

Journal of Biblical Text Research. Vol. 28.

Published Semiannually by

The Institute for Biblical Text Research of the Korean Bible Society; April 2011

Table of Contents

• Paper •

[Kor.] A Preliminary Review of the Early Korean Translations of the Book of Psalms, with a Particular Emphasis on the Source Text, Translation Technique and Quality, and their Reception History -----	Jung-Woo Kim / 7
[Kor.] Bishop Schereschewsky and the Earlier Korean Bibles --	Yi, Hwan-Jin / 35
[Kor.] Ezekiel 20: History as interpreting process -----	Sang-Kee Kim / 58
[Kor.] A Study on the Euphemism of Sex in Korean Translations -----	Yeong Mee Lee / 86
[Kor.] Übersetzung der Antwort Jesu in Johannes 6:32 -----	Young-Jin Park / 109
[Kor.] A Study of Translation and Interpretation of σκευος in 1 Thessalonians 4:4 -----	Young Sook Choi / 128
[Kor.] Übersetzung von Kyrios in koreanischen Bibeln -----	Woo-Jin Shim / 146
[Kor.] Consistency Checks in Bible Translation and Korean Bible Versions -----	Sooman Noah Lee / 170
[Kor.] A Study of πορφύρα in 1 Maccabees Chapter 10-11 (10:20, 62, 64; 11:58) -----	Ho-Seung Ryu / 204
[Kor.] A Korean Linguistic Study on <i>New Korean Revised Version</i> -----	Young-Hwan Park / 226

• Book Review •

[Kor.] <i>The Green Bible: Understand the Bible's Powerful Message for the Earth</i> (M. G. Maudlin and M. Baer ed., New York: HarperCollins, 2008) -----	Hee Suk Kim / 248
[Kor.] <i>An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts</i> (D. C. Parker, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) -----	Dong-Soo Chang / 264
[Kor.] <i>Sin: a History</i> (G. A. Anderson, New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2009) -----	Sun-Jong Kim / 279

<Abstract>

A Preliminary Review of the Early Korean Translations of the Book of Psalms, with a Particular Emphasis on the Source Text, Translation Technique and Quality, and their Reception History

Prof. Jung-Woo Kim
(Chongshin University)

As the Korean Church as a whole and the Korean Bible Society in particular are celebrating the centennial anniversary of the first publication of *the Complete Bible in Korean* (1911) this year, it seems very appropriate to look back on the history of our Bible translations and evaluate the qualities of each version and revision published in the nascent periods of translation (from 1898 to 1938 in this paper). So far, Korean biblical scholars are divided into two major camps in their understanding of the source text of *The Old Testament in Korean* (1911) and *The Revised Version of Korean Translation of the Old Testament* (1938) - one argues that even though it is a highly complicated matter, early translators must have wrestled with the original text of the Hebrew Bible; however, the other argues that they used English versions such as *The Revised Version* (RV, Oxford and Cambridge University, 1887) of the KJV (1611) and the American Standard Version (ASV, 1911) together with a couple of Chinese versions such as the Wenli Reference Bible (Delegates Version, 1804), Bridgman and Culbertson's Version (1864), Schereschewsky's Easy Wenli Bible (1902 [based on his translation in 1875]). This paper aims to discuss this agelong issue of the source text by analyzing two major texts in Psalms intensively with special reference to the translators' understanding of the Hebrew words, phrases and syntax. The present writer concludes that the first Korean translations of the Psalms by Alexander A. Pieters betrays some evidences which show that he has struggled with the Hebrew text in several passages and that he has also been in contact with the Chinese versions available in his time. With regard to the qualities of Korean translations in terms of their choice of the most suitable and common words and phrases in excellent ways, Pieters' translations could be highly evaluated even at this period. We can safely

conclude that his translations were basically followed by Underwood's translation of the Psalms (1906, 1911) even though we should acknowledge that Underwood endeavored and made his own efforts by referencing the Chinese versions and his own understanding of the received Hebrew text. We may count it as an irony of history that Pieters was appointed as one of the members responsible for the revision of *The Complete Bible in Korean*, against or in accordance with the will of Underwood of which we know little. At any rate, he as the reviser of Underwood's translation of Psalms, sometimes recovered his first translations (1898), while at other times he accepted Underwood's translations and eventually finished his job successfully (1938). As for the styles of writing, Pieters and Underwood preferred to use Korean terms and its literary style as much as possible during the early stages; however, in later works by Pieters and *The Revised Version of Korean Translation of the Old Testament* (1938), many Korean terms were replaced with the Chinese ones, which may reflect the literary taste of the time. One final suggestion to improve the literary style of the present *New Revision of the Revised Version of Korean Translation of the Old Testament* (1998) is that its style would be far better if the poetic texts are to be rearranged according to the basic design of the Hebrew poetic text, namely, in terms of parallelism.

<Abstract>

Bishop Schereschewsky and the Earlier Korean Bibles

Prof. Yi, Hwan-Jin
(Methodist Theological University)

Born as a Lithuanian Jew and an American immigrant, Bishop Samuel Isaac Joseph Schereschewsky (1831- 1906) has deeply influenced Chinese and Korean Christians with two of his Bible translations, that is the Peking Colloquial Old Testament (1875) and the Easy Wenli Version (1902). More specifically, the Korean Revised Version (1938) and Gale's Korean translation (1925) were heavily indebted to his Easy Wenli Version in terms of their dicta and wordings. In case of the Korean Revised Version (1938), about 60% of its wordings have been influenced by Bishop Schereschewsky's Easy Wenli Bible (1902).

Schereschewsky was given the title of a mission bishop by the American Episcopal Church after he completed the Peking Colloquial Old Testament (1875). He participated in the project to translate the Bible in colloquial Mandarin. In this project he was in charge of translating the Old Testament because of his excellent knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic. During his translating job, he consulted many commentaries written by Jewish medieval scholars such as Rashi and Ibn Ezra. He also read many German commentaries written by German scholars like de Wette because he had a background of German scholarship that he had gotten in Germany during his teenage years.

His second Bible translation in classic Chinese, Easy Wenli Version (1902), was done by his first Old Testament Version together with the Delegates's Version in Wenli (1854). As a matter of fact, his first Chinese translation can be said to be the mother version of the Chinese Union Version (1919), which is still in use by Chinese Christians. His second version in Easy Wenli heavily influenced earlier Korean Bibles like the Revised Version (1938) and Gale's Version (1925). Moreover, his Easy Wenli Bible, together with the Wenli Delegate's Version, was used by Korean theologians like Rev. Choi Pyung Hun for his theology of indigenization.

In summary, Bishop Schereschewsky was a pioneer in Bible translation in

China and Korea by the turn of the last century. Two of his Bibles should be acknowledged as landmarks for Bible translations in Asia.

<Abstract>

Ezekiel 20: History as interpreting process

Dr. Sang-Kee Kim
(Jeonju University)

The Grundschrift(=basic layer) of Ezekiel 20 is to be found in v.1-29.30aβ-32.39, to which v.33-38.43-44 and v.41-42 successively supplemented. The retrospection of Israel's history in v.5-29 is divided into four sections according to schematic parallelism: v.(4)5-10; 11-17; 18-28a; and 28b-29. These are, from a thematic angle, chastically structured: idolatry(a) : YHWH's laws(b) :: laws of ancestors(b') : idolatry(a'). As v.1-3 and 32-32*.39 are reverse symmetric with respect to terms and motifs, a chastic structure is to be said of the Grundschrift of Ezekiel 20.

V.15-16; 23-24; 25-26 are chastically related to v.13a-b; 21a-b; 18. V.25-26 can be regarded as a kind of question without interrogative, which is based on Israelites' complaint: YHWH has given us the not-good laws. This leads to understanding v.27 as consecutive, meaning that v.27-29 can't be dismissed as a secondary insertion.

The Grundschrift intends inherently to justify the judgement on Jerusalem announced before and after Ezekiel 20. But the end of the first three epochs concerns the continued salvation act of God, which constitutes then the presupposition of the following section. It is the perception of God's mercy in the sense of overcoming his wrath for his name's sake that causes Israel's reaction to its recounted past, which the participial phrase of V.32aα implies. It is especially crucial to figure out the picture of the Grundschrift. Its expansion, v.33-38.43-44 is made possible through the refutation of the quotation in v.32b - here the particle אשר is interpreted as temporal conjunction of when or as long as. As a result, the introduction of hope on salvation, but accompanied by judgement, becomes a possibility. This revision clears the way for a whole communication between YHWH and Israel(v.40-41aα).

<Abstract>

A Study on the Euphemism of Sex in Korean Translations

Prof. Yeong Mee Lee
(Hanshin University)

The present study aims to explore ideological premise in the selection of equivalent word while translating biblical texts from Hebrew to Korean and to propose a consistent and inclusive translation that may not exclude minor views or judge them. It examines Hebrew words that depict sexual relationships, such as yadah, shakab, shagal, and to'ebah that are usually rendered to abomination and suggests the followings.

First, the same words and phrases in the same contexts should be translated in the same way to conform to the similarities in the sense. Most Korean translations render words of sexual intercourse by euphemism. For example, yadah is translated as “go to bed” or “sleep with”(Gen 4:1) instead of “have sex” in the context where it describes sexual intercourse between man and woman (Lev 18:22). But Korean translations translate the same Hebrew words differently according to the translators' ethical view of the context. For example, the word is often translated as sexual union when used to depict sexual intercourse of animals. The difference in the selection of corresponding words in Korean reflects homophobia of the translator.

Second, different Hebrew words should be translated into different Korean words to preserve differences. For example, shakab (“sleep with”) is rendered as “being raped” or “put to shame” when it comes with other verbs of enforcement like chazaq (Deut 22:25). There is a Hebrew word for rape, that is shagal.(Isa 13:16) This study suggests to translate the former as “sexually violated” and the latter as “rape”.

Third, the Hebrew to'ebah is employed in two contexts. In religious settings, it refers to idol worship and its customs, improper cultic practice and offerings, and improper sexual relationship including homosexual relationship. Israelite worship is considered as to'ebah to Egyptians (Exod 8:26). The word is usually translated into “abominable” “disgusting”, or “detestable” (Lev 18:22). In

ethical settings, it refers to lie, arrogance, violence, and ridicule. It is translated as “dislike” or “hatred” (Prov 16:5, 12). The word, to’ebah, describes something that is prohibited or a taboo, rather than expressing abomination or any such feelings. Therefore, the word should be consistently translated in the sense of prohibition or taboo.

The consistent rendering of Hebrew into Korean may prevent Korean churches from condemning certain groups as sinners by using the Bible as proof-text when its text is already biased with prejudice and exclusive translation. For example, churches use Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 against homosexuality as these texts are believed to affirm homosexuality as “abominable”. Yet churches do not mention other religious and ethical misbehavior that are under the list of to’ebah.

<Abstract>

Übersetzung der Antwort Jesu in Johannes 6:32

Dr. Young-Jin Park

(Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary)

Die Aussage Jesu in Johannes 6:32 ist schwer zu verstehen, denn seine Aussage scheint die Forderung des Volks auf das Zeichen zum Glauben an Jesus nicht zu beantworten, sondern ihrer Erkenntnisses, Moses als Brotgeber, zu widersprechen. Darüber hinaus bezieht sich der Unterschied zwischen der Verneinung und der Bejahung nicht nur auf den Brotgeber, sondern auch auf das Tempus. Aus diesen beiden Unterschieden ergibt sich die Schwierigkeit damit, worin der Kontrast seiner Aussage besteht, und zwar im Brotgeber oder im Unterschied der Brote. Vor allem passt die Verneinung Moses als Brotgebers nicht zum Kontext, denn das Volk hat Moses als Brotgeber weder erwähnt, noch Moses mit dem ausgefallenen Subjekt im Zitat gemeint. Daher kommt es nicht infrage, dass Jesus trotzdem Moses als Brotgeber verneint hat. Aus diesen Gründen ist die Aussage Jesu neu zu interpretieren. Der Ansatzpunkt besteht darin, dass der Schwerpunkt seiner Aussage der Kontrast. Der Kontrast bezieht sich nicht auf den Subjekte, denn auch das Subjekt im Verneinungssatz ist in der Tat Gott. Demgegenüber geht es dabei um den Kontrast zwischen dem vergangenen Brot und dem gegenwärtigen Brot. Um Johannes 6:32 noch genauer zu interpretieren, ist die Forderung des Volks in Johannes 6:30f in Betracht zu ziehen, weil die Aussage Jesu ist seine Reaktion auf diese Forderung. Also ist seine Aussage aufgrund dieser Forderung zu verstehen. In Hinblick auf diese Forderung sind diese gegensätzlichen Brote der Inhalt des Zeichens, das das Volk zum Glauben an Jesus gefordert hat.

In dieser Hinsicht bedeutet seine Aussage, dass er als Zeichen zum Glauben an Jesus geben will, nicht das vergangene Brot vom Himmel, sondern das gegenwärtige und wahre Brot vom Himmel. Daraufhin ist Johannes 6:32 folgendermaßen zu übersetzen: “(I will als Zeichen zum Glauben an mich geben will) nicht das vergangene Brot vom Himmel durch Moses, sondern das gegenwärtige Brot vom Himmel, nämlich das wahre Brot”. Diese Antwort Jesu auf die Forderung des Volks ist keine Absage, sondern seine Zusage mit der Korrektur anzusehen.

<Abstract>

**A Study of Translation and Interpretation of σκεῦος
in 1 Thessalonians 4:4**

Dr. Young Sook Choi
(Westminster Graduate School of Theology)

What is the exact meaning Paul intended to convey through the word σκεῦος to the Thessalonian church? The interpretation of σκεῦος is divided into two: some minimize the interpretation of the translator while others add the interpretation of the translator. There are two groups of interpretation for the word σκεῦος: some argue as ‘wife’ and others other as ‘body’. In linguistic and grammatical aspects, both translations would not be faithful because σκεῦος itself originally means ‘vessel’ like in the Old Testament.

The original meaning of ‘vessel’ has been used as a metaphor for 4:4, thus it is inevitable that it be translated according to the theological interpretation of the translator. Most of the Korean Bibles translate σκεῦος as ‘wife’. Scholars are divided into two groups: namely the group that interprets it as ‘wife’ (Maurer, Yarbrough, etc.) and the other group as ‘body’ (McGehee, Lührmann, Haufe). Scholars who interpret it as ‘wife’ need to answer to the following questions: If Paul used σκεῦος to refer to ‘wife’, why would he use such a vague and hazy like σκεῦος, and avoid using a common Greek word γυνή (wife) to the Thessalonians who did not know Hebrew well? Did Paul divide the addressee of Thessalonica to men and woman, or to the married and the unmarried?

In this study, we find that the meaning of σκεῦος is ‘body’, as it is used in the Old Testament and the Qumran, furthermore in the New Testament, particularly in what Paul says to the Thessalonians through the text of 4:4.

<Abstract>

Übersetzung von Kyrios in koreanischen Bibeln

Dr. Woo-Jin Shim

(Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary)

Bibelübersetzung hat viele Schwierigkeiten in manchen Bereichen, besonders wenn es kein betreffendes Wort gibt. Koreanische Bibelübersetzer versuchten die Schwierigkeiten zu beseitigen, damit sie einige Ersatzwörter nahmen. Unter ihnen ist Kyrios ein Ersatzwort, und zwar am häufigsten verwendetes Wort. Diese Arbeit untersucht ob die Ersatzung des Kyrios akzeptabel ausgeführt wird. Wenn man Kyrios als ein Ersatzwort verwenden will, soll er die sprachlichen und theologischen Eigentümlichkeiten dieses Titels berücksichtigen.

In dieser Arbeit wird zunächst skizziert über Kyrios aus traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive. In dieser Skizze wird vermutet, dass der Kyrios-Titel als christologischer Titel aus alttestamentlicher Tradition herausgekommen ist, anders als Bousset behauptet, der Kyrios-Titel sei aus Mysterienkult herausgekommen. Bei Paulus ist Kyrios grundsätzlich ein Titel nicht nur für Gott als auch für Jesus. Aber er bemüht sich den Titel nur für Jesus anzuwenden. So steht Kyrios im Zentrum der Theologie von Paulus. Das ist ganz nah zum Johannesevangelium, wo Kyrios als Nominativ und als Vokativ sorgfältig differenziert wird.

Diese Arbeit prüft die jeweiligen Übersetzungsstellen von Kyrios in koreanischen Bibeln. Da wird Kyrios in einigen Stellen eingefügt, obwohl er in NTG nicht vorhanden ist, damit man den Text noch verständlicher macht. Das schwierigste Problem kommt daraus, dass es kein betreffendes koreanisches Wort zum Personalpronomen 2. Singular gibt, und zwar in Höflichkeit. In diesen Stellen wird Kyrios als Ersatzwort für verständlichen Text eingefügt. Aber in diesen Stellen soll man berücksichtigen, dass das Verständnis der Leser über die Theologie von Kyrios des Verfassers wegen der Ersatzung nicht verhindert wird.

<Abstract>

Consistency Checks in Bible Translation and Korean Bible Versions

Dr. Sooman Noah Lee
(GBT/SIL International)

The purpose of this article is to introduce consistency checks needed in the process of Bible translation, to assess the quality of some published Korean Bible versions by examining them with selected consistency items, and to suggest the need of revising the versions by applying thorough consistency checks so that Korean churches can have Bibles of better quality.

The process of consistency checks in Bible translation is a part of reproducing the nature of the original biblical text into the translated text. The original biblical text is characterized by its intertextuality comprising a linguistic cohesion and a thematic coherence. That linguistic cohesion is realized by the many terms and phrases as cohesion features that are used consistently throughout the whole Bible. It is as if the Bible is woven into a masterful piece of fabric with intertextual strings of cohesion across the Hebrew OT and the Greek NT. Some linguistic and literary features of the original text, such as the acrostic nature of some psalms, are virtually impossible to translate into another language. Some other features, however, are possible to reproduce in translation. Among the reproducible features is the domain of consistency items although checking them takes highly technical efforts over a considerable length of time.

Korean churches have strived to have a good Bible translation in Korean, and that effort produced several versions in recent years. But as yet, none of these versions has reached the stature of *the Korean Revised Version* (1961) as the “Church Bible”. This means there is a need to supply a version of high quality to Korean Christians. One channel to upgrade the quality of translation is to apply thorough and technical consistency checks.

Here, general consistency items are introduced first, then some selected consistency items are experimentally applied to six recently published Korean versions: *the New Korean Revised Version* (1998), *the Revised New Korean Standard Version* (2006), *the Agape Easy Bible* (2004), *the Duranno Korean*

Bible (2005), *the Korean Truthful Version* (2008), and *the CBCK Bible of the Roman Catholic Church* (2005). In addition, four foreign language versions are examined with the same items: *The English Revised Standard Version* (1952), *the German Lutherbibel* (1984), *the Chinese Union Version* (1919), and *the Turkish Kutsal Kitap* (2002).

The result of this examination shows that the Korean Bible versions are found largely lacking thorough consistency checks. In comparison, the four foreign language versions are more carefully done in this respect. It is not to say that the Korean versions are of poor quality but that they lack a professional finishing touch. Thus, thorough consistency checks remain the desiderata for most Korean Bible versions.

<Abstract>

**A Study of πορφύραν
in 1 Maccabees Chapter 10-11 (10:20, 62, 64; 11:58)**

Dr. Ho-Seung Ryu
(Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary)

The purpose of this article is to propose a Korean word corresponding to πορφύραν in 1 Ma 11-10. Under the rule of Selucid Antiochus IV from 167 to 164 B.C., the Jews under the leadership of Mattathias rebel against the king who forces Jews to violate the Torah. This revolt succeeded. Chapters 10-11 of the First Book of Maccabees is about Jonathan who was the leader of the Maccabean Revolt. The Selucid kingship was divided between Demetrius I and Alexander. This was a great help in gaining the religious and political freedom in Judea. By autumn of 152 B.C., Alexander Balas made Jonathan the high priest and called him the king's friend. And Alexander sent him *a purple robe* (πορφύραν) and a golden crown (1 Ma 10:20).

The Bible in Korean published in 1998 translated the Greek πορφύραν as *a dark-red priestly robe* (10:20, 62, 64; 11:58). But the Greek word πορφύραν actually means *a purple robe*. In ancient times, people used to reveal their social status by the color of their dress. The purple dress became a symbol of power. Only kings could put on such purple clothes.

The Bible in Korean assumed that Alexander made Jonathan a high priest, so he gave Jonathan a priestly robe. But the high priest wore sacred vestments that include a breastpiece, an ephod, a robe, a checkered tunic, a turban and a sash. They used gold, blue, purple and crimson yarns and fine linen (Ex 28:1-4). And the robe of the ephod is all blue.

Jonathan was not only the high priest but also the political leader in Judea. And he was the friend of the king of the Seleucid kingdom. So he could recruit troops and equip them with arms (1 Ma 10:21). The gift from Alexander, *a purple robe* and a golden crown, was a symbol not of a religious leader, but of a political leader. We must read 1 Ma 10-11 in a political aspect. The Greek πορφύραν must be translated not as a dark-red priestly robe, but a purple robe.

<Abstract>

A Korean Linguistic Study on *New Korean Revised Version*

Prof. Young-Hwan Park
(Hannam University)

This paper aims to investigate the *New Korean Revised Version* (1998) in terms of Korean linguistics. The purpose of this study is to examine some of the erroneous translations found in NKRV based on Korean linguistic aspects and lay the foundation to publish a better version of NKRV, which would provide a friendly access to its text and satisfy modern readers.

The study comprises three major aspects, i.e. morpho-syntactic, semantic, and orthographic aspects with the results as follows:

First, archaic and modern sentences are morpho-syntactically confounded, which needs to be unified. If they are unified to archaic sentences, each word ought to comply with lexical rules. Along with it, the ultra-honorific imperative ending, ‘-소서’ needs to parallel the honorific prefinal ending, and the humble prefinal ending. In other words, it should read as ‘-시옵소서’. In addition, these forms ought to comply with honorific rules. To take ‘예수’ for an example, the honorific subject case ending, ‘께서’ needs to be rewritten as ‘예수님’. Since Jesus deserves to be honored, the honorific subject case ending, ‘님’ ought to be affixed to ‘예수.’ Thus, ‘예수님’ is preferable. The second personal pronoun, ‘당신’ has no implication of honor and must not be affixed together with the honorific subject case ending. Thus, ‘나’ and ‘우리’ must be replaced with ‘저’ and ‘저희’ in accordance with the rule of humbleness. Furthermore, ‘이르되’ which means ‘to say’ can not be used toward senior hearers. The vocative case ending ‘-여’ is not used in modern times, and ‘랍비여’ and ‘주님’ ought to be changed to ‘선생님’ and ‘주님.’ Differences in the usage of particles ought to be recognized. As for quantitative expressions, ‘한 무화과 나무’ ought to be rewritten as ‘무화과 나무 한 그루.’ The noun formational ending, ‘음’ or ‘기’ conjoined with dependent nouns needs to be replaced with ‘-는 것’ to make sentences more natural.

Secondly, in view of semantics, Chinese characters which are difficult to decode need to be changed to easy Chinese or native vocabulary in spite of translators’

efforts in many ways. Words representing ‘time’ need to be changed to a proper one to enable modern readers to comprehend. Words signifying ‘the disabled’ need to be changed to appropriate ones so that they will not evoke unpleasant feelings. In addition, alternative translation is required as a means of preventing confusion from the use of homonyms. ‘자’ needs to be changed to ‘사람’ or ‘이’ in compliance with semantic change. Lexical selection requires prudence in cases such as ‘외식’ and ‘변형’, which need to be replaced with ‘가식’ and ‘변모’.

Finally, it seems extremely erroneous in terms of orthography that punctuation marks are not used at all. Legitimate (Appropriate) punctuation is required for modern readers if appropriate forms are necessary. Small letters are helpful to understand some vocabulary. However, there are minimal mistakes in word spacing despite meticulous proofreading.

<Abstract>

Book Review - *The Green Bible*:

Understand the Bible's Powerful Message for the Earth

(M. G. Maudlin and M. Baer ed., New York: HarperCollins, 2008)

Dr. Hee Suk Kim
(Chongshin University)

The Green Bible was published by HarperCollins in association with the so-called environmentalism's proposals. It has three major sections. In the first section, it provides a number of articles that address environmental issues from various viewpoints--personal and communal, Protestant and Catholic, theological and practical. These articles are summarized and evaluated by the reviewer, with a claim that they would have helped much more if they had been interconnected theologically in order to suggest a thesis that can promote the book's environmental intentions. The second part presents the biblical text, the New Revised Standard Version. It is interesting that the verses classified as supportive of the environmental thesis are printed in green. Of significance to this reviewer is the criterion of classification. It seems certain that the criterion was whether a verse has a particular word that can represent a part of nature, for example, land, earth, sun, moon, locust, etc. This etymological approach is not good enough to investigate how the Bible approaches environmental issues. This reviewer argues that the two most important themes in the Bible, creation and redemption, should be integrally understood. In other words, creation theology, when sufficiently studied in relationship with the history of redemption, is capable of providing a viewpoint that supports how humanity can take good care of the creation. Environmental needs we now face should be viewed from a theological perspective that strongly purports to encourage believers to take care of creation as redeemed people of God. The third section consists of Green Bible Trail Guides and some practical advices for the readers. Despite the foregoing critiques, the Green Bible should be acknowledged as an attempt to help Bible readers to pay attention to one of the most urgent issues that Christians are asked to seriously ponder upon in the years to come.

The Green Bible was published by HarperCollins in association with the so-called environmentalism's proposals. It has three major sections. In the first section, it provides a number of articles that address environmental issues from various viewpoints--personal and communal, Protestant and Catholic, theological and practical. These articles are summarized and evaluated by the reviewer, with a claim that they would have helped much more if they had been interconnected theologically in order to suggest a thesis that can promote the book's environmental intentions. The second part presents the biblical text, the New Revised Standard Version. It is interesting that the verses classified as supportive of the environmental thesis are printed in green. Of significance to this reviewer is the criterion of classification. It seems certain that the criterion was whether a verse has a particular word that can represent a part of nature, for example, land, earth, sun, moon, locust, etc. This etymological approach is not good enough to investigate how the Bible approaches the environmental issues. This reviewer argues that the two most important themes in the Bible, creation and redemption, should be integrally understood. In other words, creation theology, when sufficiently studied in relationship with the history of redemption, is capable of providing a viewpoint that supports how humanity can take good care of the creation. Environmental needs we now face should be viewed from a theological perspective that strongly purports to encourage believers to take care of creation as redeemed people of God. The third section consists of Green Bible Trail Guides and some practical advices for the readers. Despite the foregoing critiques, the Green Bible should be acknowledged as an attempt to help Bible readers to pay attention to one of the most urgent issues that Christians are asked to seriously ponder upon in the years to come.

<Abstract>

**Book Review - *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts
and their Texts***

(D. C. Parker, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Prof. Dong-Soo Chang
(Korea Baptist Theological University/Seminary)

This review of *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* written by D. C. Parker contains an introduction of the author, an annotated summary of the work, and the reviewer's critical comments and suggestion. This is the first major English-language introduction to the earliest manuscripts of the New Testament to appear for over 40 years. This book is comprised of 3 parts containing 11 chapters. Part I describes documents (manuscripts) of the New Testament with three chapters. Part II discusses textual criticism of the New Testament with three chapters. Part III treats, with perspectives of textual studies, each main section of the New Testament respectively, i.e. the Revelations, Paul's letters, Acts and catholic epistles, and four Gospels, with four chapters. The last eleventh chapter is the author's short conclusion to the book. A glossary and an index of manuscripts are provided at the end of the book.

As an essential handbook for scholars and students, it provides a thorough grounding in the study and editing of the New Testament text combined with an emphasis on the current dramatic developments in the field. Covering ancient sources (versions) in Greek, Syriac, Latin, and Coptic, it describes the manuscripts and other ancient textual evidence, and the tools needed to study them. It deals with textual criticism and textual editing, describing modern approaches and techniques, with guidance on the use of editions. It introduces the witnesses and textual study of each of the main sections of the New Testament, discussing typical variants and their significance. A companion website with full-colour images provides generous amounts of illustrative material, bringing the subject alive for the reader. This work is for scholars and postgraduate students of New Testament textual studies.

The author's comments on the text of the Greek New Testament give some

hints to us: “The text is changing. Every time that I make an edition of the Greek New Testament, or anybody does, we change the wording. We are maybe trying to get back to the oldest possible form but, paradoxically, we are creating a new one. Every translation is different, every reading is different, and although there’s been a tradition in parts of Protestant Christianity to say there is a definitive single form of the text, the fact is you can never find it. There is never ever a final form of the text.” The following reviews on this book also might help us to guess easily the value of this book: “This work fills a current need for an up-to-date presentation of the discipline for students, and also will serve as a valuable resource for all scholars in New Testament studies.”(Choice); “Parker offers a fascinating and often humorous look into the world of manuscript studies and textual criticism.”(Laura J. Hunt, Moody Theological Seminary).

<Abstract>

Book Review - *Sin: a History*

(G. A. Anderson, New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2009)

Dr. Sun-Jong Kim
(Hannam University)

Anderson begins his study by presenting that the metaphor on sin in the Hebrew Bible has changed since the Second Temple period. While its principal metaphors in the Classical Biblical Hebrew literature are the burden to be borne (Lev 16:22) or the stain to be wiped, the main metaphor on sin is represented as a debt (Isa 40:2) to be payed in the later period, i.e., in the New Testament (Rom 7:14; Col 2:14), the rabbinic literature, and the early Christian literature (St. Ephrem, Narsai). And this change of sin's concept is confirmed by the translation of the word 'burden' by 'debt' in the Aramaic Targum (Lev 5:1; 24:15). According to the author, the emergence of this new concept of sin as a burden derives from the influence of the Aramaic language in the Persian period (538-533 B.C). On the basis of this hypothesis, Anderson tries to unveil the relationship between sin as a debt and almsgiving as a crucial means of an atonement.

The author's interest is so wide as to range from the Old and New Testament, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the rabbinic literature to the Syriac theologians. However, he does not lose his sight any moment on the theme 'sin'. By trying to interpret sin and atonement in these wide perspectives, he makes the reader not to be isolated in a particular biased position. Anderson does not merely solve the reader's curiosity on the history of sin; he shows an excellent model how the exegete can draw the theological inferences out through the linguistic approach.