

Journal of Biblical Text Research. Vol. 29.

Published Semiannually by

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

Table of Contents

• Paper •

[Kor.] A Study on the Definiteness in the Nominal Sentences of Biblical Hebrew: focusing on Andersen, Janet and Glinert's theories -----	Sung-Dal Kwon / 7
[Kor.] Textual Criticism and Translation of Mark 1:1 -----	Hyeon Woo Shin / 33
[Kor.] Luke's Understanding of Jesus' Death (Lk 23:44-49) ----	Sun-Nam Kang / 59
[Kor.] Evaluating the Translation of the Book of the Epistle to the Romans in the Korean New Testament (1906) -----	Byoung-Soo Cho / 83
[Kor.] Übersetzung vom Galater 1:1-2:10 -----	Chung Yeon Kim / 105
[Eng.] Translation of Two Conjunctions, One Aorist Participle and One Present Verb in Hebrews 4:3 -----	Chang Wook Jung / 134
[Eng.] The Identification of "the Righteous" in the Psalms of Solomon(PssSol) -----	Unha Chai / 149

• Translated Paper •

[Kor.] Are Our Translations Convincing? -----	Ross McKerras (Chang-Nack Kim, trans.) / 171
--	--

• Book Review •

[Kor.] <i>Translation That Openeth the Window: Reflections on the History and Legacy of the King James Version</i> (David G. Burke, ed., Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009) -----	Hwan Jin Yi / 179
[Kor.] <i>All Creatures Great and Small: Living Things in the Bible</i> (Edward R. Hope, New York: United Bible Societies, 2005) -----	Hee Suk Kim / 206

<Abstract>

**A Study on the Definiteness in the Nominal Sentences of
Biblical Hebrew: focusing on Andersen, Janet and Glinert's theories**

Prof. Sung-Dal Kwon
(Westminster Graduate School of Theology)

Research on nominal sentences of Biblical Hebrew has caused many debates among Biblical Hebrew scholars through the last several decades but there are still a lot of disagreements. First of all, scholars' different opinions are observed on the definition of 'nominal sentence,' and there are many other questions to be solved in connection with nominal sentences of Biblical Hebrew including word order in nominal sentences, three-component nominal sentences, copula, casus pendens, existential sentence, and the relation between nominal sentences and HYH sentences. In particular, it is quite important to identify the subject and the predicate in nominal sentences because it is essential for solving many other problems. In nominal sentences of Biblical Hebrew in which the word order is not fixed, it is very crucial to distinguish between the subject and the predicate.

This study discussed definiteness as a criterion for identifying the subject and the predicate in the nominal sentences of Biblical Hebrew.

This study attempted to answer a number of questions on definiteness as follows:

- (1) Can definiteness be a criterion for identifying the subject and the predicate in nominal sentences of Biblical Hebrew?
- (2) If yes, how important is the criterion of definiteness?
- (3) How valid is the rating of definiteness by a number of scholars suggesting definiteness as a criterion, and what is the desirable method for rating definiteness?

In this study, statistical methods were used as important tools. Compared to ones based on theoretical inference, approaches based on definite data using statistical methods can come much closer to the fact.

Through these statistical methods, we investigated scholars' definiteness rating and the author's rating in detail and drew the following conclusions:

(1) It is risky to fix the rating of definiteness according to morphological structure, but still definiteness can be a useful criterion. The usefulness of the criterion appeared to be higher than the adequacy of the ‘given/new’ criterion.

(2) As the significance of definiteness is connected to the context or various situations, the two criteria (definiteness and given/new information) are in correlation with each other. Between the two, definiteness can be more useful than the ‘given/new’ criterion.

(3) When rating definiteness, we need to consider not only the word form but also the identity of the speaker and hearer, previous dialogs (or records) and shared knowledge between them, the situation and context in which the story is told, etc.

<Abstract>

Textual Criticism and Translation of Mark 1:1

Prof. Hyeon Woo Shin

(Westminster Graduate School of Theology)

In Mark 1:1, υἱοῦ θεοῦ ('Son of God') may not be original. Though it is supported by significant external evidence, its omission is also supported by diverse kinds of external evidence: early Alexandrian manuscripts (Ⲛ^{sa}ms), the so-called 'Caesarean' manuscript (Θ), a number of Church Fathers and ancient versions. Further, υἱοῦ θεοῦ does not fit the style of Mark since Mark elsewhere uses τοῦ θεοῦ instead of θεοῦ (3:11; 5:7) except in 15:39 where the word θεοῦ may have originally been spoken in Latin (that does not have the definite article) by a Roman centurion. Though υἱοῦ θεοῦ could have been omitted by *homoeoteleuton*, the omission of 'Son of God' did not occur elsewhere in the NT whereas the addition of 'the Son of God' took place in Mark 8:29 as P. M. Head pointed out. T. Wasserman argued that in Mark 8:29, 'the Son of God' in some manuscripts is a harmonization to Matthew 16:16. The possibility of scribal addition, however, cannot be excluded. 'The Son of God' in Matt 16:16 reflects the redactional tendency of adding 'the Son of God.' The copyists of Mark may also have had such a tendency.

Anarthrous construction is often used for titles. Since ἀρχή ('beginning,' 'basis') does not have the definite article and has no verb, Mark 1:1 is likely to be a heading. Mark does not have any section heading elsewhere, and thus Mark 1:1 may be a heading for the whole text of Mark. R. A. Guelich argued that v. 1 is connected to v. 2 since καθὼς γέγραπται ('as it is written') is always connected to the preceding elements elsewhere in the NT. The καθὼς ('just as') clause, however, is also used elsewhere in connection with its subsequent phrase, so(?) vv. 2-3 can be connected to v. 4. This possibility is supported by the parallelism between v. 3 and v. 4.

The word ἀρχή can mean "a basis for further understanding" as in Heb 5:12; 6:1. This meaning fits with the function of Mark 1:1, and thus this word, as a part of the heading of Mark, can be translated as 'introduction'.

In the LXX, the words, εὐαγγελίου and εὐαγγέλια refer to (good) news, and in Isa 40:9 (the LXX), the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι is used for preaching new exodus message. In Mark, εὐαγγελίου refers to the message about Jesus (8:35; 10:29; 13:10; 14:9) or the message proclaimed by Jesus (1:14-15). Hence, ‘good news’ is a proper translation for εὐαγγελίου. However, since εὐαγγελίου had a religious nuance on account of its usage for the emperor’s birth, enthronement, visiting, in connection with the Roman emperor worship, εὐαγγελίου may also be translated as ‘gospel’ that has a religious nuance.

‘Gospel about Jesus’ (the objective genitive) seems to be a better translation for εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ than ‘gospel (proclaimed) by Jesus’ (the subjective genitive). Since Mark 1:1 is the heading of Mark, ‘the gospel about Jesus’ better fits its context than ‘the gospel proclaimed by Jesus.’ ‘The message proclaimed by Jesus’ cannot represent the whole of Mark, but it can be called ‘the message about Jesus.’

In Mark, the word Χριστός is not yet used as a name of Jesus but as a title for the eschatological saviour sent by God (8:29; 14:61). Since the word ‘Christ’ is often misunderstood as a name of Jesus, ‘Messiah’ may be better than ‘Christ’ as a translation for Χριστός.

In conclusion, the original text of Mark 1:1 may have been Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and it can be translated as ‘Introduction to the Good News about Jesus the Messiah.’ As a heading of Mark, it needs to be capitalized and spaced apart from verse 2.

<Abstract>

Luke's Understanding of Jesus' Death (Lk 23:44-49)

Dr. Sun-Nam Kang
(Sogang University)

The aim of this study is to examine Luke's understanding of Jesus' death which has been described in Luke 23:44-49. For this purpose, we have conducted examinations utilizing the approach of intertextuality between Luke 23:44-49 and the Peter's Pentecost speech in Acts 2:14-41.

Findings from this study are as follows.

In Luke 23:44-49, Jesus has been portrayed as the obedient son of God doing His will. This theme has been expressed by the last word of Jesus on the cross (Luke 23:46; Ps. 30:6 quotation), exposing Jesus' complete trust in God. Through the lips of Peter, Luke says that Jesus' death was 'the plan of God'(Acts 2:23), and proclaims that the promise of God about the resurrection of Jesus has been fulfilled (Acts 2:24-28). In Luke, the death of Jesus was on the way to the eschatological 'last days'(Luke 23:44-45), and the 'last days' have been inaugurated by the Jesus' pouring out of the Spirit upon the disciples on the Pentecost(Acts 2:17-21; Joel 2:28-32 LXX quotation). Furthermore, Luke declares that Jesus was not only the 'innocent' but also the 'righteous' one(23:47). This notion is supported by Psalm 15 LXX(Acts 2:25-28 quotation) in which it is implied that according to the late Jewish thought about life after death: the righteous one does not go down to 'sheol' but ascends directly to the paradise in heaven. The reference of Luke about the people's guilty feeling about Jesus' death in Peter's speech(Acts 2:37), appears similarly in the death of Jesus(Luke 23:48).

Luke 23:44-49 and Acts 2:14-41 are the hermeneutical keys for each other and illustrate the dynamics of the texts. Luke saw Jesus on the cross, who had been faithful to God and who entrusted himself to God until the last moment. On the basis of this understanding, Luke depicted the death of Jesus through a sophisticated literary work.

<Abstract>

**Evaluating the Translation of the Book of the Epistle
to the Romans in the Korean New Testament (1906)**

Prof. Byoung-Soo Cho
(Hapdong Theological Seminary)

This article examines how faithfully the translation principles were exercised for the Korean New Testament, in particular the Romans, which was initially published in 1900 and revised in 1904 and 1906. It is often insisted that, for both the original translation and the revisions, the Board of Translators set the rules to use Palmer's Greek edition as the basic text; to make reference to the English Revised Version; and to let the Korean helpers consult the Chinese Delegates' Version. However, a closer examination hints us that these rules were not kept reliably. Evidences show that the Greek grammar was not applied to a number of passages. It is not difficult to find inappropriate expressions, exaggerations, and omissions. Presumably, the draft of the Korean assistants would have been adopted by and large. In addition, the Korean New Testament (1906) influenced the Korean Revised Version (1961) and the New Korean Revised Version (1998).

This study comes to the following conclusions. First, the translators did not take the original Greek into consideration very seriously. They did not consult even the English R.V. carefully while the Korean helpers dealt with the Chinese Version at their disposal. Secondly, the Korean Old Version ought to be considered as the work of the Korean helpers since they made use of their free language style for translation. They deserve, therefore, to be called 'translators,' not 'helpers' or 'assistants,' despite the fact that they have made many mistakes. Lastly, the latest Korean version (NKRIV) influenced by the Korean New Testament (1906) should be also thoroughly examined and corrected as soon as possible, and it is necessary to publish a more reliable and accurate version in Korean immediately.

<Abstract>

Übersetzung vom Galater 1:1-2:10

Dr. Chung Yeon Kim
(Methodist Theological University)

Diese Forschung geht es um die Übersetzungsprobleme vom Gal 1:1-2:10. Paulus benutzt im Gal 1:1 das Wort ἐγείραντος (Partizip vom ἐγείρω). Das griechische Wort bedeutet 'erwecken', 'aufwecken'.

Aber das Wort wird in der koreanischen Übersetzung 'leben' übersetzt. Aber Paulus benutzt dafür die anderen Wörter. Z.B: ζωοποιέω, ζάω.

Paulus schreibt sehr oft in seinen Briefen diese drei griechischen Wörter ζωοποιέω (lebendig machen), ζάω (leben) und ἐγείρω (erwecken) unterschiedlich. Aber der paulinische Unterschied wird oft in der koreanischen Übersetzung nicht beachtet: Die drei Wörter werden gleich übersetzt zu dem Wort 'leben'. Wenn diese Übersetzung 'semantisch' und 'im Kontext' richtig wäre, aber wäre 'in der zeitgenössischen literarischen Ausdruck' nicht entsprechend.

Ausserdem enthält diese Forschung die Alternative zur Lösung der Fragen nach σὺν ἔμοι ('mit mir' v.2), Grüß (v.2), und ἑαυτόν ('selbst' v.4) und die Ergänzungsprobleme von εἶη und ἐστίν (v.3, v.5), und vom Gal 2:6.

Dazu kommt noch das Übersetzungsproblem ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον ('anderes Evangelium' v.7), die Partizipien οἱ ταρασσοντες und θέλοντες ('die Verwirrenden und die Verfälschenden' v.7) und das Problem der Präpositionen παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ('an Stelle dessen', 'entgegen' v.8), παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε (v.9), κατὰ ('nach' v.11) und ἐν ἔμοι ('in' oder 'zu' v.16). Schließlich werden Genusfrage vom ἠναγκάσθη ('wurde gezwungen' 2:3) und die Frage nach dem Satzstruktur vom Gal 2:7-9 behandelt.

Translation of Two Conjunctions, One Aorist Participle and One Present Verb in Hebrews 4:3

Chang Wook Jung*1)

1. Introduction

The Greek text of Hebrews 4:3 reads as follows:²⁾

είσερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς [τὴν] κατάπαυσιν οἱ πιστεύσαντες, καθὼς εἶρηκεν, Ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου, Εἰ³⁾ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου, καίτοι τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου γενηθέντων.

Since the Greek text involves some peculiar features, various translations are suggested by English and German versions as well as Korean versions of the Bible. Comparisons will clarify the differences:

For we who have believed enter that rest, just as God has said, “As in my anger I swore, ‘They shall not enter my rest,’” though his works were finished at the foundation of the world. (NRSV)⁴⁾

Only people who have faith will enter the place of rest. It is just as the Scriptures say, “God became angry and told the people, ‘You will never enter

1) A Professor at Chongshin University, New Testament.

2) Underlined words indicate peculiar words and phrase which require explanation.

3) This particle is usually used for the conditional sentence denoting ‘if’. In strong assertions, it delivers a negative effect without the apodosis, ‘certainly not’. Walter Baur and Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1957, 3rd ed. 2000), 278. This is why most English translations render ‘they shall not enter the rest’ for the conditional clause. Cf. KJV and GNV in which the particle is translated as ‘if’. See also 21th KJV: “As I have sworn in My wrath, ‘If they shall enter into My rest’”.

4) NKJV is almost identical to NRSV in the translation of this verse except for trivial matters, of which the representative is the conjunction ‘so’ instead of ‘as’ in the beginning of the quoted text. It is unclear why ὥς is translated as ‘so’ instead of ‘as’. NIV and God’s Word Translation also interpret the conjunction as ‘so’: “So I angrily took a solemn oath that they would never enter my place of rest.”

my place of rest!” God said this, even though everything has been ready from the time of creation. (CEV)

Now we who have believed enter that rest, just as God has said, “So I declared on oath in my anger, ‘They shall never enter my rest.’” And yet his work has been finished since the creation of the world. (NIV)

We who are already believing enter that rest. This is just as what he has said, “As in my anger I swore, ‘They shall not enter my rest’, but the work has been accomplished since the creation of the world. (New Korean Revised Version)⁵⁾

These translations illustrate that the peculiar features are variously interpreted, which requires an explanation.⁶⁾ We will thus attempt to determine the meaning of the sentence(s) in Hebrews 4:3 by investigating such characteristics. In order to precisely grasp the meaning of the verse, problems raised by scholars concerning Hebrews 4:3 will be enlisted and they will be examined in turn.

2. Problems

Problems and issues concerning the Greek text in Hebrews 4:3 may be summarized as follows:

First, the conjunctions γάρ in Hebrews 4:3, where five conjunctions appear, calls our attention. Some English versions (NIV, NJB) do not interpret the conjunction as indicating a causal sense (‘now’ in NIV and ‘however’ in NJB), which represents the most frequent usage,⁷⁾ while others understand it as

5) Other translations are presented here for comparison: For we that have believed, shall enter into rest, as he said, As I swore in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest. And when the works were made perfect at the ordinance of the world, (Wycliff New Testament).

Denn wir, die wir glauben, gehen in die Ruhe, wie er spricht: “Daß ich schwur in meinem Zorn, sie sollten zu meiner Ruhe nicht kommen.” Und zwar, da die Werke von Anbeginn der Welt gemacht waren, (Luther’s Bibel) ingrediemur enim in requiem qui credidimus quemadmodum dixit sicut iuravi in ira mea si introibunt in requiem meam et quidem operibus ab institutione mundi factis. (Vulgate).

6) Needless to say, numerous expositions are also presented by scholars concerning these characteristics. For details, see below.

7) According to NA, οὖν appears in some reliable variants: ⋈ A C etc. This requires a textual-critical examination. For details, see below. The New Jerusalem Bible interprets the conjunction γάρ as indicating an adversative force, ‘however’: We, however, who have faith, are entering a place of rest... It is unclear why the conjunction is understood as ‘however’. It seems that the

indicating a causal sense. Still others, including most Korean versions, simply omit it (Good News Translation, NCV, New Korean Revised Version etc).

Second, it is also noteworthy that another conjunction in the verse, *καίτοι* may denote either concessive ('although') or adversative meaning ('and yet'). With the meaning 'and yet' or 'but', the punctuation problem of the preceding sentence in v.3b emerges; period (NIV, NIB, Holman Christian's Bible, NET; cf. Luther's German Version) or comma (NAB and Korean New Revised Version). A more serious punctuation issue arises at the end of v.3; period (NIV, NCV, Holman Christian's Bible), comma (Luther's Bibel) or semicolon (NJB). Another punctuation matter revolves around the conjunction, with its concessive meaning ('although') concerning the preceding sentence. Though most English versions employ a comma before the conjunction with the meaning 'though' (NRSV, ESV, CEV, NASB, NKJV, NLT), some adopt a semicolon (Bible in Basic English) or colon (KJV, ASV, GNV, RWB) which imposes a rather independent status on the concessive clause.

Third, the translation of the participial phrase *οἱ πιστεύσαντες* also draws our attention. While most English versions translate the phrase as 'who (have) believed' (NKJV, NRSV, NET, NASB, GNV, ESV), some versions like NJB and NLT as well as God's Word Translation understand it as denoting 'who have faith' or 'who believe.' Luther's German Bible and Korean New Revised Version also interpret the participle as indicating or at least involving the present reality. The peculiarity of the Greek participle of the verb 'believe' needs to be investigated.

Finally, the function of the present tense for the verb *εἰσέρχομαι* has to be determined in this verse, since the present tense may point to either future or present action. Intriguingly, many scholars interpret the verb as indicating future, although almost all the English versions understand the verb as delivering the present.⁸⁾

Now we attempt to resolve these problems.

addition of the adversative 'however' in NJB is not the literal rendition of the Greek conjunction, but reflects its understanding of the meaning of the text.

8) NJB translates the verb as 'are entering', while other versions as 'do enter'. See also Luther's Bibel which renders the verb as 'gehen' (present). In contrast, Latin Vulgate understands the present verb as indicating future.

3. Solutions

3.1. Meaning of the conjunction γάρ⁹⁾

Some reliable manuscripts include variation οὖν instead of the conjunction γάρ in NA27,¹⁰⁾ which makes the flow of the sentence more logical with the meaning ‘therefore’ ‘then’ or ‘however’.¹¹⁾ It is admitted, of course, that the external and the internal evidences lend support to the reading of the text in NA27. Nevertheless, the presence of variations in some reliable manuscripts indicates that the causal conjunction did not seem fitting to the context to the eyes of some copyists.

Interestingly, the NIV interprets the conjunction in v.3 as indicating ‘now,’ which implies that the following verb ἔρχομαι most probably denotes the present meaning, ‘are entering’ or ‘enter’. In contrast, the NRSV, which variously translates the conjunction γάρ in other places of Hebrews, considers it as betraying a causal sense.¹²⁾ Which one is, then, more accurate? The analysis of the passage 4:1-13 demonstrates that the conjunction γάρ is connected with the sentence of v.1: ‘Let us fear, because the promise of entering his rest still stands.’¹³⁾ The content of v.3 provides a reason for the warning as well as the promise in v.1 with the inferential meaning of the conjunction.¹⁴⁾ Though the rest still stands as God’s promise, people have to be careful not to behave like

9) The conjunction γάρ occurs about eighty-eight times in Hebrews. Its frequency is quite high considering that it occurs 1041 in the whole New Testament. It is also noteworthy that this particle is found in the three consecutive verses, vv. 2-4, in the second place of each sentence. The statistics are based on Bible Works.

10) Bruce M. Metzger argues that the conjunction γάρ is more appropriate both because “early and good external evidence” lends support to the conjunction and “because it suits the context” (Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1994; 2nd ed.], 595). It seems unclear, however, how it fits the context.

11) The conjunction basically conveys an inferential meaning, ‘therefore’, but it also denotes ‘then’ or an adversative force ‘however’. For details about this conjunction, see BDAG, 736-37.

12) For instance, “now” in 2:5,8; 3:16, “yet” in 3:3, “indeed” in 4:12, “because” in 2:18. See also 5:1 where the particle is omitted.

13) In Greek, this sentence appears in the first place, whereas NIV places it in the latter part.

14) Paul Ellingworth understands the conjunction γάρ in v.3 is linked with 2a (we were evangelized) or 1a (God’s promise). See his book, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 244. The content in 1a, however, includes the exhortation (‘Let us fear’) as well as the promise, since believers who will also have a chance to enter the rest should be careful not to follow Israelite forbears.

those OT Israelites who failed to enter the rest.¹⁵⁾

Considering the context, therefore, the conjunction here is to be interpreted as conveying inferential sense, ‘for’ or ‘because’.¹⁶⁾

3.2. Function of the conjunction *καίτοι*

Different from the conjunction *γάρ*, which occurs frequently in the NT, the particle *καίτοι* takes place only twice in the NT, here and Acts 14:17. According to BDAG, the conjunction conveys the meaning ‘yet’ or ‘on the other hand’ with the finite verb or the genitive absolute construction used in the present verse.¹⁷⁾ In other words, the particle conveys the meaning ‘nevertheless’ or ‘and yet.’ In Acts, the conjunction denotes the meaning of ‘but’ or ‘nevertheless’. In the LXX, where the particle occurs four times, it never conveys the concessive meaning.¹⁸⁾ The conjunction thus should not be interpreted simply as introducing a subordinate clause like ‘though,’ which delivers only a secondary idea to the main content; it functions here to show that the following sentence is in parallel with the previous one.¹⁹⁾ It is connected with the conjunction *γάρ* in the beginning of the sentence in v.3, which refers to the sentence in v.1:²⁰⁾

v.1 Let us fear that none of you, though(or while) the rest remains, may not

15) The meaning of ‘fear’ should not be misunderstood. Calvin precisely explicates its meaning as follows: “the fear which is recommended not that which shakes the confidence of faith, but such as fills us with such concern that we grow not torpid with indifference.” See his book, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to Hebrews*, John Owen, trans. and ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979; rep.), 93.

16) H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 122.

17) For an extended explanation about this particle in the NT, see BDAG, 496.

18) All instances are found in 4 Macc: 2:6, 5:18, 7:13, 8:16. In the first instance, the conjunction denotes ‘indeed’ which is used in Homer. H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1843; 1958, rep. of 9th ed.), 860. In 5:18, *εἰ* is accompanied with the conjunction indicating ‘although’; *καίτοι εἰ*. The concessive force, if it exists there, comes from *εἰ* rather than *καίτοι*. In 7:13 where the particle occurs with the genitive absolute construction, it signifies ‘and yet’. See 8:16, where it conveys an adversative meaning ‘and yet’ with the subjunctive mood.

19) Liddell and Scott note that the particle conveys the same meaning much as *καίπερ* (although). *A Greek-English Dictionary*, 859. Their description, however, is not precise, since the particle with the genitive absolute does not usually denote the concessive force, at least in the LXX.

20) See Luke Timothy Johnson, who notes that the conjunction *γάρ* “makes best sense if we see the statement as referring back to the exhortation ‘not to short of entering his rest’ in 4:1”. *Hebrews* (Louisville; London: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 126.

enter the rest...

v.3 because we who believe(d) (shall) enter the rest, as he said “As in my anger I swore ‘they shall not enter my rest’”, but His works have been done since the foundation of the world.

The sentence(s) in v.3 is loosely constructed with rather ambiguous conjunctions, i.e. γάρ and καιτοί and its (their) meaning will be manifested in the following verses, especially in vv. 4-6 and v.11. Vv. 4-6 emphasize that the rest existed at the creation of the universe and the OT Israelites fell short of it. Reflecting the rest at the creation, the author claims in v.11 that believers must make a great effort to enter it.²¹⁾

Considering the usage of the conjunction in Acts and the LXX and the context of the following verses, the καιτοί clause has to be interpreted as having a rather independent value. This indicates that the conjunction has to be understood as denoting an adversative force of ‘but’ rather than the concessive one.²²⁾

3.3. Implication of the usage of the aorist participle οἱ πιστεύσαντες

The aorist participle of the verb πιστεύω may refer to either present or perfect in this context, especially because the participle is used as a ‘substantial participle’.²³⁾ In fact, the aorist participle usually indicates antecedent time to that of the main verb. Nevertheless, many are the exceptions that make it difficult to claim that this is an absolute rule.²⁴⁾ It is understandable since the

21) Yune Sun Park, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews and the General Epistles* (Seoul: Yung Eum Sa, 1977), 45.

22) The connection with the following verse, i.e. v.4, is more logical with this interpretation, since v.4 includes the causal conjunction ‘γάρ’ pointing to the last clause in v.3: εἶρηκεν γὰρ πού περὶ τῆς ἑβδόμης οὕτως· καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. (“For he has spoken somewhere concerning the seventh day in this way: “and God rested on the seventh day from all his works.”)

23) The aorist participle used as a substantial participle may be used in generic utterances. For instance, ὁ ἀπολέσας (aorist participle) does not mean ‘the one who has lost’ but ‘the one who loses’ in Matthew 10:31. Even in the adverbial and supplementary usages of the participle, the aorist tense may point to present or perfect. For details about this matter, see Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 615.

24) Wallace emphasizes ‘by no means always,’ but only ‘normally’ concerning the time relation between the participle and the controlling verb. See his book, *Beyond the Basics*, 624.

orist tense of the participle in principle describes the whole action of the verb-which is called ‘aspect’ of the participle.²⁵⁾ Relative time of the participle results from the aspect of the participle. In determining the time for the participle, therefore, lexical analysis and context play an important role.²⁶⁾

To make a decision about the time of the participle, the substantival participle of the verb πιστεύω need to be investigated. It occurs nine times in the NT and the orist participle renders the action antecedent in time to the controlling verb:

Mark 16:16-17 The one who will have believed and been baptized will... these signs will follow those who will have believed...²⁷⁾

Luke 1:45 blessed is she who believed since there will be a fulfillment...;

John 7:39 those who believed or came to believe (not those who believe) in him were to receive:²⁸⁾

John 20:29 Blessed are those who did not see and believed;²⁹⁾

Acts 4:32 those who had believed were one heart;

Acts 11:21 a great number that had believed turned to the Lord;

2 Th. 1:10 (when he comes to be glorified on that day) among all those who

25) For the meaning of the verbal aspect of New Testament Greek, see S. E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament: With Reference to Tense and Mood* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989) and B. M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in the New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon; New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

26) “The orist participle, in itself,” P.T. O’Brien avers, “does not indicate whether it should be rendered in English by a present tense or a past.” “The context, however,” he concludes, “points to the past.” P. T. O’Brien, *The Letter to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 163, nt. 36. BDF.

27) Most English versions render the orist participle as the present: the one who believes and is baptized ... those who believe. However, the orist participle more probably refers to the antecedent action in time to the main verb. Cf. NASB translates the orist participles as present perfect: has believed and has been baptized ... those who have believed.

28) The participle in this verse requires a textual-critical investigation. Even though the external evidence does not support any of the two variants- the orist or the present participle- Bruce M. Metzger notes that “the majority of the (Editorial) Committee (of the UBS’ Greek New Testament) judged that the tendency among copyists would have been to replace the orist participle ... with the present participle”(Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 186). This indicates that the orist tense seemed awkward to some copyists, probably because the orist participle of the verb πιστεύω did not convey, they believe, the present state of believing in Jesus. See also Edwin A. Abbot, *Johannine Grammar* (Wipf & Stock: Eugene, 2006; rep. of 1906 ed), 2499, in which John 7:39 is translated as follows: “Now he spake concerning the Spirit which they (lit.) were destined to receive that should [hereafter] have believed on him.”

29) The orist participle points to ‘those who already came to believe in Jesus though not seeing Jesus.’

have believed;

2 Th. 2:12 all who have not believed may (will) be condemned;³⁰⁾

These instances illustrate that the aorist participle of the verb πιστεύω always indicates the action of believing, which happens antecedent in time to the controlling verb. Although the context makes the final decision, the aorist participle of the verb πιστεύω itself always refers to the action antecedent to that of the main verb. In other words, the lexical ingredients of the verb more probably indicate that its aorist participle signals antecedent time to the leading verb.³¹⁾ Intriguingly, although the tense of the controlling verb in the present verse is present, it may refer to simple present or emphatic future in this context. If the present tense denotes simple present, the aorist participle refers to present perfect- an action antecedent to the main verb; if the main verb indicates future, the aorist may denote future perfect or present perfect; the context determines its temporal meaning. In Hebrews 4:3, ‘we’ points to Hebrews who have already become believers. Even if the present tense of the main verb εἰσέρχομαι indicates future action, the aorist participle points to an action of believing that has already happened.³²⁾

Considered these observations, the aorist participle in Hebrews 4:3 is used to contrast the faith which already happened (determined to believe) with the future or present rest; we who have already come to faith (will) enter the rest.³³⁾ The aorist tense of the participle emphasizes an action antecedent to the main verb and places the focus on the fact that a person has already become a believer before the action of the controlling verb begins.³⁴⁾

In sum, the author of Hebrews expresses the past action of believing in this context by employing the aorist tense for the participle.

30) ‘All’ refers to those who did not respond to the Gospel in the past though they had a chance.

31) Johnson argues that the aorist participle provides the meaning ‘we who have come to have faith’. See his book, *Hebrews*, 126.

32) For the meaning of the present verb εἰσέρχομαι, see below.

33) Amplified English Bible’s translation explicates the nuance of the participle: For we who have believed (adhered to and trusted in and relied on God) do enter that rest. It would have been much better, however, if the tense of the two verbs (adhere and trust) had been the present.

34) The comparison of the two tenses, present and aorist, of the verb πιστεύω makes the aorist tense of the verb evident. The present tense pays attention to the present state of belief; it does not accentuate the ‘already’ aspect of faith in relation to the main verb. With the present tense, the participle, i.e., πιστευοντες, would expect the action in progress, or simply yields generic utterance; we who believe (or we believers) [will] enter the rest.

3.4. Understanding of the present verb εἰσερχομαι

The Greek present tense indicates either a present process or a future event. In the latter, it expresses an emphatic future.³⁵⁾ Thus, the present tense of the verb εἰσερχομαι may render either a simple present or an emphatic future. Consequently, some Bible versions translate the Greek present in the future (CEV, Wycliff NT, Vulgate) though most versions understand it as indicating the present. Scholars' opinions are also divided basically into two groups concerning this matter, though the division is more complicated.³⁶⁾

Many scholars argue that the present verb tense certainly indicates both the future rest and its present realization. For instance, Attridge succinctly states as follows:

This verb should not be taken simply as a futuristic present, referring only to the eschaton or to the individual's entry to the divine realm at death, but as a reference to the complex process on which 'believers' are even now engaged, although this process will certainly have an eschatological consummation.³⁷⁾

The proponents of this view seem to apply the norm 'already'/'not yet'; believers are now already entering the rest, but its ultimate consummation has not yet come. Postulating that we who believe are entering the rest 'at the moment-in principle but not yet in full realization-', Kistemaker clearly reflects this idea.³⁸⁾

35) The present tense of Greek may be used as "futuristic present". See BDF, 323 who notes that "in confident assertions regarding the future, a vivid, realistic present may be used for the future". See also S. E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 32.

36) As pointed out above, most scholars insist that the present verb refers to the emphatic future whereas most translations render it as the present. Needless to say, translation is different from interpretation; a translator must choose only one aspect even when the verb involves two or three aspects.

37) H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 126.

38) S. J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984), 107. R. Kent Hughes also suggests that the present verb indicates both the present and the future aspect. R. K. Hughes, *Hebrews: An Anchor for the Soul* (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1993), 111. D. A. Hagner also agrees with these scholars. See his book, *Hebrews* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983), 69. See also Alan C. Mitchell who avers that "the author suggests that the process has already begun but has not yet been fully realized". *Hebrews* (Collegeville:

Other scholars, however, claim that the present tense refers to only one aspect, either present or future. Westcott asserts, on the one hand, that the present verb does not render the future action but simply the present.³⁹⁾ William Lane also argues that the present tense refers to the present.⁴⁰⁾ Craig R. Koester, on the other hand, claims that the present tense refers exclusively to the future aspect; “To rest in the manner that God himself rested after creation (4:10) remains a future reality.”⁴¹⁾ In this way, opinions are divided concerning the meaning of the present verb. Which one is more probable?

In order to answer the question, the context should be examined. The author of Hebrews highlights the tension between promise and obligation in this verse. Rest remains, he explains, because OT Israel had failed to enter the rest- this is certainly a promise. In contrast, he accentuates the danger that the readers of Hebrews could confront-coming short of rest or failing to reach it. The present verb indicates that those who have already believed will certainly have a chance to enter the rest as did OT Israelites, but they must refuse the way the OT Israel walked. The aorist participle πιστεύσαντες implies that those who had already acquired faith should display such faith with perseverance in the present, in order to enter the future rest prepared by God.⁴²⁾ In the context of Heb. 4:1-3, therefore, the present verb εἰσέρχομαι is to be interpreted as indicating a future reality, certain to happen. This interpretation is strengthened by the remark in v.9 and v.11, where the author declares that a rest still remains for the people of God and they have to strive to enter that rest: v.9 “as a result there remains Sabbath rest for the people of God”; v.11 “Let us therefore strive to enter that rest, so that no one may fall according to the same example of disobedience.”⁴³⁾

Liturgical, 2007), 97.

39) B. F. Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 95.

40) W. Lane, *Hebrews* (Waco: Word Books, 1991), 165. O’Brien, though cautious, includes Attridge in the group of the scholars who argue for the ‘present time’ of the verb. Of course, his understanding is not precise.

41) Craig R. Koester, *Hebrews* (New York: Doubleday, 1964), 270. See also O’Brien, who claims that “the arguments in favour of a (solely) futuristic interpretation are stronger.” He listed seven reasons for his argument. For details, see his book, *Hebrews*, 165-166. Paul Ellingworth also stands with these scholars. See his book, *Hebrews*, 246.

42) Richard D. Phillips claims that the passage in 4:1-5 reveals emphases “that are central to overall message” of Hebrews. One of the emphases is “the demand for perseverance under trial”. See his book, *Hebrews* (Phillipsburg: P&R publishing, 2006), 116.

43) Calvin comments concerning v.11 that “a similar end awaits us, if there be in us the same unbelief.” *Hebrews*, 100. See also Sung-Soo Kwon, *Hebrews* (Seoul: Chongshin University

With regard to this matter, a sharp comparison appears between OT Israelites and new believers in v.1. The participial phrase in v. 1, καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας could be understood as ‘concessive’: “though the promise of entering His rest remains”. With this force, contrast and comparison emerge between the state of those who came to believe the Gospel and that of OT Israelites who had had a chance but failed. This comparison recurs in the following verses, including v.3: we who believed will enter the rest whereas people of Israel had failed to enter the rest. In addition, the author of Hebrews has never mentioned “a full and unconditional realization of the Christian hope in the present.”⁴⁴⁾

In brief, the context lends support to the argument that the present tense of the verb εἰσερχομαι indicates the future rather than the present, or both the present and future action.

3.5. Punctuation

So far, we have decided upon meanings of the words which demand examination. It needs to be pointed out that the conjunction καίτοι conveys the adversative meaning ‘but’, which is related to the final task of our work-resolving a punctuation problem. Fortunately, the punctuation matter is not very complicated with the adversative force of the conjunction as much as with its concessive force.⁴⁵⁾ The following outline of vv.3-5, provides a clue to deciding the punctuation:⁴⁶⁾

Press, 1997), 146. He asserts that the author of Hebrews admonishes the people of God to work hard to enter the rest.

44) Paul Ellingworth, *Hebrews*, 246.

45) A semicolon appears at the end of v.3 in the NJB and the NEB:

3. We, however, who have faith, are entering a place of rest, as in the text: And then in my anger I swore that they would never enter my place of rest. Now God’ work was all finished at the beginning of the world; 4. as...

3. It is we, we who have become believers, who enter the rest referred to in the words, ‘As I vowed in my anger, they shall never enter my rest.’ Yet God’s work has been finished ever since the world was created; 4.

46) Concerning the punctuation problem, Ellingworth claims that the punctuation of NJB or NEB (period before the conjunction καίτοι in both and semicolon and comma at the end of v.3 respectively) is possible, or very probable. Nevertheless, he postulates that the conjunction γάρ in v.4 raises a serious problem concerning such understanding, because the conjunction καίτοι should be interpreted as ‘concessive.’ In other words, the concessive conjunction in 4:3 makes

There still remains a rest for us (v.3a)
Ps. 95:11 proves its existence (v.3b)
 But God's rest existed from the time of creation (v.3c)
 Gn. 2:2 attests this (v.4)
 This is the same rest (v.5a)
 of which Ps. 95:11 spoke (v.5b)

In this outline, the content in v.3c is indirectly related to that in v.3a and 3b, which indicates that the punctuation at the end of v.3b does not matter much; it may be comma (NA27 and NASB) or period (NIV, TNT, Luther's Bibel, New Revised Korean Version). In contrast, v.3c and v.4 need to be closely connected by adopting a comma or semicolon, different from most English versions that employ the period. This punctuation makes the meaning of the sentences in v.3 more evident.

4. Conclusion

Considering the above observations, the sentences in Hebrews 4:3 should be translated as follows:

3. For we who have believed shall enter the rest, as he said, "As I swear in my anger, 'They will never enter my rest'". But His works have been finished since the foundation of the world.

(4. for He has somewhere spoken about the seventh day in this way "and God rested on the seventh day from all His works".)

According to this translation, the causal conjunction γάρ in the beginning of v.3 refers not only to the promise but comprises the warning: unbelief causes a problem.⁴⁷⁾ In addition, the last clause beginning with καίτοι holds a rather

the flow of the argument difficult because of the causal conjunction γάρ in v.4. See his book, *Hebrews*, 245-46. This demonstrates that to decide the meaning of the conjunction is pivotal to tackling the punctuation problem. As demonstrated above, the conjunction καίτοι does not need to be interpreted as delivering a concessive sense. Rather it is to be interpreted as conveying an adversative force.

independent force related more closely to the following verse with the causal conjunction γάρ. This conjunction connects the sentence in v.4 with the last part of v.3, “But His works have been finished since the foundation of the world”. Such an understanding makes the flow of the logic most smooth and reasonable.

<주요어>(Keywords)

Hebrews 4:3, conjunction γάρ, conjunction καίτοι, Greek aorist participle, Greek tense

히브리서 4:3, 접속사 γάρ, 접속사 καίτοι, 헬라어 과거분사, 헬라어 시제

(투고 일자: 2011. 8. 22, 심사 일자: 2011. 8. 25, 게재 확정 일자: 2011. 8. 25.)

47) Calvin clearly declares that “unbelief alone shuts us out; then faith alone opens an entrance.” See his book, *Hebrews*, 95.

<참고문헌>(References)

- Abbot, Edwin A., *Johannine Grammar*, Wipf & Stock: Eugene, 2006; rep. of 1906 ed.
- Attridge, H. W., *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.
- Baur, W. and Frederick, W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1957, 3rd ed. 2000.
- Blass, F. and Debrunner, A., *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, R. W. Funk, trans. and rev., Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1961.
- Calvin, J., *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to Hebrews*, John Owen, trans. and ed., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979; rep.
- Ellingworth, P., *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Fanning, B. M., *Verbal Aspect in the New Testament Greek*, Oxford: Clarendon; New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Hagner, Donald A., *Hebrews*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.
- Hughes, R. K., *Hebrews: An Anchor for the Soul*, Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1993.
- Johnson, Luke T., *Hebrews*, Louisville; London: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Kistemaker, S. J., *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.
- Koester, Craig R., *Hebrews*, New York: Doubleday, 1964.
- Kwon, Sung-Soo, *Hebrews*, Seoul: Chongshin University Press, 1997.
- Lane, W., *Hebrews*, Waco: Word Books, 1991.
- Liddell, H. G. and Scott, R., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1843; 1958, rep. of 9th ed.
- Metzger, Bruce M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1994; 2nd ed.
- Mitchell, Alan C., *Hebrews*, Collegeville: Liturgical, 2007.
- O'Brien, P. T., *The Letter to the Hebrews*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Park, Yune Sun, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews and the General Epistles*, Seoul: Yung Eum Sa, 1977.
- Phillips, Richard D., *Hebrews*, Phillipsburg: P&R publishing, 2006.
- Porter, S. E., *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Porter, S. E., *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament: With Reference to Tense and Mood*, New York: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Wallace, Daniel B., *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Westcott, B. F., *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

The Identification of “the Righteous” in the Psalms of Solomon(PssSol¹)

Unha Chai*

1. The Problem

The frequent references to “the righteous” and to a number of other terms and phrases²) variously used to indicate them have constantly raised the most controversial issue studied so far in the Psalms of Solomon³) (PssSol). No question has received more attention than that of the ideas and identity of the righteous in the PssSol. Different views on the identification of the righteous have been proposed until now. As early as 1874 Wellhausen proposed that the righteous in the PssSol refer to the Pharisees and the sinners to the Sadducees.⁴)

* Hanil Uni. & Theological Seminary.

- 1) There is wide agreement on the following points about the PssSol: the PssSol were composed in Hebrew and very soon afterwards translated into Greek(11MSS), then at some time into Syriac(4MSS). There is no Hebrew version extant. They are generally to be dated from 70 BCE to Herodian time. There is little doubt that the PssSol were written in Jerusalem. The English translation for this study is from “the Psalms of Solomon” by R. Wright in *The OT Pseudepigrapha 2* (J. Charlesworth, ed.), 639-670. The Greek version is from *Septuaginta II* (A. Rahlfs, ed.), 471-489; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 203-204; K. Atkinson, “On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light From Psalm of Solomon 17”, *JBL* 118 (1999), 440-444.
- 2) In addition to his use of the term of “righteous” for the group which the psalmist represents, he employs such descriptions as “devout”, “those who fear the Lord”, “Israel”, “servant”, “innocent”, “humble” and/or “poor”. This is evident from the fact that they are utilized in parallel with each other: e.g., “the devout” are paralleled with “those who fear God” in 13:12; “the righteous”, “the devout”, “those who call upon God” and “those who fear Him” are all parallel in 2:33-37; “Israel”, “the devout” and “the poor” are in parallel with “those who fear God” in 5:18; “Israel”, “servants” and “the devout” all refer to the same group in 12:6, and so on.
- 3) It is one of the OT Pseudepigrapha written during the intertestamental period, specifically during Pompey’s invasion of Jerusalem in 63 BCE. S. P. Brock, “The Psalms of Solomon”, H. Sparks, ed., *the Apocryphal Old Testament*, 651; Ky-Chun So, “Christological Insights: Between the Psalms of Solomon and the Sayings Gospel Q”(1), *KPJT* 6 (2006), 34.
- 4) J. Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadduäer*, 93ff, cited by J. O’Dell, “The religious background of the PssSol”, *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1961), 241.

This view has been traditionally accepted by the earlier scholars who dealt with the PssSol.⁵⁾ It is still the Pharisees that the righteous have been most commonly identified with.

On the other hand, there are those who hold that the righteous of the PssSol should not be linked with the Pharisees, but they should be instead equated with another group within Judaism of that time. In contrast to the trend for the righteous of the PssSol to be identified with the Pharisees or a particular group already known to us, some scholars tend to avoid saying that they should be related to any defined group. O'Dell represents this view.⁶⁾ He argues that the several points which are generally considered to provide definite evidence of Pharisaic authorship of the PssSol are rather to be seen as being held in common by the “the general eschatologically-minded population”(p. 250). In support of this view O'Dell cites some stronger evidence: “the Last Judgement” in PssSol. 8:1-6 and the “exile of the wilderness” in PssSol. 17:15-17, both of which are notable features of the eschatological movement. Consequently he concludes that the PssSol should not be ascribed to the Pharisees, but are “the common goods of the larger eschatological movement”(p. 255). Buechler and Flusser argue that the righteous in the PssSol belong to the stock of the Hasidim.⁷⁾ Soon after the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls an attempt at their identification was made by Dupont-Sommer. He was convinced that the righteous of the PssSol are associated with the Qumran community, and consequently with the Essene. He assumes that the ideas and style of the PssSol betray their Essene origin.⁸⁾ In close relation to this idea Franklyn and Hann acknowledge that there is an undeniable link between the PssSol and the Qumran Scrolls, though not

5) A selection of chief references is as follows: Ky-Chun So, “Christological Insights: Between the Psalms of Solomon and the Sayings Gospel Q”(1), *KPJT* 6 (2006), 34; M. Winninge, *Sinners and the Righteous*, 1-2, 180; M. Black, “Pharisees”, *IDB* 3, 777-779; G. Gray, “Psalms of Solomon”, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT* 2, 625-652; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 212; H. E. Ryle and M. R. James, *Psalms of the Pharisees*, xlv-li; E. Schuerer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ(175 B.C. - A.D. 135)*, 183-195.

6) J. O'Dell, “The religious background of the Psalms of Solomon”, *RQ* 3 (1961), 241-257; J. Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research*, 195. Charlesworth also agrees in that he finds no convincing evidence to link the PssSol with a defined sectarian group.

7) A. Buechler, *Types of Jewish Palestinian Piety*, 128-195; D. Flusser, “Psalms, Hymns and Prayers”, M. Stone, ed., *The Jewish Writings of the Second Temple period*, 573.

8) A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene writings from Qumran*, 296, 337.

sufficient to demonstrate definite authorship.⁹⁾ Recently Kim contends that the PssSol is a document written by a Zadokite priest in support of Zadokite priests who have been displaced from Jerusalem Temple authority positions.¹⁰⁾

Like this even though the wide diversity of opinion on the question of the righteous has occurred until the present, it is the Pharisees that the righteous are most often and favorably to be identified with. It still remains, however, that on the basis of discerned similarities and differences of the righteous with the Pharisees a more specific focus of study on it is to be needed. Therefore the purpose of this present exercise is both to examine the identification of the righteous with the Pharisees and to offer a general picture of the righteous in a more objective way. This shows that during the intertestamental period, there were various groups or sects that were claimed to be the so-called “righteous” or its similar terms. But it is very tentative that the righteous are easily identified with one of the well-known groups such as the Pharisees on the basis of some similarities between them. Now let us examine the similarities and differences of the Pharisees with the righteous in the PssSol so that it leads us to the problem of the identification of the righteous more closely.

2. The Close Examination of the Pharisees related to the righteous

It has been a traditional and widely-accepted understanding that the righteous of the PssSol are to be identified with the Pharisees. Some theological and socio-political views extracted from the descriptions of the righteous have been

9) Comparisons are made of literary themes common to both sets of literature. Both groups had been exiled from Jerusalem (PssSol 17:16-18/1QpHab. 4-6); they recall persecution from illegitimate religious authorities (PssSol 17:5, 16-18/1QpHab. 8:8-17, 12:2-10); they condemn backsliders in their midst (PssSol 4:1-7/CD 19:13-26); they accuse their enemies of excessive wealth (PssSol 1:4-6/4QpHab. 8:10-11), of violating menstrual taboos (PssSol 8:12/CD 5:6-7), of tolerating remarriage after divorce (PssSol 8:10-14/CD 4:20-21), of intimacy with Gentiles (PssSol 1:8, 17:14-15/4QpNah. 1:1) and perhaps, of abandoning the traditional calendar (PssSol 18:10-12/1QpHos. 2:15-16, 1QH 12:1-11). P. Franklyn, “The cultic and pious climax of eschatology in the Psalms of Solomon”, *JSJ* 18 (1987), 1-17; R. Hann, “The community of the pious: the social setting of the Psalms of Solomon”, *Studies in Religion* 17 (1988), 169-189.

10) H. Kim, *Psalms of Solomon*, vii-viii.

regarded as primary evidence of their identity. The main elements which are believed to support an identification with the Pharisees in the PssSol are as follows:¹¹⁾ 1) the opposition to the sinners, “the Hasmoneans”, and their supporters, 2) reference to obedience to the Law, 3) the dual idea of God’s providence and the freedom of humankind, 4) the belief in retribution, resurrection and eternal life, 5) the means of atonement by fasting, 6) the emphasis on God's kingship, 7) the expectation of the Davidic Messiah, and 8) political quietism. Of these possibilities, especially such ideas as the Hasmonean, the opponents of the righteous, reference to obedience to the Law, the means of atonement by fasting and the expectation of the Davidic Messiah and political quietism are most often chosen to compare with the picture of the righteous in the PssSol. It is necessary to deal with each of these groupings separately and for the sake of convenience they will be grouped as: A. The evidence that supports identification with the Pharisees; B. The evidence less supportive of an identification with the Pharisees; C. Evidence that strongly negates identification with the Pharisees.

2.1. The Evidence that supports identification with the Pharisees.

The foremost evidence introduced for identifying the righteous as the Pharisees is their opposition to the Hasmoneans. The “sinners” described as committing gross sins in the PssSol are the opponents of the righteous because religiously they occupied a different position from that of the righteous, deprived them of their rights, persecuted them and threatened their lives. Thus the sinners' overthrow was welcomed by the righteous and interpreted as the direct intervention of the hand of God (PssSol 1:3, 8:15, 24-26, 17:5-6). Going further, the righteous hoped for the total destruction of the sinners.

This picture of the antagonistic relationship of the righteous to the sinners in the middle of the first century BCE has often been presented in terms of the Pharisees on the one side and the Hasmoneans and the latter's close supporters on the other. On the evidence of Josephus it can be shown in fact that the

11) W. Lane, “Paul’s legacy from Pharisaism: light from the PssSol”, *Concordia Journal* 8 (1982), 134-135; Ryle-James, *Psalms of the Pharisees*, xlix, lii; E. Shcuerer, *The Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ III*, 21; J. Schuerpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomon: Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Froemigkeit in der Mitte des Vorchnistlichen Jahrhunderts*, 134-136.

Pharisees and the Hasmoneans were, at times, enemies. Oppression of the Pharisees by the Hasmoneans occurred during the reigns of John Hyrcanus (134-104 BCE) and Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE).¹²⁾ After John Hyrcanus was asked to give up his high priesthood by one Pharisee named Eleazar with whom he had previously maintained close intimacy, the Pharisees became his enemy (Ant. XIII.x.6[293-298]). In the course of time, this situation grew worse. Again, according to Josephus, Alexander Jannaeus crucified eight hundred Pharisees. He cruelly forced the crucified to watch the slaughter of their own wives and children. From the time of the first recorded appearance of the Pharisees there existed antipathy between the two groups and this persisted throughout most of the remaining Hasmonean period (except the reign of the queen Alexandra), i.e., down to 37 BCE. In this respect they had much in common with the righteous of the PssSol.

However, we must now ask a question. Were the Pharisees the only enemies of the Hasmoneans? As an answer to this question, it is well-known that the men of the community from Qumran were also bitter enemies of the Hasmoneans.¹³⁾ Likewise the group from which 1 Enoch 92-105 originated had a deep hatred for the Hasmoneans.¹⁴⁾

With this we turn to Pharisaic beliefs. Doctrine such as the strict observance of the Law, of divine providence and freedom of the human will, and of resurrection and eternal life are well known as being ascribed to the Pharisees in Josephus and the New Testament: they are reckoned to interpret the Law exactly (War II. xi.14[162-163]; Vita 38[191-192]; Acts 22:3, 26:5, Phil 3:5); they pride themselves on the exact interpretation of the Law of the fathers (Ant. XVII.ii.4[41]); they impose on the people many laws from the tradition of the fathers not written in the Law of Moses (Ant XIII.x.6[297]); and they never contradict the teaching of those who are older in years (Ant XVIII.i.3[12]). This attitude to the Law of the Pharisees is well known.

However, such dedication is not to be limited to the Pharisees alone. The Qumran community also demanded obedience to the Law and were even stricter about it than the Pharisees were.¹⁵⁾ Besides, in the initial stage of the Maccabean

12) Ant. XIII. x.5-6 (288-298), xii.5 (338-344).

13) 1QpHab. 8:8-13, 9:2-7, 11:17-12:10, CD 4:12-21, 5:7-10.

14) V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, 258-259, 492; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Literature*, 113.

war the Hasidim were willingly prepared to be killed in order to keep the Law, i.e., the Sabbath law (1 Macc. 2:32-38). Jesus the Nazarene also thought himself as fulfilling the Law (Mt. 5:17-19). Indeed, it may be argued that the Sadducees, despite their differences with the Pharisees over “the traditions of the fathers”, were adamant in their keeping of the constitutionalized or canonized torah. All religious Jews or groups swore allegiance to the Law no matter to which particular party they belonged. The literature of this period gives ample proof of the growth of pure piety, deep devotion and a reverence for the Law.¹⁶⁾ Like other Jewish writers and groups of the period, the righteous of the PssSol were very keen on the Law and kept it strictly.

Therefore either the enmity of the righteous against the sinners, i.e., the Hasmoneans or devotion to the Law hardly seem a very distinctive attribute of the Pharisees alone and do not serve as a clear means by which an identification with any particular group like them may be made.

2.2. The Evidence less supportive of an identification with the Pharisees

An examination on this issue must now be made using some further supposed common elements. These are notions such as the means of atonement by fasting and the expectation of the Davidic Messiah by the righteous.

PssSol 3:7-8 expresses the consciousness of the righteous concerning sins, even those sins committed by mistake. This passage was understood as a reference to the means of atonement of the righteous. PssSol 3:8a reads: “He atones for (sins of) ignorance by fasting and humbling his soul”. The expression “humbling his soul” can vary in its meaning to refer to all forms of abstinence, not just fasting.¹⁷⁾ This raises the possibility that the means of atonement

15) 1QS 1:7-8, 12-14, 3:5-9, 5:8-9, 22, CD 11:13, 16-17.

16) The references to keeping the Law are numerous in the literature of the Second Temple period: Tob. 6:12, 7:12-13, 14:9; Jud. 11:12; Wis. 6:4, 18, 14:16, 16:6; Ben Sir. 2:16, 9:15, 15:1, 19:17, 21:11, 23:3, 24:23, 32:15, 24; 1Bar. 2:2, 4:12; 1Macc. 2:27, 42, 50, 67, 68; 2Macc. 1:4, 4:2, 6:1, 7:9, 30; 1Ezra 1:33, 48, 5:51, 8:12, 19, 21, 23; 3Macc. 7:12; 2Ezra 1:8, 2:40; Jub. 2:18, 3:8-11, 6:10-11, 20:7, 21:18; 1En. 99:10.

17) Lev. 16:29, 31, 23:27, 32, Biblical Ps. 35:13, Isa. 58:3, cf. Jud. 4:9; H. Guthrie, Jr. “Fast, Fasting”, *IDB* 2, 242; M. Herr, “Fast and Fast Days”, *EJ* 6, 1189; E. Sanders, “Fasting”, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*, 81-84.

practised by the righteous included more than fasting and was extended to include all forms of abstinence. It was taken by Ryle and James to indicate the Pharisees' obedience both to the written law by making offerings for sins and to the oral tradition by observing the days of fasting.¹⁸⁾ It is true that the requirement for additional obedience to the oral tradition is one of the distinctive features of the Pharisees. However, neither the whole collection of the PssSol nor the verse itself gives the slightest hint that the righteous in the PssSol made atonement for any kind of sins by means of sacrifices.¹⁹⁾ It does not truly mean that they did not perform the sacrificial cultic practice to make atonement for themselves. In addition, fasting was not used as the sole means of atonement by the Pharisees nor was it practised by them alone. In PssSol 3:8 there is little evidence that the psalmist was engaging in polemics against the sinners on the issue of oral tradition as did the Pharisees and the Sadducees.

And also PssSol 17 is one of the few texts to show the expectation of the Davidic Messiah in the first century BCE. The Davidic Messiah and his everlasting kingdom yet to come are assumed to be the main hope of the righteous, the view which is ascribed to the Pharisees. This may have originated from the firm belief of the Pharisees in a future life.²⁰⁾ According to PssSol 17:5-6 the sinners rose up against “us”, i.e., the righteous including the psalmist; they set upon us and drove us out; they took away the promise from us by force; they set up a monarchy because of their arrogance; they despoiled the throne of David. Thus they fled from the sinners and wandered in the desert. A few managed to survive (PssSol 17:16-18). Judging this statement, the sinners took over power from the “us”, usurping the existing power and setting up a new monarchy. The sole solution would be the coming of the ideal king, the Son of David. He is designated as *χριστὸς κυρίου* in PssSol 17:32, and *χριστοῦ κυρίου* in the title to PssSol 18 and in 18:7. All of these are to be literally translated as “the Anointed of the Lord”. Instead of *χριστὸς κυρίου* in PssSol 17:32 some MSS read *χριστὸς κυρίου*, which is understood as “the Lord

18) Ryle-James, *op.cit.*, xlix.

19) This does not necessarily imply that the righteous did not use the sacrificial system at all for atonement for their sins, considering that at the time the temple was still in existence and sacrifices were also being practised.

20) *Ant.* XIII.v.9 (172), XVIII.i.3 (12-15), War II.viii.14 (162-166), Mt. 22:23-24, Mk. 12:18-23, Lk. 20:27, Act. 32:6-8.

Messiah” in a technical sense.²¹⁾ However, whether this should be read as “the anointed of the Lord” or as “the Lord Messiah” is not our main issue. The point here is that in either case he is portrayed by the psalmist as the expected ideal king who is appointed by God and who will fulfill his ultimate promises in the messianic times. The messianism held by the righteous, i.e., the expectation of the Davidic Messiah and his ideal times is a point that sharply distinguishes them from the various religious groups or authors which produced Jewish writings during the intertestamental period. In fact, since the displacement of the Davidic kingdom early in the Persian period, the expectation of the Davidic king and his kingdom had been long forgotten, though it did not die totally.²²⁾ The reason why the psalmist took up the notion of the Davidic Messiah and his messianic times can be found in the undesirable and deteriorated conditions of Jewish society under the Hasmonean kings/High priests. He believed that this would be the sole and ultimate solution for the present evil of the day and for the creation of a new future. This very account has led to wide agreement that the sinners, who are here referred to in the third person plural “they”, correspond to the Hasmoneans who established the dynasty, as in the case of PssSol 2 and 8.

However, there is little evidence or information to support the contention that the Pharisees held to a belief in the Davidic Messiah. It also appears in texts from the Qumran community, and the Testament of 12 Patriarchs.²³⁾ That the Pharisees expressed a future hope in the Davidic Messiah, which was different from that of other known groups, is scarcely verifiable from any sources. The most that may be said is that it is possible that the Pharisees shared the belief in a coming Davidic messiah in some sense or other but to say that is to be a long way from finding evidence that securely ties the Pharisees to the righteous in the PssSol.

2.3. Evidence that strongly negates identification with the Pharisees

21) Wright and Charlesworth read it in this way. R. Wright, *TOTP* 2, 667-668; J. Charlesworth, “The concept of the Messiah in the Pseudepigrapha”, *Principat 19:1; Judentum*, 197.

22) Mendels notes that in Ezra and Nehemiah David is mentioned almost solely in connection with the service in the Temple: Ezra 3:10, 4:20, 8:20, 9:7; Neh. 3:16, 12:24, 36, 45, Jer. 23:5-6, Ezek. 34:23-24, 37:24-25, Zech. 4:6, Hg. 1:2-3, Dan. 9:4-20, Judith 5:6-19. D. Mendels, “Hecataeus of Abdera and a Jewish ‘Patrios Politeia’ of the Persian Period”, *ZAW* 95 (1983), 104-105, n56.

23) IQS 9:8-11, IQSa 2:11ff, CD 12:23, 14:19, 19:10, 20:1; TJudah 24:1-6; TDan 5:10-13.

There is a strong argument that opposes identification, maybe seen to bear no resemblance to those of the Pharisees.

To propose that the Pharisees should be regarded as political quietists and probably pacifists in the same way as the righteous of the PssSol at that time in Jewish history is quite unconvincing. Though they had at times suffered persecution, the Pharisees had not ceased their involvement in politics ever since they first engaged in such matters during the reign of John Hyrcanus (134-104 BCE). Especially during the reign of Salome Alexandra (76-67 BCE) they played a prominent role in politics as well as in religion (Ant. XIII. xvi. 2[408-409]). During this period the Pharisees were allowed control of all political and religious power. In fact, they ran the government during Alexandra's reign. It is quite certain that they had a strong voice in the assembly at the time of the psalmist.²⁴ We can presume that the power of the Pharisees was enormous at the time. This may be derived from Josephus' statement describing one of the reasons for the usurpation of the throne by Aristobulus II: “he (Aristobulus II) was now much more afraid, lest, upon her death (Salome Alexandra), their whole family should be under the power of the Pharisees” (Ant XIII. xvi. 5(422-429)). This clearly demonstrates that the Pharisees were a force to be reckoned with during this part of the Hasmonean era. They were certainly not political quietists. It is difficult to accept that within the space of a few years their political involvement would cease to exist. The political quietism of the Pharisees or, rather, of their rabbinic successors is a much later phenomenon and even then differences emerged within their ranks.

This is a totally different picture from that of the righteous in the PssSol, who were powerless and could not take any action or revenge against the sinners. The righteous are further described as poor, starving and persecuted.

On the basis of these considerations we find that the conclusion that the theological and socio-political perspectives of the righteous are exclusive to the Pharisees is unverifiable. On one point, namely, that of their political quietism (and probably pacifism) the righteous of the PssSol and the Pharisees (of Josephus) appear to be poles apart. Again, this does not, of course, mean to deny that the righteous share some of common beliefs and relation with the Pharisees.

24) L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees: the Sociological Background of their Faith*, vol 2, 612-620; H. Jagersma, *A History of Israel from Alexander the Great to Bar Kochba*, 96-97.

3. An Attempt to identify the righteous with any historical-religious group

As we have already noted, there is no doubt that the picture of the righteous in the PssSol bears similarities to the Pharisees, albeit to different degrees. However, we have also found that it was very difficult to accept a close relationship between the righteous in the PssSol and the Pharisees because supportive evidence for such identification is often flimsy, and differences are so large that any valid conclusion based on acceptable facts cannot be verified.

Of singular importance is that in this study it is possible to identify a number of features of the righteous which are of value in constructing a description of them as a group within Judaism. The attempt to identify the group with one or another of the known groups has served to emphasize these features. Though their anonymity cannot be lifted, it is possible to describe them in such a way as to understand who and what they were and why they existed at the time they did. For the sake of convenience seven distinctive features of the righteous as a religious group are to be described as follows:

(1) The “righteous”²⁵⁾ which the psalmist represents are described by the use of a wide variety of biblical terms not as titles or names but as epithets or descriptions. The expressions so used are “devout”²⁶⁾, “those who fear the Lord”²⁷⁾, “Israel”²⁸⁾, “servant”²⁹⁾, “innocent”³⁰⁾, “humble”³¹⁾ and/or “poor”³²⁾. Each of these terms is used as a means by which the psalmist describes the righteous. This may mean that the use of the terms is insignificant for identifying the group from which it arose or for tracing it back to its origin. In the same manner the psalmist depicts his (their) opposing group by using such terms as “sinners”³³⁾, “wicked”(12:1, 4, 6), “hypocrites”(4:20), “criminals”(12:1, 4, 14:6),

25) 2:34, 35, 3: title, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 4:8, 9:7, 10:3, 13:title, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14:9, 15:6, 7, 16:15.

26) 2:36, 3:8, 4:6, 8, 8:23, 34, 9:3, 10:6, 12:4, 13:10, 12, 14:3, 9, 15:1, 17:16, 18:2.

27) 2:33, 3:12, 4:23, 5:18, 6:5, 12:4, 13:12, 15:13.

28) 5:18, 9:8, 10:5, 12:6, 14:5.

29) 2:37, 10:4, 12:6.

30) 4:22.

31) 5:12.

32) 5:2, 11, 12, 10:6, 15:1, 18:2.

33) The “sinners” can either be Gentiles or Jewish people, the latter of whom are referred to in 2:16, 34, 35, 3:9, 11, 12, 4:8, 13:6, 7, 8, 11, 14:6, 15:8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17:5.

“slanderers”(12:4), “unrighteous”(15:4), “profaner”(4:1), and so on. There is repeated mention of two opposing groups, “the righteous” including the psalmist and “the sinners”, or their equivalents within Israel itself.

(2) The righteous stood in sharp opposition to the Hasmoneans, and their immediate supporters who are dubbed as “sinners”. They challenged not only their conduct but their legitimacy and authority (PssSol 2, 4, 8). The sins with which they are charged are rather informative in indicating their identity. Transgression of the sanctity of the Temple and its service is indicated in 2:3 and sexual sins are mentioned in 2:13 as follows: *Because the sons of Jerusalem defiled the sanctuary of the Lord/they were profaning the offerings of God with lawless acts(2:3); And the daughters of Jerusalem were available to all, according to your judgements because they defiled themselves with improper intercourse(2:13)*. Especially other factors such as the sinners' persecution and oppression on the righteous formed part of the milieu from which the PssSol arose (Pss. 2, 17).

It is particularly noteworthy in the descriptions of the sinners, such as the reference to those “who deceitfully *quote* (*λαλέω* in Gk.) the Law”(4:8). In commenting on the sinners' understanding of the Law the psalmist employs the verb “*λαλέω*”, a derogatory word which can simply mean “to prattle”, or “to babble.”³⁴⁾ What is at issue here is not a question of committing moral and religious sins. The sinners did not disobey or disregard the Law, nor were they indifferent to it. The point is that of differing interpretations of the Law. The sinners, who were the high priests or upper stratum priests, had the authority to interpret the Law, and performed religious and political duties according to their interpretation. In addition to this, the problem of the understanding by the sinners of the Law is hinted at by the psalmist who accuses the sinners of “lawbreaking”³⁵⁾ and “lawlessness”³⁶⁾. It means that the contrast and enmity between the two groups seem to have originated from marked ideological differences, i.e., disagreement concerning points of understanding and interpretation of the Law, and resultant beliefs and practices such as the belief in resurrection and eternal life (3:11-12).

(3) Despite the fact that the temple was in existence and its cult was still

34) A. Debrunner, “*λεγω...λαλέω...*”, *TDNT* (one volume), 506.

35) 4:1, 9, 12, 19, 3, 8:9, 12: title, 1, 3, 4, 14:6.

36) 2:3, 12, 9:2, 15:8, 10, 11, 17:18.

accepted by them as valid, the group of the righteous did not seem to have fully relied upon the sacrificial system for atonement (PssSol 3, 9, 13).

One of the most distinctive features of the righteous is their manner of dealing with sins that they have committed. The passage that illustrate this idea is PssSol 3:7-8a: *The righteous constantly searches his house³⁷⁾ to remove his unintentional sins/He atones for (sins of) ignorance by fasting and humbling his soul.* On the basis of this translation, this raises the possibility that the means of atonement practised by the righteous included more than fasting and was extended to include all forms of abstinence.³⁸⁾ Apart from fasting and all forms of abstinence, even suffering was also a means they employed to make atonement for sins committed (PssSol 13:10).

(4) They had a stance of political quietism or of being powerless because of the sinners (PssSol 12). They did not take action against their enemies, whether Gentiles or the Jewish sinners, nor did they have schemes for regaining power after being deprived. For this to be true, it is necessary to pay attention to PssSol 12:5, saying that *May the Lord protect the quiet person (ψυχὴν ἡσύχιον) who hates injustice/ May the Lord guide the person who lives peacefully at home (ἄνδρα ποιουντα εἰρήνην οἴκῳ).* The Greek word ἡσύχιος is quite uncommon in the LXX. The sole references are in Isa. 66:2, Wis. 18:14 and Ben Sir. 25:20. This term is rendered from “nakeh” in Hebrew which is generally used in the sense of smitten, the state of quietness or a broken and humbled condition.³⁹⁾ This application of the understanding of ψυχὴν ἡσύχιον in PssSol 12:6 denotes the righteous as those who suffered and were hurt and quiet, probably by the sinners' various conspiracies and wrong doings. In such a situation, however, all that they did was pray that the sinners should be removed far from them.

The next Greek phrase *ἄνδρα ποιουντα εἰρήνην οἴκῳ* translating “lives

37) Numerous references to the ‘house’(οἶκος), denoting a variety of meanings like household, the house of Jacob, Israel as a whole and so on, are found within the PssSol (3:6, 7, 9, 4:12, 17, 20 ... etc.). It is noteworthy that ‘house’ in PssSol 3:7 may be used as a designation for the assembly of the righteous in a specific sense, considering that the psalmist throughout the PssSol has a group of the righteous in mind (PssSol 10:8).

38) Some Jewish writings illustrate fasting as a way of atonement for sins committed either deliberately (TSimeon 3:4) or to prevent them (TJoseph 3:4, 4:8, 10:1-2).

39) W. Arndt & F. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT and other Early Christian Literature*, 349; L. Koehler & W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the OT* I, 699.

peacefully at home” with the sinners in PssSol 12:1-4 is instructive. These verses describe how the sinners met and visited peoples on one pretext or another, probably concerning the areas of personal life, politics and religion. But they caused troubles. From the psalmist's point of view they were nothing but troublemaker, criminals and slanderers (12:1, 4), as these descriptions imply. To go further, the addition of “at home” in PssSol 12:5 may indicate a limitation of the status of the righteous, as opposed to the powerful and official position of the sinners in politics and religion. This may be confirmed in PssSol 17 which explicates the socio-political status of the righteous, being even in danger of their lives. Consequently some of them had to flee to the wilderness and were scattered over the earth. The others, whose lives were not threatened, probably because of their minor roles, managed to stay in Jerusalem. Given this, it is quite plausible that they remained as political quietists, as they are depicted as “remaining home” in PssSol 12:5.

This feature of the righteous makes it difficult to accept that they could be identified with the Pharisees. Black correctly points out an important fact about the Pharisees:

It was a mistake to regard the Pharisees as religious quietists. Both Pharisees and Sadducees were power groups, each striving for ascendancy in the Jewish state; political alignments were formed by both groups with the dominant foreign power.⁴⁰⁾

(5) The ultimate hope held by the righteous lies, namely, in the messianic times and in the figure of “the Messiah” in PssSol 17. This hope is articulated in response to a set of grave personal and national problems. The national leaders were the sinners committing the gross sins, and the people were sinful in a general sense so that the situation was beyond remedy (17:20). The sole solution would be the coming of the ideal king, the son of David. They held to the expectation of the Davidic Messiah as God's single agent, and of his ideal times.

According to PssSol 17, the first task of the Messiah, when he comes, is to remove all the evil of the present time: he will destroy the unrighteous rulers and nations, purge Jerusalem of Gentiles and drive out the sinners. As his second

40) M. Black, “The Pharisees”, *IDB* 4, 777.

positive function, he will play a perfect role in ruling and judging. He will gather a holy people, possibly including Gentiles, who are loyal to God. He will distribute the land to the tribes of the sanctified people, as in ancient times. He will judge peoples and nations, and rule them all in righteousness and holiness. The days of the Messiah are depicted as ideal times. Israel will be free of sin (17:27, 32, 40). As the nations flow to Jerusalem to bring their tribute, God's kingly power will be evident not only in Israel but also over all the earth. He will bless the gathered people and glorify God. His instruments in fulfilling these, however, are not such weapons as horse, rider and bow, but divine qualities such as strength, wisdom, righteousness (17:23, 27, 37, 40), purity from sin (17:36) and words whose power is mighty, creative and effective (17:24, 35-36). It is worthy of note that the temple, its cult and the priesthood, which were believed to be defiled, are not mentioned in the list of his works.⁴¹⁾ All in all, he is portrayed as a perfect worldly ruler, a real Davidic King of Israel, and God's agent.

An attractive proposal concerning the identity of the group of the righteous on the basis of the idea of the messianic figure(s) and messianism is that this group may represent an apocalyptic group, because these are themes often to be found in a number of apocalyptic writings.⁴²⁾ Though the development of the expectation of a coming Davidic Messiah may betray some of the tenor and spirit of apocalypticism, it still has to be noted that the view presented in the PssSol does not correspond to that of any apocalyptic literature or group known to us.

(6) Suffering was regarded as essential and significant because it disciplined the righteous, proved their identity as God's children, protected them from evil ways, rewarded them and cleansed their sins (PssSol 13).

In PssSol 13:1-12 the focus is upon the suffering which fell upon the righteous and the sinners alike, albeit to different degrees and upon the meaning attached

41) Though Davenport claims that the Davidic Messiah will play the dual roles, royal and priestly, his priestly duty is hardly mentioned. G. Davenport, "The Anointed of the Lord in the PssSol", G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. Collins, eds., *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profile and Paradigms*, 75.

42) Such documents as 2 Baruch, 4 Ezra, 1 Enoch 37-71, and 2 Enoch, which are generally classified as Jewish apocalypses, contain the messianic titles like "the Messiah", "the Anointed one", "the Christ" or important messianic passages. J. Charlesworth, "The concept of the Messiah in the Pseudepigrapha", W. Hasse, ed., *Principat 19:1: Judentum: Allgemeines: Palastinische Judentum*, 197-217.

to this suffering. It is this suffering that becomes an issue for PssSol 13:1-12. Several interpretations of the suffering of the righteous are available as follows:

① The suffering of the righteous is discipline while that of the sinners is destruction (13:7-9). Though God disciplines the righteous, he would not destroy them utterly. To the righteous, discipline can serve as a sign of their righteousness: understanding this, they can endure (16:14-15). It is an interpretation placed upon divine action or result of what was believed to have been divine action and is to be found in the Bible.⁴³⁾ In addition to this, the suffering of the righteous is construed as testing. The test applied to them is “in the flesh” and “in the difficulty of poverty”(16:14).

② That the righteous are suffering is beneficial to them because it is an instrument of God to keep them from evil and to lead them to repent (13:5, 10). Their suffering is a sure mark that they are God’s children, beloved and firstborn (v. 9), in the same manner as correction is given to a beloved son by his father or as the horse is goaded for service (16:4).⁴⁴⁾ They will then be protected from being swept along with the sinners (13:5-6). Suffering is therefore understood as an act of God’s mercy and as a source of hope.

③ Significantly the suffering of the righteous serves as an atonement, mainly for their sins (17:10, 10:1-2, 18:5). It is probably in this sense that they can describe themselves as “innocent” (12:4).

Despite the various significance of suffering, there is not the slightest suggestion that it can effect a cleansing of Israel as a whole from her iniquities through the afflictions of the righteous. In other words, there is no possibility here of an efficacious “vicarious suffering”. A vicarious function by which any suffering is seen as suffering for the sins of others has no place here.

(7) The righteous experienced exile, death, dispersion, poverty and/or deprivation of power (PssSol 5, 16, 17).

Certain bitter experiences that the psalmist and his group of the righteous underwent are extracted from PssSol 17 in particular. It says: they rose up against us (v. 5); they set upon us and drove us out (v. 5); they took away the

43) Sanders has shown that there are several instances in which suffering is understood as discipline in the OT and that this is deeply rooted in Hebrew thought: Hos. 5:2, 7:2, 10:10; Zeph. 3:2, 7, Jer. 10:24, Biblical Pss. 6:2, 38:2, 39:12, 94:12, Job 5:12, passim. J. A. Sanders, *Suffering as Divine Discipline in the OT and Post-biblical Judaism*, 44-45.

44) This image appears often in the PssSol (4:3, 5, 4:8, 8:7, 26, 9:2, 18:3-8).

promise (from us) by force (v. 5); they set up a monarchy because of their arrogance (v. 6); they despoiled the throne of David (v. 6). Some of the righteous who loved the “assemblies of the devout” (συναγωγὰς ὁσίων) were forced to leave the country and to forgo their meeting together because they were in danger of their lives. Thus they fled from the sinners and wandered in the desert. A few managed to survive (vv. 16-18).⁴⁵⁾

Judging this statement “they” set upon “us” and drove “us” out, usurping the existing power and setting up a new monarch (17:4-6). This very account has led to wide agreement that the sinners, who are here referred to in the third person plural “they”, correspond to the Hasmoneans who established the dynasty. On the other hand, what may not be ruled out is that the “assemblies of the devout” (17:16) may refer to a particular congregation which the psalmist and the righteous formed, whether their meetings were held either in the ‘synagogue’ as such or in their privately owned building. It seems that they gathered together as a group for some time until some of them were forced to leave. The fugitives may have been separated from the rest of the righteous remaining in Jerusalem, either through death in the desert, or through scattering among the nations. This may have been because they were influential in society, thus constituting a threat to the Hasmoneans. This means that the righteous including the psalmist seem to have remained as a group in Jerusalem and there continued their religious functions (10:5-8).

This is the indelibly drawn picture of the righteous given to us by the psalmist who is undoubtedly to be numbered among them. Though no identification with any known group or stream within the Judaism of the time is possible, there is clear evidence that they did exist as a group with many features that differentiate them from all others. Though they must remain anonymous so far as any brief title is concerned, their existence and importance for Jewish society of the time should not be overlooked or minimized. Though the righteous could not be identified with any historical group of the time known to us, they existed as a religious group as we mentioned above. We are not informed as to when the group called “righteous”, by that or an equivalent term, started to congregate and for how long they lasted as a group. The PssSol give only a general picture of

45) Buechler surmises that a long drought forced them to emigrate to neighbouring countries. However, there is no evidence for this. A. Buechler, *Types of Jewish-Palestinian Piety from 70 BCE to 70 CE*, 186.

the righteous opposed to the 'sinners' instead of their identification or historical group name.

4. Conclusion

As we have seen above, the inability to identify precisely the righteous of the PssSol is the result of a serious and fundamental deficit of information. That is to say, our knowledge of the religious and political groups existing during the last two centuries BCE and the first century CE is very limited. We are informed of only a very small number of groups, and of these very little is known. Josephus refers to four main religious groups in his day describing them, for the sake of his Gentile readers, as Philosophies, namely, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Eseenes and the Zealots or the Fourth Philosophy.⁴⁶⁾ In addition to such groups as the Qumran community, the Therapeutae⁴⁷⁾, Christians and Samaritans⁴⁸⁾ are known to us. However, it is also true that they were not the only groups that existed. There is evidence to suggest that during this period there was a great variety of different groups or sects, some of which are no longer known to us. For example, there were different orders within one group named as the Essenes.⁴⁹⁾ A Talmudic tradition refers to 24 groups at the time of the destruction of the Second temple.⁵⁰⁾ Charlesworth lists at least 21 groups, some of which contained further subdivisions, that existed prior to 70 CE in Jerusalem.⁵¹⁾

46) *Ant* XIII. x.5-6(288-298), XVIII.i.1(3-6), *War* II, viii.2-14(119-166), cf. Mt. 24 and Acts 23. The Sicarii may be identified with the Zealots.

47) Philo depicts them in *De vita contemplativa* iii.22-23. C. D. Yonge, (tran.), *The Works of Philo*, 700.

48) *Ant* XI. viii.6 (340-345).

49) Josephus recognized that there was more than one sort of Essenes (*War* II, viii, 13 [160-161]).

50) Yerusahaim, Sanhedrin, X, 5, cited by J. O'Dell, “The religious background of the PssSol”, *RQ* 3 (1961), 251-252.

51) Content of lecture given by Charlesworth on the 18th, August, 1989 in Melbourne. The following are the groups which he believes existed prior to 70 CE in Jerusalem: Enoch groups, Priestly groups, Hasidim, Pre-Qumran Essenes, Non-Qumran Essenes, Pharisees, Samaritans, Zealots, Herodians, Itinerant charismatics, John the Baptist, other groups, other Apocalyptic groups, scribes, Ascetics, synagogal groups, non-religious Jews, converted Jews and Palestinian Jewish movement.

The figures shown here may not be entirely accurate, but what is clear is that there were many more groups than those whose identity is known.⁵²⁾ Some did not last long, while others had such a limited following that historians ignored them. Others, such as the Qumran community, might have been undetected because of their location. In this respect, to ascribe all the writings of this period to one of the known groups would be tantamount to denying the existence of any other group. Moreover, to limit the existence of the groups to those known to us would be to run the risk of ignoring a significant portion of the Judaism of the day. This, in fact, is the most essential and important point of this study. It means that many proposals concerning a historical identification of the righteous must remain hypothetical. To go further, the righteous of the PssSol have to remain a religious group otherwise unknown and shadowy to us. They must not simply be subsumed under the heading of some known group. They have to be seen and understood, so far as is possible, in their own right.

<주요어>(Keywords)

솔로몬의 시편, 구약 위경, 의인, 바리새인, 유대 종파들.

Psalms of Solomon, OT Pseudepigrapha, the righteous, Pharisees, Jewish religious groups.

(투고 일자: 2011. 9. 30, 심사 일자: 2011. 10. 10, 게재 확정 일자: 2011. 10. 17)

52) Black describes the situation within Judaism in the first century BCE as “one of a widespread and dangerously proliferating and fissiparous heteropraxis, a kind of baptizing nonconformity, with many splinter groups”, extending from Judaea to Samaria and beyond into the Dispersion itself. M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christians*, 8.

<참고문헌>(References)

- Arndt, W. F. and Gingrich, F., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1957, 1979.
- Atkinson, K., “On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism At Qumran: New Light From Psalm of Solomon 17”, *JBL* 118 (1999), 435-460.
- Black, M., *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the NT*, London: SCM, 1981.
- Brock, S. P., “The Psalms of Solomon”, H. F. D. Sparks, ed., *The Apocryphal OT*, New York: Oxford, 1984.
- Buechler, A., *Types of Jewish-Palestinian Piety from 70 BCE to 70 CE*, New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1968(=1922).
- Charlesworth, J., “The concept of the Messiah in the Pseudepigrapha”, 188-218, W. Hasse, ed., *Principat 19:1: Judentum: Allgemeines: Palastinisches Judentum*, Berlin, N.Y.: Walter de Gruyter, 1979.
- Charlesworth, J., *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research*, Missoula: Scholars press, 1976.
- Cohen, S., *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987.
- Davenport, G. L., “The Anointed of the Lord in the PssSol”, 67-92, G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. Collins, eds., *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profile and Paradigms*, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Debrunner, A., “λεγω ... λαλέω ...”, *TDNT* (one volume), G. Bromiley, ed., Abridged in one volume from *TDNT* (10 volumes), Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985, 505-506.
- Dupont-Sommer, A., *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.
- Finkelstein, L., *The Pharisees: the Sociological Background of their Faith*, vol 2. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1962.
- Flusser, D., “Psalms, Hymns and Prayers”, M. Stone, ed., *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, Assen: Van Gorcum, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Franklyn, P., “The cultic and pious climax of eschatology in the Psalms of

- Solomon”, *JSJ* 18 (1987), 1-17.
- Gray, G., “The Psalms of Solomon”, R. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT 2*, Oxford: Clarendon press, 1913, 625-652.
- Guthrie, Jr. H., “Fast, Fasting”, *IDB 2*, N.Y.: Abingdon press, 1962, 242-244.
- Hann, R., “The community of the pious: the social setting of the Psalms of Solomon”, *Studies in Religion* 17 (1988), 169-189.
- Herr, M., “Fast and Fast Days”, *EJ* 6, Jerusalem: Keter, 1972, 1189-1195.
- Jagersma, H., *A History of Israel from Alexander the Great to Bar Kochba*, London: SCM, 1985.
- Kim, H., *Psalms of Solomon: A New Translation and Introduction*, Highland Park: The Hermit Kingdom press, 2008.
- Koehler, L. and Baumgartner, W., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the OT I*, Leiden, Boston, Koeln: Brill, 2001.
- Lane, W., “Paul’s legacy from Pharisaism: light from the PssSol”, *Concordia Journal* 8 (1982), 132-138.
- Mendels, D., “Hecataeus of Abdera and a Jewish Patrios Politeia of the Persian Period”, *ZAW* 95 (1983), 96-100.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E., *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, London: SCM, 1981.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E., *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Literature*, Cambridge: Harvard Uni. Press, 1972.
- O’Dell, J., “The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon”, *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1961), 241-257.
- Rahlfs, A., (ed.), *Septuaginta*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 1935, 1979.
- Ryle, H. and James, M., *Psalms of the Pharisees: Commonly Called the Psalms of Solomon*, Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2006.
- Sanders, E., *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*, London: SCM, 1990.
- Sanders, J. A., *Suffering as Divine Discipline in the OT and Post-Biblical Judaism*, New York: Colgate Rochester Divinity School, 1955.
- Schuepphaus, J., *Die Psalmen Salomon: Ein Zeugnis Jerusalem Theologie und Froemigkeit in der Mitte des Vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.
- Schürer, E., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)*, vols 1-3, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark LTD. 1973, 1979,

1986. G.

So, Ky-Chun, “Christological Insights: Between the Psalms of Solomon and the Sayings Gospel Q”(1), *Korea Presbyterian Journal of Theology(KPJT)* 6 (2006), 31-54.

Tcherikover, V., *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, New York: Atheneum, 1975.

Whiston, W., (tran.), *The Works of Josephus*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1987.

Winninge, M., *Sinners and the Righteous*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1995.

Wright, R. B., “Psalms of Solomon”, J. Charlesworth, ed., *The OT Pseudepigrapha 2*, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1985, 639-670.

Yonge, C. D., (tran.), *The Works of Philo*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993.

<Abstract>

**Book Review - *Translation That Openeth the Window:
Reflections on the History and Legacy of the King James Version***
(David G. Burke, ed., Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009)

Prof. Hwan Jin Yi
(Methodist Theological University)

This book includes three parts: (1) The World of Bible Translation Before the King James Version, (2) The Making of the King James Bible, and (3) The World of Bible Translation After the King James Version. As the subtitle of it shows, it is an anthology of 12 articles about “reflections and legacy of the King James Bible.” From this book we can get the detailed knowledge of the historical background and translation purpose of KJV as well as a variety of influences on later generations. To say nothing of English literature and philosophy, KJV had heavily influenced English speaking Jews and African Americans.

According to the authors of this book, King James I of England initiated the translation project of KJV when he led “the Hampton Court Conference” in 1604 for unity and stability in his church and state. He wanted a new Bible translation: an accurate, popular, nonsectarian, speedy, national, and authoritative translation. The translators consisted of about 50 scholars from Cambridge and Oxford Universities. They took Hebrew and Greek Bibles as their basic texts for their translation. They also frequently referred to the earlier translations such as Bishops’ Bible, Coverdale Bible, Great Bible, Geneva Bible, Matthew Bible, Rheims-Douay Bible, Wycliffite Bible, Tyndale Bible, or the like. KJV’s translation team tried to make their translation in current English as literal as they can. But “elegance was achieved by accident, rather than design”(McGrath).

This book, however, does not contain an article of textual analysis about KJV and its relations to later translations such as RV, ASV, and RSV etc. For this argument, the following books are recommended to read: Gordon Campbell, *Bible: The Story of King James Version 1611-2011* (Oxford: Oxford University

Press, 2011); David Norton, *A History of the English Bible as Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); and David Crystal, *Begat: The King James Bible and the English Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

How about KJV's influence on East Asian Bibles? It is deeper than we think. Chinese Bridgeman and Culbertson's Version (1874), Japanese Meiji Translation (1888) and Korean Old Version (1911) had leaned deeply on KJV for their textual decision and selection of their diction and expressions. Let us take a few examples by Korean Bibles. New Korean Revised Version (1998)'s "mist"(Gen. 2:6) seems to come from KJV because LXX, Peshitta and Vulgate take the Hebrew "ed" as "river" or "fountain", or the like. "Still waters", which Korean Old Version (1911) and Korean Catholic Bible (2005) contain in Psalm 23:2, must be KJV's term for MT's "water in places of repose"(me menuhot). In addition, New Korean Revised Version also seems to follow KJV in 1 John 2:23 for the textual decision.

<Abstract>

Book Review - *All Creatures Great and Small: Living Things in the Bible*
(Edward R. Hope, New York: United Bible Societies, 2005)

Prof. Hee Suk Kim
(Chongshin University)

This monograph (*All Creatures Great and Small*; ACGS hereafter) was published by United Bible Societies as a part of its series, *Help For Translators*. In ACGS' introduction, the basic issues for reading its main portion are dealt with in relation to how to understand the classification of the animal ranks and how to translate biblical animal names in accordance with the interrelationship between the ancient world of Israel and the modern world in which we live. The second part, the major portion of ACGS, explains the animal names, which are divided into seven categories: general animals; mammals; birds; snakes and lizards; fish, frogs, and mollusks; insects, spiders, and worms; and mythical monsters. Each category provides a good number of animal names, which are explained in terms of biblical references, discussion, description, special significance or symbolism, and translation issues. In a word, ACGS examines what a name meant in the ANE context, what it meant in the Bible, and what it could mean in our contemporary context. The third part presents bibliography, glossary, and a series of indices such as general index, animal index, scientific animal name index, scripture references, etc. ACGS is an invaluable resource for Bible translators as well as for the serious readers of the Bible. It helps us to more understand the world of living things presented in the Bible. For Korean readers, ACGS should be utilized with an understanding that ACGS has been written from a viewpoint of Western culture and language. When used with an attempt that pays attention to the cultural and linguistic differences between Korea and the Western world, ACGS will surely be an asset to enhance our understanding of the Scripture. This writer urgently recommends that ACGS should be translated into Korean and be used by the hands of Bible translators and the members of the church.