almsgiving (世尊布施論)

The following text is quoted from the Nestorian *Jesus' Teaching on Almsgiving*.

世尊曰
如有人布施時
勿對人布施
會須遣世尊知識
然始布施
若左手布施
勿令右手覺

Lokajyestha (世尊, World's most venerable: The Lord, Jesus) said, "whenever you give alms, do not let the people know what you are doing. Whenever you give alms, your almsgiving may be known only by *Lokajyestha* (世尊, World's most venerable: The Lord, God). When you give alms, do not let your right hand know what your left hand is doing."

The above text is a summary of Matt. 6:2-4.

"(2) So whenever you give alms, do not sound a trumpet before you, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, so that they may be praised by others. Truly I tell you, they have received their reward. (3) But when you give alms, do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing, (4) so that your alms may be done in secret; and your Father who sees in secret will reward you."

9) K. Kessler, "Nestorians," Samuel Macauley Jackson, ed., *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, vol. III (New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1910), 121.

(NRSV)

We can pay attention to the terms which the Nestorian text borrowed from Buddhism. The Lord Jesus is translated as 世尊 (*Lokajyestha*), one of the highest titles of Buddha, literally meaning “world’s most venerable, lord of worlds.” God is also translated as 世尊 (*Lokajyestha*). Both Jesus and God have the same Chinese equivalent, 世尊 (*Lokajyestha*). This may be a reflection of the theological view that both God and God’s Son Jesus are one and the same person¹⁰). In Matthew those who give alms are warned not to let their left hands know what their right hands are doing, but in *Jesus’ Teaching on Almsgiving*, those who give alms are forbidden to tell their right hands what their left hands are doing. Some critics explain this as the influence of Taoism in which the left hand is more important than the right hand in function.¹¹

3.3. Jesus the Messiah (序聽 迷詩所經)

In this book, God is translated as “Buddha(佛陀),” and sometimes as “天尊”. The word “Buddha(佛)” is derived from “Buddh,” which means “to be aware of, conceive, observe, wake”. Buddha means “completely conscious, enlightened”, and came to mean the enlightener. The Chinese translation is 覺 to perceive, be aware, awake; and 智 *gnosis*, knowledge. There is an Eternal Buddha, and multitudes of Buddhas, but the personality of a Supreme Buddha, an Adi Buddha, is not defined.¹²) 天尊 means the most honoured among devas, a title of Buddha, i.e., the highest of divine beings. This title was applied by the Taoists to their divinities as a counterpart to the “Buddhist 世尊”.¹³)

10) Nestorius’ Christology, for which he was eventually condemned, was elaborated in relation to the question of the legitimacy of the term *theotokos* (‘bearer of God’, commonly translated ‘mother of God’) in reference to the Virgin Mary. He declared the designation unscriptural and going ‘best with those who deny Christ’s true humanity’. Instead Nestorius preferred *anthropotokos* (‘bearer of man’) or *Christotokos* (‘bearer of Christ’). He made a clear-cut distinction between the human and the divine natures in Christ, denying any real organic union between the man Jesus and the indwelling divine Logos. For details, see H. D. McDonald, “Nestorius,” Sinclair B. Ferguson and David F. Wright, ed., *New Dictionary of Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 457-458.

11) Kami, Naomichi, *Introduction to Nestorianism* (Tokyo: Kyobunkan, 1981), 98-99 (Japanese).

12) DCBT, 225.

13) *Ibid*, 145.

誰見天尊生於衆生 無人得見天尊
 皆諸佛爲此風流轉 世間風流無處不到
 誰報佛慈思 計合思量明知
 天尊受許辛若 始立衆生 衆生理佛不遠
 始有人受刑 及不柏天尊 此人及一依佛法 不成受戒之所 郎是返羊之人
 先遣衆生亂諸天 佛爲佛受若置立
 聖上宮殿 於諸佛求得

3.4. A Comparison of Terms used in the Nestorian Bible and the Union Version of the Chinese Bible¹⁴⁾

Nestorian Bible	Union Version	English Versions
彌師訶	彌賽亞	Messiah
彌施訶		
迷師訶		
阿羅訶	耶和華	LORD
慈喜羔	神的羔羊	God's Lamb
聖子端任父右座	耶蘇坐在神的右邊	Christ, seated at the right hand of God
序數	耶蘇	Jesus
多惠	大衛	David
明 ¹⁵⁾ 泰	馬太	Matthew
摩矩辭	馬可	Mark
盧伽	路加	Luke
瑜罕難	約翰	John
岑穩僧伽	西門彼得	Simon Peter
三常	信 望 愛	Faith, Hope, Love
八境	八福	Beatitudes
天尊 ¹⁶⁾ 法	神的律法	the Law of God
鳥黎師斂	耶路撒冷	Jerusalem
天上飛仙 ¹⁷⁾	天使	Angels

14) The New Chinese Bible Centre, ed., *A Brief Survey of Chinese Bible Translation History* (Hong Kong: Tien Dao Publishing House, 1986), 6.

15) *Vidya*, knowledge. *Ming* means bright, clear, enlightenment. It represents Buddha-wisdom and its revelation. It means also the manifestation of Buddha's light or effulgence.

16) A title of Buddha.

17) Literally, "a benevolent wizard flying in the sky" from Taoism.

It is very interesting that the word “彌 (*me, mai*)” in “彌師訶 (Messiah)” reminds the Asian audience of “彌勒 (*Maitreya*),” the Buddhist Messiah, or next Buddha, now in the *Tusita* heaven, who is to come 5,000 years after the nirvana Sakyamuni, or according to other reckoning, after 4,000 heavenly years, i.e., 5,670,000,000 human years. According to tradition, he was born in Southern India of a Brahman family. His two titles are “慈氏 (Benevolent),” and “阿逸多 (Invincible).” He presides over the spread of the church, protects its members and will usher in ultimate victory for Buddhism. His image is usually in the hall of the four guardians facing outward, where he is represented as the fat laughing Buddha, but in some places his image is tall, i.e., in Peking in the Yung Ho Kung.¹⁸⁾

The Nestorian name of Simon Peter is *Sangha* (僧伽), a Buddhist term which means (1) an assembly, collection, company, society, (2) the corporate assembly of at least three (formerly four) monks under a chairman, empowered to hear confession, grant absolution, and ordain, and (3) the church or monastic order. The term *Sang* (僧) used alone has come to mean a monk, or monks in general.¹⁹⁾ The Nestorian name of Simon Peter associates him with a Buddhist monk.

The Tetragrammaton יהוה is translated as 阿羅訶. “a (阿)”, the first letter in 阿羅訶 is the first letter of the Sanskrit Siddham alphabet. From it are supposed to be born all the other letters, and it is the first sound uttered by the human mouth. It has, therefore, numerous mystical indications. It also indicates Amitabha Buddha (阿彌陀佛), the Buddha of infinite qualities, known as “boundless light (無量光)” and “boundless age (無量數).” This name indicates an idealization rather than an historic personality, the idea of eternal light and life.²⁰⁾

4. Mongolian Equivalents for Deity

There are two groups of opinion of this matter.

4.1. The Opinion of Mongolian Bible Translation Committee

18) DCBT, 456.

19) Ibid, 420.

20) ibid, 287.

Khans after him already knew of the religions of Shamanism, Budd, Islam, and Nestorianism. The terms of each were familiar to them. Basically, these were “tenger” for the pantheon of shamanist deities, and the word “*burhan*” for the person of Buddha and the various idols of him.²²⁾

According to celebrated Soviet Academician and scholar of Mongolian, Lev Gumilev, when talking of Christianity, Chinggis and other Khans used the Persian term *hudai* for referring to the God of the Bible. This was in spite of the fact that all the terms of Shamanism and Buddhism were fully known to them. Gumilev, an atheist to the end of his days, states that this term was used because the Mongols wanted to use a clearly monotheistic term for the Biblical God. Even today, in Pushto, the term “Hudai” means “the one who exists from himself” and is used for Allah/God. The term is retained in such as the modern day Bible translation in Khazakh — “Hudei.”

The summation of this, is that Mongols understood there is a difference between monotheistic Christianity and polytheism, and signalled this.

The second observation is that there is no evidence that the term of either “tenger” or “burhan” were used by Mongols for the Christian God. Even in the early 19th Century initial translations of the Bible into Kalmyk Mongolian by Father Schmidt, in Elistia (between the Black and Caspian Seas), they called God “Deed Geegen” — “high lama,” rather than Burhan. It is not until some years later in the 19th Century that Scottish missionaries Swann, Stallybrass and Yuielle in Selenhinsk (modern day Buryatia) started to call the Biblical God “burhan.” According to Mongolist scholar Charles Bawden, University of London, in his book “Shamans, Lamas and Evangelicals,” Mongolians were utterly confused by this, and suggested the Scottish missionaries should limit their discussions to the Buddhist lamas, as they were all talking about the same deities! Their translation of both the OT and NT was hailed as a success in the West, yet Mongols claimed it was incomprehensible, having far too many words which were transliterated from English in the translation. These were the words for “testament,” “demon,” “heaven,” “hell” and so on!

The next point is that when in 1972, modern Bible translation, taking the lead

22) According to the Buddhist Research Institute of the Soviet Union, the term “burhan” is derived from the Sanskrit spelling of the proper noun “Buddha,” and was never used as a generic term for any kind of deity, being just a proper noun.

from the Buryat translation of 1842 (OT) and 1846 (NT) and the revision of the NT into “Inner Mongolian” dialect (1952), the Buddhist terms such as “burhan” were initially used. At that time, the work was being done in Ulaanbaatar, at the Mongolian Studies Department of the Mongolian State University, involving well known lecturers and scholars. When the terminology for “God” was discussed, these very people unanimously rejected the term “burhan,” declaring it to be a Mongolian Buddhist term exclusively, and not usable for the God of the Bible. This was very much in the spirit of Chinggis Khan many hundreds of years previously!

There was a time when no one really could come up with many other ideas. In the end, the “Concise English-Mongolian Dictionary” (Ulaanbaatar 1968, Mongolian State University, compiler — Nyam-suren) was consulted. This contains the two entries:

god	burhan, tenger
God	Yertunztin Ezen

The interesting thing was the capitalization on the second entry. It should be noted that Nyam-suren, an accomplished linguist, had been amongst the very first of Mongolian scholars to visit England in the 1960’s, just after Britain had opened full diplomatic relations with Mongolia, in 1967, following the acceptance of Mongolia in United Nations in 1966. Nyam-suren had been befriended in England by a church minister, and had learnt something about the God of the Bible.

Thus what became the Bible Society of Mongolia translation, derived its terminology from recommendations from Mongolian State University personal. After the full New Testament was printed in 1990 and copies received in Mongolia, there were just a few Mongolians who raised negative comments about the terminology for God. They were:

- a. those who believed that the God of the Bible was identical to the gods of all other religions, and that the same god is called “Allah” by Muslims, “Buddha” by Buddhists and so on. This was a prevalent idea in the communist era in both Soviet Union and Mongolia, believing that society creates god in their own image. It was part of the anti-religious propaganda in those days. Thus, in Mongolia, some Mongolian workers in some of the evangelical churches have had articles printed in Mongolian newspapers that the Mongols also had a virgin birth in the

person of the brother of Chinggis Khan, just as Jesus had, and the gods worshipped by Chinggis were in fact the same as those in the Bible. Lately, this has gone further, with some Mongolian workers in some of the evangelical churches taking up the New Age position, and explaining the miracles of Jesus in such terms as extra sensory perception and so on. b. just a very few Mongolian nationalists. Quote from Mr. Damdin, Mongolian TV reporter: (atheist) “I can understand why some would object to calling the Christian God, ‘Lord of the Universe.’ The problem is the term is too high. It sounds as though the gods of Chinggis and the Buddhist burhans are just nothing, against one who made and rules the universe. I think you should change it so that the Bible God is on the same level as all the others.”

The next point is that the most authoritative dictionaries state:

burhan	Buddha, image of the Buddha
burhan religion	Buhhism
burhan teacher	Gutama Buddha

Of all the dictionaries, only one gives:

burhan - Buddha, God

This dictionary (Altangerel) was co-edited by New Zealand missionary H. Kemp in 1991! All the rest do not give this definition at all. Mongolian newspapers now often capitalize the word ‘Burhan,’ and use it exclusively for ‘Buddha’ and ‘Buddhism.’ In a recent interview with a noted Russian heart-surgeon, he was asked, “do you believe in God?” Interestingly, the newspaper did not use the term “burhan,” but instead, like Chinggis Khan, borrowed a foreign term, in this case, the Russian word “Bog!” Observation — Mongolians do not like a polytheistic term when referring to the Biblical God. They prefer to use a foreign word rather than do this!

One observation has been that although missionaries have tried to persuade Mongolians to adopt the word “burhan,” by far, Mongolians just use the term “Yertunztin Ezen.” Use if the term ‘burhan’ is rare, and generally limited to just a few people.²³⁾

Charles Corvin, in the appendix of his book “A Biblical encounter with Japanese

Culture,” 1952, says that rather than cause lasting confusion using a polytheistic term in Bible translation, it is better to use a clear, even if less well known monotheistic term, and although it may take time, in the end the result is far better. Some have theorized that the reason for the greater appeal of Christianity in Korea has been influenced by the fact that their term for God is monotheistic, as against the polytheistic Japanese term.

As the Bible Society of Mongolia has got on the job of translating the OT, so they have felt the case against the polytheistic term ‘burhan’ is far clearer. Whereas the situation in the NT it perhaps could be taken either way, taking into account the term ‘burhan’ is a proper noun of a historical person, they have found it clashes seriously with OT exegesis.

When the issue is raised with rank and file church attenders in Mongolia they have said:

“I can’t see what the problem is. We all know ‘burhan’ is just Buddha. We can’t see why missionaries are deliberately trying to create confusion. Surely they know the God of the Bible is not Gutama Buddha?”

“I call God ‘burhan’ because I could lose my job otherwise. But I know God is not burhan, and when I pray I call him ‘Yertunztin Ezen.’”

“I only say ‘burhan’ in public with missionaries. At home, with my children, I only use the term ‘Yertunztin Ezen.’”

Thus, the term ‘burhan’ and even for that matter the shamanist term ‘tenger’ are in fact specific terms for specific deities. Neither has been proved to be a generic term as are elohim and theos. It is also clear that both ‘burhan’ and ‘tenger’ are alive and current names of deities in Mongolian consciousness. The question then, is whether Mongolians can accept what is a specific proper noun of Buddha for the generic elohim and theos of the Bible, which then have to take on the specific of the Bible meaning of those terms in the person of YHWH. The history of Chinggis Khan and many after him has been to avoid doing just that.

23) R. Foster has presented at the Bible Translation committee of the Interdev Conference in May 1996, “The most recent survey has not produced any clear result.”

5. The Necessity of Positive Appropriation

- 1) The Biblical message cannot be conveyed without the hermeneutical process.
- 2) In Bible translation, borrowing words is inescapable.
- 3) Sometimes it is better to borrow terms from the indigenous religions to express the Biblical message than to coin new words.
- 4) The Biblical message expressed with borrowed terms sometimes experiences the formation of a new identity, different from that of other cultures.
- 5) In the case of Mongolian Bible translation, both Burkhan and Yertunztin Ezen are likely to be used as being the Mongolian equivalents for deity for the time being among the different Bible translation teams.
- 6) After such an examination, the Mongolian Christians should decide which symbol can convey the Biblical idea more effectively. Both Burkhan and Yertunztin Ezen are the symbols of ideas.
- 7) They may either choose one of those symbols, or both.

Since Mongols have used the term Burhan as the proper noun for Buddha it remains to be seen as to whether people are going to accept it in the long run for the generic term for deity and the specific monotheistic concept of the Biblical terms for God.

* **Keyword**

Biblical Concepts, WASAI, EASA, Nestorian Hermeneutics, Bible translation, Mongolian equivalent for Deity

* **References**

- Kami, Naomichi, *Introduction to Nestorianism*, Tokyo: Kyobunkan, 1981 (Japanese).
- Kessler, K., "Nestorians," Samuel Macauley Jackson, ed., *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, vol. III, New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1910.
- Kim, Kwang-Soo, "Nestorianism," Ki-Moon Lee, ed., *The Christian Encyclopedia*, vol. 1, Seoul: Christian Literature Press, 1980.
- Kim, Seng-Chul, *Land and Wind - An Attempt at Molding Oriental Theology*, Seoul: Dasan Gelbang, 1994 (Korean).
- McDonald, H. D., "Nestorius," Sinclair B. Ferguson and David F. Wright, ed., *New Dictionary of Theology*, Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1988.
- Moosa, Matti, "Nestorian Church," *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, Mircea Eliade, ed., vol. 10, New York: Macmillian Publishing Company, 1987.
- Shae, Gam Seng, "Communicating Concepts; Preparatory Steps," EASA NEWSLETTER, No. 6 (June 1994).
- The New Chinese Bible Centre, ed., *A Brief Survey of Chinese Bible Translation History*, Hong Kong: Tien Dao Publishing House, 1986.
- Thomas, Kenneth J., "Study Bibles for Religious Audiences," 1995 Mini-workshop Paper.

Reflections on the First Translation of Korean Bible: the Ross Version of 1887(*Yesu-Seonggyo-Jeonseo*)¹⁾

Hwan-Jin Yi*

1. Introduction

The purpose of this article is to explore some of the translation features of “Yesu-seonggyo-jeonseo”(예수성경전서), the first Korean translation of the New Testament. This Bible is also called the “the Ross Version” by giving it the last name of its chief translator. The translation team includes Revs. John Ross and John McIntyre, who were Scottish missionaries working in Manchuria, along with five young Koreans(Eung Chan Lee, Sung Hah Lee, Jin Ki Kim, Hong Joon Paek, and Sang Yoon Seo). The translation work of the Ross Version seems to have been prepared since 1875. Under the leadership of Rev. Ross, the gospels of Luke and John were published in Korean in 1882, followed by the whole New Testament in Manchuria in 1887.

The most distinctive contribution of the Ross Version to Korean churches is the fact that the Ross translation team has created terms referring to God: “하느님”(hah-neu-nyim) or “하나님”(hah-nah-nyim). Both terms convey the same meaning and reflect different pronunciations according to districts. Another notable feature of the Ross Version is the fact that the translation team had used functional equivalence method, even though they had not known it. Indeed, they have tried to adopt easy and understandable Korean terms and expressions as much as they could.

Reflecting on these features, this article shall deal with the following five aspects of the Ross Version: (1) the basic text, (2) the translation process, (3) the translation principle, (4) translation examples, and (5) comparison of the Lord’s Prayer with

* The professor of Methodist Theological Seminary, Old Testament

1) This article is a revision of Yi Hwan-Jin and Jeon Moo-Yong, “Yesu-seonggyo-jeonseo”(예수성경전서), *The Korean Bible Society News* 33:1 (June 1987), 8-18 (Korean). The third and fourth part of the original article was written by Mr. Jeon Moo-Yong who is working at the Translation Department of the Korean Bible Society.

other versions.

2. The Basic Text

Korean scholars have long contemplated upon identifying the basic text for the Ross Version, and the two most widely accepted suggestions are the English Bible and the Chinese Bible. Prof. Chang Gyoon Yoo, a Korean linguist, insists that the first Korean New Testament might have been based on English Bibles.²⁾ His suggestion has been supported by few scholars. On the other hand, Dr. Young-Jin Min argues in his book³⁾ that Korean translators had definitely adopted Chinese versions for their translation work. At that time they could not read or understand English, nor used the English Bibles at all. On the same line, Dr. Deok Joo Rhie also insists, through his careful review of John Ross' missionary reports, that the basic text of the Ross Version was a high Wen-li version.⁴⁾ More recently Dr. James H. Grayson has dealt with the question about the basic text of the Ross Version more deliberately.⁵⁾ He has mentioned three kinds of Chinese Bibles: Delegates' Version, Mandarin and easy Wen-li versions. He contends that Delegates' Version and high Wen-li version might be the basic text of the Ross Version.

Dr. Grayson's opinion seems to be more accurate than suggestions by other scholars, but his classification of Chinese versions would be problematic because Delegates' Version is one of the names of Chinese Bibles and high wen-li version indicates a literary style in which some of the earlier Chinese Bibles were translated.

Chinese Bibles can be divided into three categories in terms of their style and expression: high Wen-li (深文理), easy Wen-li (賤文理), and Mandarin. According to this classification, Delegates' version is a Chinese Bible which was translated in high Wen-li style.⁶⁾ The Delegates' Version had been accepted as the *Textus*

2) Yoo Chang Gyoon, "Korean Bibles' influence on the Development in Korean Language," *Dong-Seu-Moon-Hwa* 1 (1967), 59-75 (Korean).

3) Min Young-Jin, *An Introduction to Korean Versions of the Bible* (Seoul: Sung Kwang Publishing Co., 1984), 134-143 (Korean).

4) Rhie Deok Joo, "Studies on Earlier Korean Bibles," *Korean Bibles and Korean Culture* (Seoul: Ki-dok-Kyo-Moon-Sah, 1985), 466-467 (Korean).

5) James H. Grayson, "John Ross and the Process of Bible Translation," *Theology and World (Shinhak-kwa-Segye)* 11 (1985), 362-382 (Korean).

6) Delegates's Version was translated by Western missionaries from diverse denominations by

Receptus in China for about half century since its publication in 1854 until the Union Bible was published by the General Missionary Conference in Shanghai, China, in 1905. It will be possible to discern whether the Ross Version was translated from the Delegates' Version or not by comparing the Lord's Prayer of the Ross Version with other versions.

Korean Bible translators of the Ross Version were the educated, so they could read and write Chinese in Wen-li style as easily as Chinese scholars. Of course, they could read and understand Mandarin. They might have relied on any Chinese versions in the process of translating the Bible into Korean. But they are believed to have chosen the Delegates' Version as their basic text, as it was recognized as the Chinese Textus Receptus until that time.

We can also find out one example supporting this argument when we read Rev. John Ross's article written in 1883.⁷⁾ Rev. John Ross, as the chief translator of the Ross Version, reported in this article that a line of Romans 7:20 “非我行所不好行之者” from a Chinese version was taken as an example for the first draft of the Korean translation. This is exactly the same line as the one in the Delegates' Version. It means that the Korean translators heavily referred to the Delegates' Version, even though Rev. Ross did not specify their basic text in his report.

3. The Translation Process

The translation team of the Ross Version is believed to have taken the Delegates' Version as their main basic text along with some other subsidiary literatures

organizing the committee of Chinese Bible translation in 1843. Its literary style was high Wen-li. High Wen-li style had been used by Chinese scholars for over 1,500 years. Especially the literary style of Confucian literature was the same as that of Delegates' Version. The New Testament of Delegates' Version was issued in 1852 and The Old Testament was published in 1954. Only the Chinese intellectuals could read this Bible, but common people in China could not understand what it meant in high Wen-li or classic Wen-li style. Many other versions in easy wen-li and spoken Chinese language style were produced after publication of Delegates' Version. For Delegates' Version, see Yi Hwan Jin, “The Chinese Translation of the Bible in the 19th and 20th centuries,” Tai-il Wang, ed., *Explain the Meaning of What We Read- Exegesis and Bible Translation* (Seoul: Christian Literature Society of Korea, 2002), 440-447 (Korean).

7) James H. Grayson, *John Ross: The First Missionary of Korea* (DaeKoo: Gyemyong University Press, 1982), 211-212. (Korean and English). His original article was published in *Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal* 14 (Nov. - Dec. 1883): 491-497 by the title of “Corean New Testament.”

including the Greek Bible, *King James Version*, and *English Revised Version*, as Ross and McIntyre remarked in their contribution to *Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal*. In addition to these, they also consulted not only the Biblical Greek lexicon but Meyer's exegesis as well.

According to one of John Ross' reports to the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland⁸⁾, the translation process of the Ross Version can be summarized as follows. Firstly, Korean translators had been translating the Delegates' Version into Korean language while referring to other Chinese versions like Mandarin version. Their works might have served as the first draft for Ross' corrections. Secondly, Ross and McIntyre had compared the first draft with the Greek and English Bibles word by word, clause by clause, and sentence by sentence. Thirdly, this draft with careful corrections was copied out, and the work was laid aside for a time after the Greek concordance was thoroughly consulted. Finally, Ross and Macintyre carefully compared again the revised draft with the Greek text, i. e. Alford edition, word by word. They have not carried out this delicate translation process only one time but again and again to perfect their translation. In case of Luke, the Ross translation team undertook such translation process even four or five times.

I will take two passages as an example to explain that the Ross translation team have referred not only the Delegates' Version but also Greek and English Bibles when making their textual decision. In case of Matthew 6:13, the Ross Version omits the last line: "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever, Amen" (KJV). Unlike the Ross Version, the Delegates' Version puts it like this: "以國, 權, 榮, 皆爾所有, 爰及世世, 固所願也." The English Revised Version reads it not on the text but as a marginal note just like the Greek text. In case of Mark 1:2, the Ross Version reads "seyunji isayah sseosadoi(선지 이사야 써사디)," including the name of the prophet, Isaiah, while the Delegates' Version leaves out the prophet's name like this: "先知載曰." The English Revised Version has "Isaiah" in the text, while its marginal note simply says "the prophet" rather than "Isaiah the prophet," as shown in the Greek text. These two examples indicate the fact that the Ross translation team relied on the Greek text instead of the Delegates' Version when they translated some specific lines.

8) *United Presbyterian Missionary Record*, July 1 (1882), 244; cf. Rhie Deok Joo, "Studies on Earlier Korean Bibles," 423.

4. The Translation Principles

The main goal of the Ross translation team was to deliver the message of the Biblical text correctly and simply to general Korean readers.⁹⁾ In other words, they tried to translate the Bible into easy and spoken language. Ross recognized both Korean and Chinese scholars had good command of Wen-li in reading and writing. He once commented that Korean scholars tended to prefer Chinese words and expressions over those of Korean. However, most common people did not understand Chinese characters but read Korean alphabets very easily. This means that Ross wanted to make the Korean Bible for the common people.

Especially, translation of some words like “Passover,” “baptism” or “Sabbath” were challenges to Ross’ translation team up to the last moment as they sought to convey exact meanings of such words to Korean readers who were without knowledge of Chinese or Greek. Ross was aware that the translation of “baptism” into “wash-rite” in Korean language was not correct at all. To Korean people whose cultural background are different from Jews or Greek, the word, “wash-rite” did not carry any specific meaning except washing of the body. Korean readers were very much confused in understanding the word, “Sabbath.” The Sabbath day (“안식일”) was regarded as nothing more than a day like the rest. Some argued why they should not work on Sabbath. Sabbath was translated as “sa-bat-il” (사밧일). Similarly baptism was read as “bap-tim-rae” (밥딤래). Passover became “num-an-jeol” (넘논절). These words sound quite natural and acceptable even to modern Koreans. However, the other expression for Passover, “유월절” (yu-wol-jeol), shown in later Korean Revised Version (1938/1961), can be misleading because readers might think of it as a rite which took place in June. This expression, unless written in Chinese characters, cannot convey the exact meaning of Pascha to ordinary Korean people.

As Ross had mentioned, word by word translation was not a true translation. As a matter of fact, some aspects of functional equivalence translation theory asserted by Dr. Eugene Nida can be found in the Ross Version. Koreans do not say “eyes” when mention a needle’s eye. In Korean, a needle does not have an eye but an ear. In a similar way, Ross demanded that it should be easier for a camel to pass through the ear of a needle instead of the eye. One Korean term that reflects functional

9) Ross, “Corean New Testament,” 206.

equivalence in the Ross Version is “지게”(jaege) which corresponds to “nesteuo” of Greek. Usually this Greek word means “fasting.” The Chinese Delegates’ Version puts this word as “禁食,” which means stopping eating. If the Ross translation team had simply followed the Delegates’ Version, Korean people would be frustrated when they read or hear that word. Indeed, starvation or suffering from the lack of food was part of the daily life of the Korean people in those days. Even though the Korean word for fasting, “지게”(jaege), would not make the exact literal translation, the Ross translation team adapted it properly to the Korean cultural context at that time.

Another noteworthy feature of the Ross Version is in how personal and place names have been transliterated. “Abraham” was vocally written as 亞伯罕 in Chinese. When read in Korean, it should be read as “아백라한”(ah-baik-nah-han), which is far from the original sound. This name was transliterated as “아브라함”(ab-rah-hahm) in the Ross Version. The same kind of example was “Peter,” which was written as “彼得” in Chinese, and read as “피득”(pee-deuk) in Korean. The Ross translation team recognized the different pronunciation of Chinese characters in each country and tried to transliterate the original names into Korean as exactly as possible.

5. Translation Examples

It was mentioned earlier that the Ross Version was written in easy Korean language. Dr. Young-Jin Min has written an article evaluating characteristics of Korean words used in the Ross Version, where Korean north-western dialect, native words and Chinese characters have been compared and analyzed.¹⁰⁾ He has discovered that the Ross translation team intended to make maximum use of spoken words even including old idioms with renewed sense, and concluded that anyone who could understand Korean language would easily read and understand the Ross Version.

However, easy reading did not necessarily construe proper delivery of textual meanings to the readers. “The righteous,” which might be 義人 in the Chinese Delegates’ Version, was translated into “올은 스름”(or-eun sah-rahm) in most

10) Min Young-Jin, *An Introduction to Korean Versions of the Bible*, 134-143 (Korean).

passages of the Ross Version. Sometimes, it was translated into other diverse expressions such as “올은자”(or-eun jyah), “올운자”(or-eun jyah), “올흔사름”(or-eun sah-rahm) or “의인”(eui-in). All of these expressions could be understood similarly, but how each word is understood might be slightly different from one other depending on the people and their context. For example, “의인”(eui-in) was understood in general as a patriot willing to sacrifice himself or herself for his or her own people or nation. In other words, the term implies a certain outstanding person to the eyes of the ordinary people. Unlike “의인”(eui-in), the word, “올은 스름”(or-eun sah-rahm), which refers to a person of conscience, has broader bearings than other terms in their understanding and usage. Idiomatically, every employer wants to hire a person of conscience, i. e. “올은 스름”(or-eun sah-rahm). However, they do not say “의인”(eui-in) to an employee of good standing.

The remarkable contribution of the Ross Version to the translation of Korean Bibles lied in the fact that the Ross translation team had translated “God” into native Korean words, “하느님”(hah-neu-nim) or “하나님”(hah-nah-nim). These two words convey all the same meaning, the “Lord of Heaven,” but just reflect different pronunciations in various parts of Korea.

When they translated the word for divinity in the Bible, the Chinese translators of the Delegates’ Version had a harsh debate about selecting the words, “shen”(神, or and “shangti”(上帝, Highest Majesty). Unfortunately they divided up into two parties without any final decision on that matter, and published two different versions as the Shen edition and Shangti edition. Even till today, two different editions in Chinese are being published.

Ross’ report shows the similar sort of endeavors of his translation team on selecting the term for divinity.¹¹⁾ The classic term, “shangti” in its classical sense to scholars only, while the term “shen” sounded like an devil. The Korean term “하느님”(hah-neu-nim) for divinity appeared in the Gospel of Luke and John published by the Ross translation team in 1878 and 1882. But the term had been slightly changed into “하나님”(hah-nah-nim) in the first edition of the whole Ross Version in 1887. Both terms just reflect the difference in pronunciations, as mentioned earlier. These two expressions have been interchangeably used in Korean Christianity until now. The term of “하나님”(hah-nah-nim) has been selected and

11) Ross, “Corean New Testament,” 209-210.

used in the Korean Revised Version(1938/1961), which is the Textus Receptus of the Korean protestant churches, whereas the term of “하느님”(hah-neu-nim) has been used in the Korean Common Translation(1977), which was the Textus Receptus of the Korean Catholic church for more than 30 years.

Another technical difficulties arose from the translation for “Holy Spirit”(peuma). The Chinese term in the Delegates’ Version is “聖神,” which was revised by the Ross translation team into “성령”(seong-ryeong) after long and thoughtful deliberations. The reason for the change was due to the fact that the Korean people already had used the word “영”(yeong) for the spirit of a person.

What is more, the translation of pronouns was hard on the Ross translation team. The Korean word for the second personal pronoun, “너”(neo), points out the person of the other party in a dialogue under very specific situation. Koreans tend to be punctilious in distinguishing the social position of persons in both speech and writing. Equals in age or social rank may employ the direct form of speech, but strangers or socially unequal persons could not use the direct “you” or “thou” of English or Greek. To them, such use of the second personal pronoun is extremely disrespectful. When God was addressed, the Ross translation team used the indirect mode of address. In the Lord’s Prayer, every “thy” was translated into “Father’s.” When the disciples called Jesus, they always used the indirect mode of address like “Lord” or “Teacher.” Korean people placed greater importance on the form of address than did the Chinese. The term for the third personal pronoun, “they” was translated into a substantive form like “몫사람”(moot sah-rahm, meaning “numbers of people”) in Acts 1:9-12, but was frequently omitted in other passages. In case of the Sermon on the Mount, the other expression for “they” was “더”(dyeo), which means “those” in Matthew 5:2, and this was omitted in the following verses. The term for the third personal female pronoun, “she,” was read as “부인”(boo-yin) in Matthew 15:23-27, similar to “婦” in the Chinese Delegates’ Version. Sometimes it was expressed as “녀인”(nyeo-yin) in Mark 7:28 and was omitted in Mark 7:30.

6. Comparison of the Lord’s Prayer with Other Versions

Here we will briefly examine the Lord’s Prayer of the Ross Version to find out

the degree of Greek reflection, application of functional equivalence translation, and the influence of the Ross Version on later Korean Bibles. The following table enlists every word of the Greek Lord's Prayer in its order. Chinese and Korean words are matched with the respective Greek ones. The translated words make sense almost as the original context when read according to the numbers on the left.¹²⁾

Greek ¹³⁾	Delegates' ¹⁴⁾	Ross ¹⁵⁾	English transliteration
(v. 9)			
pater	C02 父	K04 아바님	ah-ba-nyim
hemōn	C01 吾	K01 우리	woo-ryi
ho	C03 在	K03 계신	gye-shin
en tois ouranois	C04 天	K02 하늘에	ha-nahl-e
hagiassthetō	C05 願 C08 聖	K07 성히시며	shyeon-hah-shi-myeo
to onoma	C07 名	K06 일흠이	yil-heum-yi
sou	C06 爾	K05 아바님의	ah-bah-nyim-eui
(v. 10)			
elthatō	C11 臨格	K10 님히시며	nyim-hah-shi-myeo
hē basileia	C10 國	K09 나라이	nah-rah-yi
sou	C09 爾	K08 아바님	ah-bah-nyim
genēthētō	C14 得成	K14 일우기를	yil-woo-ki-reul
to thelēma	C13 旨	K12 뜻이	teu-shi
sou	C12 爾	K11 아바님	ah-bah-nyim
hōs	C16 若	K16 갓치(히시며)	kat-chi (hah-shi-myeo)
en ouranō	C17 天	K15 하늘에(히히심)	hah-nal-e (haeng-hah-shim)
kai			
epi gēs	C15 在地	K13 땅에	tahng-e

12) In the sections of Delegates' Version and the Ross Version, "C" stands for Chinese Bible and "K" stands for Korean Bible.

13) The Greek text cited above is as follows: Brook Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, ed., *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949).

14) The edition of Delegates' Version cited above is as follows: <文理 舊新約聖書>, 聖書公會印發. The English title of this edition is *Wenli Bible, Delegates' Version*, British & Foreign Bible Society, Shanghai, 1933 (Ed. No. 2908).

15) The edition of the Ross Version cited above is the carbon copy of *Yesu-seonggyo-jeonsoo* (예수성교전서), (경성: 문광서원, 1887).

(v. 11)

ton arton	C19 糧	K18 음식을	eum-shik-eul
hemōn			
ton epiouision	C18 所需之	K17 쓰느바	seu-nahn-bah
dos	C21 錫	K21 주시며	joo-shi-myeo
hēmin	C22 我	K20 우리를	woo-ryi-reul
sēmeron	C20 今日	K19 날마당	nah-al-mah-dahng

(v. 12)

kai apheres	C26 求免	K27 샅시며	sah-hah-shi-myeo
hemin			
ta opheilēmata	C28 負	K26 빚을	byit-ahl
hemōn	C27 我	K25 우리	woo-ryi
hōs		K24 갓치	gat-chi
kai			
hemeis	C23 我		
aphēkamen	C24 免	K23 샅함	sha-hahm
tois opheiletais	C25 人負	K22 사롭의 빚	sah-rahm-eui byit
hemōn			

(v. 13)

kai			
mē	C30 勿	K31 안케 하시며	ahn-kye hah-shi-myeo
eisenegkēs	C29 俾	K30 드지	deu-jyo
hemas	C31 我	K28 우리로	woo-ryi-ro
eis peirasmon	C32 試	K29 시험에	shi-heom-e
alla		K32 오직	oh-jyik
rhusai	C33 拯, C35 出	K35 구원하시여니소서	koo-wan-hah-yeo-nyi-so-sheo
hemas	C34 我	K33 우리를	woo-ryi-reul
apo tou ponērou	C36 惡	K34 악에	ahk-e

First of all, translation of the personal pronouns is noteworthy. The personal pronoun is translated as an substantive following the Korean way of addressing superiors. In verses 9 and 10, the Greek term, “sou” for the second personal pronoun was read as “爾” in Chinese(C06, C09, C12) which refers to the second singular personal pronoun. On the other hand, it took a substantive, “아바님”(ah-bah-nyim), which is an honorific expression for “father” in Korean(K05, K08, K11). Actually,

this word is a translation of “pater,” the first word of verse 9 in the Greek text.

The Korean expression of “헝하십… 헝시며”(haeng-hah-shim… hah-shi-myeo) in verse 10 would be equivalent to the Greek idiomatic expression of “hos … kai …” which can mean “as …, so ….” The Greek Bible and Chinese Delegates’ Version, however, do not have the same equivalent expression as the ones in the Ross Version, but only allude to this connotation. This Korean expression can be a sort of expansion or insertion in order to help the readers understand. It can be regarded as a feature of the Korean language.

“Ton arton”(v. 11) meaning “bread” was translated into “crops”(糧) in the Chinese Delegates’ Version(C19). This sort of functional correspondence translation was inevitable in the countries of different cultural backgrounds. The Ross Version also expressed it as “foods”(음식) or “crops,” similar to the Chinese Bible. Together with “hemon,” “ton arton” was translated into “쓰느바 음식을”(seu-neun bah eum-shik-eul) on the basis of the Chinese expression, “所需之糧”(C18, C19). Korean and Chinese versions did not translate “hemon” in this verse.

Another intriguing term is “날마당”(nahl-mah-dahng) in verse 11, which means “everyday” and the translation of “sēmeron.” The Chinese Delegates’ Version had the expression of “今日”(today)(C20). Translators of the Chinese Bible would take “sēmeron” as the meaning. Since the term, “ton epiousion”(v. 11) is still very controversial in academic circles, they are claimed to have multiple implications like “necessary for existence” or “for today or for the following day.”¹⁶⁾ We can raise two possibilities for this translation. One possibility is that the Ross translation team took “ton epiousion” out of context as “쓰느바”(seu-nahn bah, meaning “necessary”) and “날마당”(nahl-mah-dahng meaning “everyday”) purposely in double translation. The other is that they mistranslated “semeron” into “날마당”(nahl-mah-dahng meaning “everyday”). Its parallel text can be found in Luke 11:3, where “날마당”(nahl-mah-dahng) would have come from the Chinese expression of “日日”(day by day). “날마당”(nahl-mah-dahng) in Luke 11:3 is believed to be the exact verbal translation of the Chinese expression of “日日,” unlike “semeron”(今日 meaning “today”). It seems likely that one translator worked

16) William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2nd ed. (The University of Chicago, 1958), 296-297; J. H. Moulton and W. F. Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. II (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), 313-314.

hardly on his own draft to maintain consistency of wordings with others, or they lacked the knowledge of the Greek text.

“빚”(byit, K26) in verse 12 was a proper translation of “負”(C28) or “ta opheilemata,” both of which means “debt.” The parallel text in Luke 11:4 has an expression of “죄”(joi), counterpart of Chinese “罪” and Greek “hamartia” meaning “sin.” The clear distinction between the two terms was given in the Ross Version. Nevertheless, confusion between the two words has been made in later Korean versions such as the Korean Old Version of 1911 and the Korean Revised Version of 1938 and 1961. In the marginal note to Matthew 6:12 in the Korean Revised Version, a short explanation of the original meaning of the term, “ta opheilemata” was provided.

The Greek “hemin”(v. 12) was not translated in Chinese and Korean versions, and the Greek “hemeis” meaning “we” was also deleted in the Ross Version. “人負”(C25), the Chinese translation for “tois opheiletais hemon”(v. 12) is adopted in the Ross Version: “사람의 빚”(sah-rahm-eui byit).

“오직”(oh-jyik, K32) does not have its counterpart in the Chinese Delegates’ Version. This might have come from the Greek “alla” or English “but”(English Revised Version).

“Kai”(vss. 12, 13) is a conjunction, which is not reflected in the Chinese Delegates’ Version but is expressed as “...시며”(shi-myeo) in the form of verbal conjugation in the Ross Version. In relation to this, the Korean expression of “하시며”(hah-shi-myeo) in K07, K10, K16, K21, K27, and K30, seems to be one of Matthew’s typical stylistic characters of aoristic imperative form that implies wish. Though each phrase could be completed in the wishful sentence form, the Ross translation team adopted the Chinese condensed term, “願”(to wish, C05) so that it would continuously contain wishful phrases in one sentence.

Over all, adoption of some Korean language features is distinctive. First, noteworthy are the use of substantives instead of personal pronouns and the omission of personal pronouns. In verse 9, “아바님”(ah-bah-nyim) is employed for the Greek “sou” or Chinese “爾.” In verse 12, Greek terms for “we” or “our” are omitted. Second, honorific expressions are employed in nouns and verbs. “아바님”(ah-bah-nyim) in verse 9 is the honorific expression for the Chinese “父” or “father.” Greek aoristic imperative forms are expressed with “...하시며”

(hah-shi-myeo) throughout the Prayer.

We can also notice that the Ross Version has followed the Chinese Delegates' Version in textual decision. The Korean term, “사름의 빚”(sah-raham-eui byit), in verse 12 is a translation of the Chinese “人負”(that which is owed by people). In addition, the Chinese “願”(to wish) is rendered into the Korean “하시며”(hah-shi-myeo). Besides the above, this is also exemplified in “쓰는바 음식을”(seu-neun bah eum-shik-eul) in verse 11 and “오직”(oh-jyik) in verse 13.

7. Conclusion

We have tried to look at some characteristics of the Ross Version, the first Korean New Testament published in 1887. Some noticeable characteristics including the degree of Greek reflections in the Ross Version, application of functional equivalence translation theory and the Ross Version's influence on later Korean Bibles have also been pointed out. The question about the basic text(Vorlage) of the Ross Version has not been completely resolved yet. It seems likely from the analysis of the Lord's Prayer that the Chinese Delegates' Version might be the basic text for the Ross Version.

Above all, one of the most important contributions of the Ross Version is that the Ross translation team created the term for God in Korean: “하느님”(hah-neu-hyim) or “하나님”(hah-nah-nyim). These two terms for God in Korean have been used by Korean churches up until now.

We can also say that the Ross translation team seems to have intended to create a Korean Bible in easy and native Korean language. The necessity of a native-spoken version was due to the important fact that missionaries focused on large numbers of people including the common Koreans without knowledge of Chinese words and expressions. Many examples of translation hardship such as the selection of native Korean vocabularies, transliteration of proper nouns, functional correspondence to Christian in-group words and localized title of God have been presented in this article.

As a matter of fact, the Ross Version was a pioneer Korean translation accepted as the Korean Textus Receptus until the publication of the Korean Old Version in 1911. The Ross Version had far-reaching influences on later Korean Bibles. Efforts

of the first Korean Bible translators deserved incessant gratitude on the part of Korean Christians.

* **Keyword**

the Ross Version, the First Korean New Testament, John Ross, Delegates' Version, Wen-li version

* **References**

- The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Brook Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, ed., New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.
- Wenli Bible, Delegates' Version*, British & Foreign Bible Society, Shanghai, 1933 (Ed. No. 2908). (<文理 舊新約聖書>, 聖書公會印發).
- Yesu-seonggyo-jeonseo*(예수성교전서), KyeongSeong: Moomkwang Seowon, 1887.
- Grayson, James H. *John Ross: The First Missionary of Korea* (羅約翰 - 한국의 첫 선교사), DaeKoo: Gyemyong University Press, 1982. (Korean and English).
- Grayson, James H. "John Ross and the Process of Bible Translation" (羅約翰과 성서번역 과정), *Theology and World (Shinhak-kwa-Segye)* 11, 1985. (Korean).
- Min Young-Jin, *An Introduction to Korean Versions of the Bible* (국역성서연구), Seoul: Sung Kwang Publishing Co., 1984. (Korean).
- Moulton, J. H. and W. F. Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. II, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979.
- Rhie Deok Joo, "Studies on Earlier Korean Bibles" (초기 한글 성서번역에 관한 연구), in *Korean Bibles and Korean Culture*, Seoul: Ki-dok-Kyo-Moon-Sah, 1985. (Korean).
- United Presbyterian Missionary Record*, July 1 (1882).
- William, F. and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2nd ed., Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1958.
- Yi Hwan Jin, "The Chinese Translation of the Bible in the 19th and 20th centuries" (19세기와 20세기의 중국어 성서), Tai-il Wang ed., *Explain the Meaning of What We Read — Exegesis and Bible Translation*, vol. 2, Seoul: Christian Literature Society of Korea, 2002. (Korean)
- Yoo Chang Gyoon, "Korean Bibles' influence on the Development in Korean Language" (국역성서가 국어의 발달에 끼친 영향), 『Dong-Seo-Moon-Hwa』 1, 1967. (Korean)

<Abstract>

Inner Mongolian Equivalents for Deity

Eun-Yi Goh

(Worldwide Evangelization for Christ)

Finding the word corresponding to the Hebrew *Elohim* and Greek *Theos* of the Bible is not only a difficult task for Bible translators, but is also an important work that affects the future of local churches to a considerable extent. There have already been lots of disputes over the differences in the term for the Deity among Bible translation teams in outer Mongolia, and such arguments have already begun in inner Mongolia as well. In hope that such disputes will ultimately lead to firmly establish the churches, this article has sought compare and evaluate the terms for Deity used among the Mongolians living in China, particularly the Mongolians residing within the inner Mongolian Autonomous District.

The most representative words used for referring to Deity by the inner Mongolians are ‘Burkhan,’ ‘Sakhiulsan,’ ‘Deed Tenger,’ ‘Tenger Aav,’ etc. Among them, none of them specifically refers to ‘God’ of Christianity alone, but all carry pagan implications. The primary meaning of ‘Burkhan’ is ‘Buddha’ and has a strong buddhist color to it; ‘Sakhiulsan’ and ‘Tenger Aav’ are words from shamanism; and ‘Deed Tenger’ not only implies shamanism but taoism as well.

Up till now, the term mostly commonly used to refer to Deity in various Bible translations targeting inner Mongolians is the word, ‘Burkhan.’ In addition, most Mongolian translations done in outer Mongolia have chosen the word, ‘Burkhan.’

Some missionaries and Christians object to using the word, Burkhan because of its strong implication of ‘Buddha.’ However it is the word that has been most firmly rooted in the hearts of Mongolians, carrying the concept of deity, and has been the word naturally selected and used by Mongolian Christians before the arrival of foreign missionaries. A lot of missionaries and Christians still in favor of using this word, and young Mongolians, in particular, do not give much meaning to its buddhist implications. On the other hand, words like ‘Sakhiulsan’ or ‘Deed Tenger’ are words unfamiliar to contemporary Mongolians. In this regard, the author recommends Bible translators in inner Mongolia to select the word, ‘Burkhan’ as the term for Deity.

<Abstract>

An Introduction and Review of <CD-ROM Bible 2.0> by Korean Bible Society

Prof. Yeong-Mee Lee
(Hanshin University)

The present article is to introduce and review the CD-ROM Bible 2.0, released by Korean Bible Society in September 2005. The CD-ROM Bible 2.0 contains various modern versions of the Bible (7 Korean versions and 5 English versions) as well as the original texts, including Hebrew, Greek, and Latin texts. It also has analytical tools like Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible, Abridged BDB-Gesenius Lexicon, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, etc. There are other useful materials for in-depth Bible studies, including biblical maps, history of the Israelites, daily Bible reading, and history of translation of the Bible.

The CD-ROM Bible 2.0 is very helpful especially for those who do not know biblical languages of Hebrew or Greek, but want to closely examine the biblical text against the original text, because analytical tools for original languages provide readers with step-by-step guide to detect the meanings. Dictionary of short subjects, maps, and history also help them research of the meaning of biblical texts more extensively. The comparison of different translations shows readers the diversity of interpretation even in translation, and encourages them to consult the original text. The daily Bible reading in the CD-ROM Bible 2.0 is valuable for daily meditation. Individual reader can formulate his or her own daily Bible reading chart by setting the length of biblical texts and the length of period of reading.

However, an expert reader of biblical languages would hope to have more resources for analyzing the biblical texts included in the CD-ROM Bible 2.0. For advanced researches, analytical tools for Targum (Aramaic text), Septuagint, and some authoritative English versions(RSV, JB, JPS, Tanak, etc) should be supplemented. In addition, lectionary reading texts need to be added for ministers. Finally, it should be noted that users found it inconvenient to insert the CD-ROM each time they were running the software, and hoped to use it without the CD-ROM once it had been installed on their computers.