

Journal of Biblical Text Research. Vol. 32.

Published Semiannually by

The Institute for Biblical Text Research of the Korean Bible Society; April 2013

Table of Contents

• Paper •

- [Kor.] Some Characteristics of the Translation of Genesis 1-4 in “Crusade (1937-1938)” by
Rev. Kim Jae-Joon ----- Hwan-Jin Yi / 7
- [Kor.] A Suggestion for the Translation of *Bāmôt* in Deuteronomy 33:29
----- Jeong Bong Kim / 30
- [Kor.] A Structural Understanding of Psalm 1: Blessedness of the Righteous and the Fall of the
Wicked ----- Sang-kee Kim / 50
- [Kor.] An Inquiry into Translational Issues of Isaiah 7:1-25 ---- Hae Kwon Kim / 71
- [Kor.] Asherah Pole or Goddess Asherah?: The Translation of אַשְׁרָה in Korean Bibles
----- Dong-Hyuk Kim / 94
- [Kor.] The Usage of Αὐτός (m.sg.nom.) in LXX Greek: Analyses of LXX Genesis, Ruth,
Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, and 2 Maccabees ----- Joohan Kim / 112
- [Kor.] Verbs of ‘Seeing’ in the Gospel of Mark: Literary and Theological Observation for
Proper Translation ----- Tae Yeon Cho / 137
- [Kor.] Revisiting σωτηρία in Philippians 1:19: An Evaluation of the Diachronic Approach and
Suggestion of the Synchronic Approach ----- Jae Hyun Lee / 159
- [Kor.] An Evaluation of the Translation of the New Testament of the English Standard Version
----- Chang Wook Jung / 185

• Translated Paper •

- [Kor.] Redundancy is Information: The Literary Function of Participant Reference in Biblical
Hebrew Narrative ----- Rachele Wenger (Yoo-Ki Kim, trans.) / 205

• Book Review •

- [Kor.] *Prophetic Rhetoric: Case Studies in Text Analysis and Translation* (Ernst Wendland,
Xulon Press, 2009) ----- Changdae Kim / 214

<Abstract>

Some Characteristics of the Translation of Genesis 1-4 in “Crusade (1937-1938)” by Rev. Kim Jae-Joon

Prof. Hwan Jin Yi
(Methodist Theological University)

Reverend Kim Jae-Joon, one of the founding members of Hanshin University, translated the Book of Genesis (chapters one through four) into Korean from the Hebrew original in the years of 1937 and 1938. His translation was published four times in a row in a Korean journal called “The Crusade”, which is named Ship-Jah-Goon(십자군, 十字軍) in Korean. It was distributed in Yong-Jung (용정, 龍井) which is located in the north-eastern part of Manchuria, China. In those years he served as a junior high school teacher there. At the same time he was working as the chief editor of the periodical mentioned above. Some characteristics of his translation can be summarized as follows:

(1) His translation of Genesis, though partly translated, is easy to read compared to the Korean Revised Version, which was released in the same year or so.

(2) It seems to be the first Korean translation of the Bible that adopts “Yah-weh” instead of “Jehovah” or “Yehowah”, which is publically accepted by the Korean Protestant Church.

(3) He tried to deliver the Hebrew pun in Genesis 2:23 (“ish” and “isha”) with transliteration because translating them cannot deliver its impact.

(4) The Hebrew Masoretic text is rendered as literally as possible. For example, Genesis 2:4b in original Hebrew reads: “In the day Yahweh God created earth and heaven.” The word order of the sentence is held in his translation. The most important thing is that the Hebrew “adam” is thoroughly translated as “human” in Genesis chapter 2, contrary to other Korean translations such as the Old Version and Revised Version.

(5) Hebrew idioms are translated into natural Korean. Genesis 4:5 reads “and it was kindled to Cain”, while it is read in Korean, “Cain was very angry” or so.

(6) The scholarly finding from textual criticism is reflected in his translation.

For example, the Massoretic Genesis 4:8 does not have “Let us go out to field.” But old translations such as the Old Latin version, the Syriac translation like Peshitta, and the recension of the Samaritan Pentateuch do. This explanation is added to his translation in parenthesis.

(7) The most updated scholarly opinion concerning Genesis 1:1 is reflected in his translation. It is taken as a circumstantial phrase so that he reads it as follows: “In the beginning when God created heaven and earth.”

(8) Faithful transliteration of proper nouns to original Hebrew appears here and there. Compared to the Old Version in Korean (1911), his translation shows closer affinity to the original pronunciation.

(9) Nevertheless, it seems that his translation of Genesis follows the Old Version in Korean (1911), more specifically in its ending style.

(10) Korean orthography of his time those days frequently appears in his Genesis translation. Such examples are “Bae-ahm”(배암) for “Baem”(뱀, snake) and “Ahn-hae”(안해) for “Ah-nae”(아내, wife).

(11) It has proper expressions used in the north-eastern part of Korean peninsula at the time.

<Abstract>

A Suggestion for the Translation of *Bāmôt* in Deuteronomy 33:29

Dr. Jeong Bong Kim
(Korea Baptist Theological University)

The translation of the Hebrew word *bāmôt* in Deu 33:29 is not consistent in Korean versions of the Bible. The meanings of the translations are quite different from one another. The same situation is found in certain versions of Dutch, German, and English translations. This observation leads one to examine the root meaning of *bāmôt* for a proper translation.

In the Old Testament, there is no obvious clue to determine the meaning of *bamah*, whose plural form is *bāmôt*. As a rule *bamah* is translated as either “high places” in the cultic context or as topographical ‘heights’. However, it is difficult to decide on a proper meaning of the word in any biblical text that does not provide a clear context for the word, as in the case of Deu 33:29. In the biblical text, many scholars translate *bāmôt* as “backs”. In that case, they mostly see the Ugaritic *bmt* as a cognate to *bāmôt*.

However, this researcher does not agree that the meaning of *bmt* is fixed as “back” as a cognate to *bāmôt*. Rather, it depends on a given literary and theological context. It is essential to determine the context of *bāmôt* to define its meaning in the text. It is proposed that analysing the literary structure of Deu 33 and the poetic structure of Deu 33:29 may yield meaningful results that will allow the discussion of a proper literary and theological context of *bāmôt* in the broader context of Deuteronomy. Apparently “backs” as an anatomical term possesses a tangible and concrete meaning that the biblical context indicates. The result of this research reaffirms that “backs” would be the proper meaning of *bāmôt* as seen in certain versions.

<Abstract>

A Structural Understanding of Psalm 1: Blessedness of the Righteous and the Fall of the Wicked

Dr. Sang-kee Kim
(Jeonju University)

Judging from its form and contents, this Psalm is composed of 10 long or short units, which are rather chiasmically structured: (a) V.1ac *^(אֲשֶׁר־יִדְרֹאֲשׁ) - (a') V.6b, (b) V.1* - (b') V.5, (c) V.2 - (c') V.6a, (d) V.3a - V.4b (d'), (e) V.3b - (e') V.4a. It is read to bring comfort to the righteous having a hard time, but at the same time, functions as a warning to the wicked on his subversion. This may be a theological point not found in complaint psalms. In this sense, it can be characterized as prophetic rather than sagacious. This would also be supported by its deep-structure, which doesn't foreclose the possibility of the wicked being transformed.

The word עָרַהּ in V.5 would be reinterpreted as a testimony in court, based on Tosefta Bekhorot 3:8, although it is a compilation of the Jewish oral law from the period of the Mishnah. If this is the case, it will provide stronger support to the reading V.5-6 from a juristical point of view. Then it will be meaningful, to translate יָרַע in V.6a into 'recognize' as in the *(New) Korean Revised Version* rather than simply 'know' or 'care for'. The righteous will finally be recognized as such in JHWH's (eschatological) Judgment.

Therefore אֲשֶׁר־י is a speech form, representing the promise of the changed present-future and recognized future to a person living under certain conditions of his past-present life. And when textualized, it is formulated with or without a conjunctive ׀ or כִּי.

<Abstract>

An Inquiry into Translational Issues of Isaiah 7:1-25

Prof. Hae Kwon Kim
(Soongsil University)

The twofold purposes of the present article are first to discuss several translational issues Isaiah 7 through an exegetical inquiry into it and then to offer a new translation of the present chapter, which can be summed up in a sentence: “You shall not stand firm, if you do not believe.” Isaiah 7 deals with the vital impact of faith in God intervening in human affairs on real political decisions, which runs through the entire book of Isaiah. The prophet Isaiah challenges King Ahaz to trust in the Lord and stay firm even in the face of military threats of the Syro-Ephramite coalition against herself and instead absolutely trust in God’s unconditional commitment as promised in the Davidic covenant (2 Sam 7:12-16).

However, King Ahaz and the House of David seriously oscillated between trust in God and trust in a powerful foreign nation like Assyria or Egypt. Isaiah 7 illustrates how badly faith in a living God affects the real political decision of a nation and its aftermaths. Isaiah 7 chronicles the two historic failures of the House of David in a salvific intervention of Yahweh God of Israel on behalf of Israel: the Syro-Ephraimite crisis(B.C. 735-732) and the B.C. 701 Assyrian crisis.

While Isaiah urged both King Ahaz and King Hezekiah to trust God alone, the House of Judah failed to trust in the intervention of God in the two crises and instead relied on powerless idols such as foreign powers and spirits of dead ancestors. Nonetheless, Isaiah 7 emphasizes that the human infidelity of Judah to the divine covenant of God to the House of David could not nullify Yahweh’s zeal for the House of David.

In closing the translation and exegesis of Isaiah 7 offered above has offered some new translations of several key verses in Isaiah 7 such as v. 3 and v. 14, whose nuances have been overlooked.

<Abstract>

**Asherah Pole or Goddess Asherah?:
The Translation of אַשְׁרָה in Korean Bibles**

Dr. Dong-Hyuk Kim
(Methodist Theological University)

Regarding the Hebrew word אַשְׁרָה and its Korean translations, the present article argues the following. First, while the Hebrew word אַשְׁרָה, which occurs 40 times in the Hebrew Bible, means either the Canaanite mother-god Asherah or the sacred pole that was venerated as part of the Yahwistic religion, the Korean translations of this word are not clear in distinguishing the two meanings, and most of them give the reader an impression that they denote the goddess. At present, various expressions translate אַשְׁרָה in Korean Bibles, but they should be either ‘(the goddess) Asherah’ or ‘the asherah pole’ so that the Korean reader may understand that there were two (and only two) different kinds of ‘Asherah’ in ancient Israel. Second, of the eight possible references to the goddess (Jdg 3:7; 1Ki 15:13 // 2Ch 15:16; 1Ki 18:19; 2Ki 21:7; 23:4-7[3x]), four are argued to point clearly to the goddess (Jdg 3:7; 1Ki 15:13 // 2Ch 15:16; 1Ki 18:19), whereas it is difficult to decide whether the other four (2Ki 21:7; 23:4-7[3x]) mean the goddess or the pole. Third, the use of the definite article with the name ‘Asherah’ was probably induced by the linguistic analogy with the foreign god Baal. The Deuteronomist’s insistence on using the expression ‘the Asherah’ may have been due to the fact that the cult of the asherah (the pole) was a persistent challenge for his attempt to establish an orthodox Yahwism.

<Abstract>

**The Usage of Αὐτός (m.sg.nom.) in LXX Greek:
Analyses of LXX Genesis, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, and 2 Maccabees**

Dr. Joochan Kim
(Chongshin University)

In this article I research the usage of αὐτός (m.sg.nom) in the LXX Greek. Classical Greek grammarians have insisted that the nominative form of αὐτός is not used as a person pronoun. Instead, it either intensifies a noun, which is modified by αὐτός, with the meaning of “oneself” or emphasises the noun with the meaning of “the same”, in the name of the special usage of αὐτός. But, from some passages in the LXX, we sometimes find examples that seem to imply the usage as the pronoun of αὐτός (m.sg.nom). For this phenomenon, grammatical explanation is to be requested. However, well-known LXX Greek grammar books, such as those of F. C. Conybeare and G. Stock (English), H. J. Thackeray (English) and S. -N. Kang (Korean), do not provide sufficient explanation of this phenomenon. They just mention that such a phenomenon is found in a few books in the LXX. Such a situation have sometimes produced difficulties not only in understanding the nature and feature of LXX Greek, but also in investigating the influence of LXX Greek on NT Greek as well as the literary or/and genealogical relationship(s) between the Hebrew *Vorlage* and the LXX. The very reason of this situation is the absence in the study of the usage of αὐτός in the sphere of the LXX Greek. Thus I try to investigate the usage of αὐτός (m.sg.nom.) in the LXX in order to offer hints to solve the above- mentioned difficulties. To achieve this aim, I tried to analyse and compare the usage of αὐτός (m.sg.nom.) and its substitutes in a few selected books in the LXX, i.e. LXX Genesis (literary translation), LXX Ruth and Ecclesiastes (literal translations), LXX Isaiah (free translation), and 2 Maccabees (original, but summarised, Greek work), and revealed that αὐτός (m.sg.nom.) was used as personal pronoun in the third person in the LXX and its occurrence increased in later books of the LXX.

<Abstract>

**Verbs of ‘Seeing’ in the Gospel of Mark:
Literary and Theological Observation for Proper Translation**

Prof. Tae Yeon Cho
(Hoseo University)

In the Gospel of Mark, the gospel is revealed with extraordinary lights and voices. But faith comes out of the responses to the revelation. Mark has various ‘verbs of seeing’ in his gospel. They include not only βλέπω and its derivatives (διαβλέπω, ἀναβλέπω, ἐμβλέπω, περιβλέπομαι) but also ὀράω(εἶδον), θεωρέω, θεάομαι, and δείκνυω (δείκνυμι). This study repeatedly finds the fact that Mark uses each of these verbs for different layers of meaning in different contexts and in different occasions.

The purpose of this study is to determine the exact meaning of each verb in the Gospel of Mark; to point out either wrong translations or those bearing unclear meaning in the Gospel of Mark of the *New Korean Revised Version*; and finally to suggest better translations of these verbs according to how Mark intended to use them in each verse.

Essential to this study is whether Mark has any ‘theology of seeing’ in his gospel or not. The answer is always positive. In his gospel, Mark developed theological insights of ‘light and voice’ and ‘seeing and hearing’ through the literary devices of parables and miracles of healing.

On the one hand, parables are ‘picture language’ full of symbols and poetic images. They are devices which create visual effects through audio effects. If one hears a parable from Jesus, one has some pictures in his or her mind even if the speech is over. Thus Jesus says, “Listen and look!” (Mark 4:3). He repeats, “Look what you hear” (Mark 4:24). On the other hand, Jesus articulates the reason to teach in parables that “they may be ever seeing but never truly seeing … otherwise they might turn and be forgiven!” (4:12). But an extremely critical question is directed to his disciples, “Don't you understand this parable? How then will you understand any parable?” (4:13). They misunderstood one parable, and would thus misunderstand all other parables. Crucial to them, however, is the fact that Jesus “did not say anything to them without using a parable” (4:34).

Jesus will soon rebuke his disciples, “Do you have eyes but fail to see…?” (8:18)

The stories of healing the blind are miracles which open the eyes of the blinds (8:22-26; 10:46-52). The story of the blind in Jericho (8:22-26) uses five verbs of seeing in just three verses, which are βλέπω, ὁράω, ἀναβλέπω, διαβλέπω, and ἐμβλέπω. Each verb has its own place in the hierarchy of meaning. The blind are healed to ‘look up’ (ἀναβλέπω) and to ‘look perfectly’ (ἐμβλέπω). Ultimately the blind come to see the genuine characters of the gospel and the Kingdom of God, and they become true disciples of Jesus.

A good understanding of Mark’s ‘theology of seeing’ yields exact meaning of each verb of seeing in the gospel. Every verse which includes even a verb of seeing will be tested according to the former. All these observations and tests are suggestions for better translation of these verbs according to Mark’s intention for using them in each verse, especially in the *New Korean Revised Version*.

<Abstract>

**Revisiting σωτηρία in Philippians 1:19:
An Evaluation of the Diachronic Approach and Suggestion of the
Synchronic Approach**

Dr. Jae Hyun Lee
(Korea Baptist Theological Seminary)

What is the meaning of σωτηρία in Phil 1:19? To determine its meaning is not just a matter of choosing among lexico-semantic options. Rather, this process contains a possibility that the way of thinking could be different according to one's stance on the expression that is regarded to be relevant to Job 13:16 (LXX). In this sense, the process of determining the meaning of σωτηρία in Phil 1:19 is connected to the area of hermeneutics. As an important step, this paper evaluates two kinds of approaches to Phil 1:19 with this concept in mind.

At the outset, this paper examines the diachronic approach to Phil 1:19, especially the intertextual approach with the concept of echoes. Those who support this approach assume that since Phil 1:19 reflects Job 13:16 as an echo, the content of the OT text should be a definite clue in deciding the meaning of σωτηρία in Phil 1:19. Such assumption leads them to see the meaning of σωτηρία as future eschatological salvation or vindication from God. However, this paper demonstrates that there are several problems in using this approach as the primary way for understanding σωτηρία. The diachronic approach contains its methodological weakness not only in defining the so-called echoes of the OT, but also in answering several difficult questions regarding the application of consonance of the OT to the present text.

This study then deals with the second approach, the synchronic approach to the text, which focuses on the present text and its context, and argues that this approach be used as the primary way in interpreting Phil 1:19. Evaluating the two kinds of understanding of σωτηρία, such as 'release from prison' and 'future eschatological salvation or vindication', which are suggested through synchronic approach, this study proposes another interpretation. According to the structure of Phil 1:19-20, the prepositional phrase with κατά in Phil 1:20 plays an

important role in identifying the meaning of σωτηρία in Phil 1:19. As an additional modification of the main reason of Paul's joy in Phil 1:19, it reflects Paul's eager expectation and hope in relation to his present situation. Based on the results from the analysis of structure and content of Phil 1:19-20, this study suggests that the meaning of σωτηρία in Phil 1:19 be understood as the status that the dignity of Jesus will be raised through the life of Paul and his bold proclamation of the gospel. This status reflects the present aspect of salvation in two-realm framework, and matches well with the previous context of Phil 1:19.

<Abstract>

An Evaluation of the Translation of the New Testament of the English Standard Version

Prof. Chang Wook Jung
(Chongshin University)

It is generally agreed that the English Standard Version (ESV) is to be placed between the NASB which aims to be a literal translation, and the NIV which aims to be a literary translation. The preface of the ESV claims that “the ESV is an ‘essentially literal’ translation that seeks as far as possible to capture the precise wording of the original text.” At the same time, the version takes readability into account. The emphasis is laid on literal translation, but the literary style of the English language is not ignored. It is generally said that such goals of the ESV’s goal is accomplished.

A close investigation demonstrates, however, that the ESV fails to maintain its consistency in some cases, or to mark any advancement over the RSV, which it follows too rigidly. This study examines some instances in which these characteristics of the ESV stand out. First, the study deals with the understanding of the imperfect tense, which represents one of the most complicated tenses when translating Greek into English. Whereas the ESV is better than the RSV or the NIV in translating the imperfect, it fails to convey the precise meaning of the imperfect tense in some passages.

Second, the translation of the conjunction ‘καί’ reveals that the ESV has faithfully adhered to the RSV. While appropriately interpreting the conjunction as an adversative in some cases, the ESV, nevertheless, is hesitant to do so in other passages as required. The third part reviews the translation of some Greek nouns, one area where the ESV surpasses the RSV. This section also investigates an instance in Romans 14:17 where the ESV does not subscribe to its own translation principles. In sum, the ESV represents a reliable translation, which faithfully reflects the Greek text, in spite of some debatable instances explored herein.

<Abstract>

***Book Review-Prophetic Rhetoric: Case Studies in Text Analysis
and Translation***

(Ernst Wendland, Xulon Press, 2009)

Prof. Changdae Kim
(Anyang University)

This work by Ernst R. Wendland has attempted to make a discourse analysis of nine books from the prophetic books, one from the Major Prophets and eight from the Minor Prophets, for the purpose of providing Bible translators with some insights as to how to communicate the rhetorical impacts of the text to the audiences of modern day. The main arguments of this work are based on the assumption that “literary structure and form are inherent parts of meaning,” as Dr. Lynell Zogbo notes.

With the contributions of text linguistics in mind, this work has explored the ways that a text has its textual cohesion and semantic coherence in order to impact its audiences. In this regard, the chief attention of this work has been devoted to the literary forms and structures of prophetic discourses. This work successfully demonstrates how the literary structures and forms of the text facilitate our understanding of its major themes. In particular, it is convincingly argued that diverse rhetorical devices for demarcation and bonding help the reader to distinguish the constituent parts of the text, and then to uncover its thematic peaks and evocative climaxes.

What is noteworthy in this regard is that this work provides a detailed explanation of the rhetorical devices such as aperture and closing signals, metaphor, verbal shift, direct speech, rhetorical question, and so on. Wendland focuses his special attention on the rhetorical features of recursion and variation, with the result of arguing that those devices enable the author to demarcate the text and to bring the attention of the audience to the central content of the text. He goes on to make a case that the sound effects of a text has an important rhetorical function because they add excitement and emphasis to the text when it impacts the audience.

On the basis of the above insightful observations, this work has come up with several suggestions that have to do with Bible translation. The main suggestion

is that Bible translators should make every effort to transfer all the rhetorical effects of the text into their target languages by means of contextualizing the original text. To borrow the words of Wendland, this way of translating produces a “literary-oratorical version” which is relevant to the audience of today.

In my view, there are some areas in which this work should be improved. First, this work does not provide sufficient explanation of some key terms like thematic peak, thematic nucleus, and climax. As a result, the line between those terms is blurred in such a way that we cannot see the criteria by which the terms are defined. Second, due to its preoccupation with the forms of the text, it seems to me that this work focuses too much on textual cohesion so that it displays little interest in the way meanings of words form a thematic network (or semantic coherence) within the whole text in an effort to persuade the audience.

Despite these limitations, it is true that this work contributes much to drawing out the operations and functions of rhetorical devices of the text, and more importantly, it presents a vivid picture of how Bible translators should communicate the rhetorical effects of the original text in their target languages.