

Table of Contents

• Paper •

[Kor.] A Canonical Reading of Exodus 33:7-11: A Proposal for the Translation of ‘Tent of Meeting’(אהל מועד) to Make a Distinction from ‘Tabernacle’(משכן)	Keun Jo Ahn / 7
[Kor.] A Proposal on the Translation of Leviticus 6:18b	Se Young Roh / 29
[Kor.] Research on the Redaction History of 2 Kings 23:8-9 and a Suggestion for New Translation	Een Woo Lee / 53
[Kor.] Did Hellenism Influence the Septuagint Proverbs?: A Focus on Proverbs 9	Jung-Ja Kim / 74
[Kor.] A Critical Study of the Terms ‘Sokjoe’ and ‘Hwahae’ in the Pauline Epistles: With Particular Attention to the Problem of Interpretating ἱλαστήριον and καταλλαγή	Seo-Jun Kim / 98
[Kor.] Metaphor of “Leaven and Paschal Lamb”: A Translation and Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 5:7	Young-in Kim / 131
[Kor.] A Reflection on the Translation History of 1 Corinthians 13:13	Tae Sub Kim / 149
[Kor.] Translation of James 2:18 and 4:5-6	Hyeon Woo Shin / 168
[Kor.] A Study on the Consistency Problem of Some Translated Words in the New Korean Revised Version: Notes on the Translation of Anthropological Terms and <i>Pneuma</i> Meaning the Holy Spirit	Sung Jong Oh / 191
[Kor.] Biblical Performance Criticism and Bible Translation: James A. Maxey and His Contribution	Ki-Min Bang / 218
[Kor.] Historicity of Classics and the Difficulties of Their Translation	Sung-Hoon Kang / 238
[Eng.] A Textual-Critical Analysis of Achsah’s Story With Focus on the Characterization	Yonghyun Cho / 264
[Eng.] Is the Old Testament Too Old for Christian Ethics?	Youngju Kwon / 283
[Eng.] The Art of Biblical Performance: Biblical Performance Criticism and the Old Testament Narratives	Travis West / 301



• **Translated Paper** •

[Kor.] Towards an Ecological Handbook for Bible Translators

----- Stephen W. Pattemore (Youngmog Song, trans.) / 328

• **Book Review** •

[Kor.] *The Threat to Faith: An Exegetical and Theological Re-Examination of 2 Thessalonians 2*

(Charles H. Giblin, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967)

----- Hyung Dong Kim / 352

[Kor.] *Katechon: II Thess 2,1-12 im Horizont apokalyptischen Denkens* (Paul Metzger, BZNW

135, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005) ----- Eun-Geol Lyu / 362

<Abstract>

**A Canonical Reading of Exodus 33:7-11:  
A Proposal for the Translation of ‘Tent of Meeting’(אהל מועד)  
to Make a Distinction from ‘Tabernacle’(משכן)**

Keun Jo Ahn  
(Hoseo University)

This is a paper to delve into the canonical significance of Exodus 33:7-11 in order to make a distinction between the *tent of meeting* (אהל מועד) and the *tabernacle* (משכן). I have wrestled with two problems, i.e. translation of the tent of meeting and integral reading of Exodus 33:7-11 in the present canonical context. Scholars had discussed the text in question as a later insertion redacted by the so-called Priestly Historian. Without it, the preceding text of 33:1-6 would flow smoothly into the following 33:12-23. Both texts consist of a successive dialogue between God and Moses regarding the judgment of God in the face of Israelites' idolatry worship of the Golden Calf. Why does the text of the tent of meeting interrupt the divine-human dialogue in the chapter of 33? Moreover, the verb forms of *yiqtol* and *wegatel* indicate that the tent of meeting in 33:7-11 had been installed occasionally even before the construction of the tabernacle. What is the relationship between those two tents?

Several canonical readers have suggested their own interpretations on the meaning of the text in the context of chapters 32-34. Some of them regard the function of the text as a focal point of change from the judgment to restoration. Others argue that the role of Moses as an intercessor is highlighted. This claim is strengthened by the expression of “face to face” encounter between Yahweh and Moses. Still others notice that the theme of the presence of God is the main issue that is consummated by the inauguration of the tabernacle in chapter 40. However, structural analysis of chapters 32-34 has revealed that the tent of meeting is situated at the heart of a series of divine-human dialogues. Also, the structure of chapter 33 itself shows a chiasmus whose focus is placed on the conversation of Moses with God. Furthermore, the extended context of chapters 19-40, which contain the legal codes such as the Ten Commandments, Covenant Code, the Law of Tabernacle, displays that the legal provisions and regulations are the result of personal conversation between God and human.

Through these observations, I have asserted that Exodus 33:7-11 conveys a theological remedy to misunderstandings of Israelites who had considered the meaning of the tabernacle as an experience of divine presence by *seeing* the clouds and fire. When the P placed the text at the center of chapters 32-34, they must have intended to emphasize the experience of ‘listening’ to the divine words that transpire in the tent of meeting. I have found, in agreement with Menahem Haran, that the tradition of tabernacle represents the priestly experience of seeing while the tent of meeting’s tradition represents the prophetic experience of listening. In conclusion, I have proposed that the tent of meeting should be translated as ‘tent of Words’ or ‘tent of listening.’

<Abstract>

## A Proposal on the Translation of Leviticus 6:18b and 27a

Se Young Roh

(Seoul Theological University)

This article proposes a more adequate translation of Leviticus 6:18b (כל אשר יגע) [Heb. v. 11] and 27a (כל אשר יגע בבשרה יקדש) [Heb. v. 20] in response to J. Milgrom. In order to understand these phrases, the usage of three terms (כל, נגע, יקדש) should be studied in the context of priestly tradition. Milgrom insists that כל is the subject of יקדש and cannot refer to a human because holiness does not transfer to humans as demonstrated in Leviticus 5:14-16, Haggai 2:12, Exodus 30:26-29, and Numbers 4:15. Accordingly, the phrase in Leviticus 6:11b has to be translated as ‘whatever touches them shall become holy.’ However, Leviticus 5:14-16, Exodus 30:26-29, and Numbers 4:15, which belong to priestly tradition, basically show that humans have to be qualified at the time of contact with sancta and are silent on whether or not holiness can be transferred to humans.

Four cases (Lev 7:19, 21; 12:4; Num 4:15) in which נגע refers to contact with sancta also show that נגע is used in the context of qualification at the time of contact with sancta. The use of יקדש is limited to the transfer of holiness. Holiness is transferred to the high priest, who is prepared to enter the most holy when entering the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement. He, however, has to desanctify after he is finished with the purification offering. In addition, the things which are contagious by sancta have to undergo rites to remove the holiness, which has been transferred (Lev 6:27-28 [Heb. vv. 20-21]). This means that the contagion of holiness is very different from the contagion of impurity. If holiness is in contact with impurity, then holiness is polluted by impurity. These characteristics of holiness imply that יקדש can be translated as ‘to be in a holy state.’ Finally, Leviticus 22:1-16, which is auxiliary to Leviticus 6:14-30, regulates that the priests should be in a holy state when they come into contact with sancta.

Through the discussion on these three terms, it can be proposed that the phrases in Leviticus 6:11b and 20a should be translated as ‘whoever touches

these should be in a holy state' and 'whoever touches its flesh shall be in a holy state' respectively. Holiness has to be separated from impurity (Lev 10:10). When society is polluted by impurity, it has to be restored to a holy state by sacrifices not by contagion. If anyone who is not qualified comes into contact with sancta, he/she is given the penalty of death or being cut off.



<Abstract>

**Research on the Redaction History of 2 Kings 23:8-9 and  
a Suggestion for New Translation**

Een Woo Lee

(Presbyterian University and Theological Seminary)

2 Kings 23:8-9 reflects the peculiarity of King Josiah's reform intensively around the themes of elimination of high places and cult centralization.

In this study, the writer traces the redactional history of 2 Kings 23:8-9 through etymological, lexical, and exegetic analysis, and tries to suggest a new translation to solve the discrepancies between this text and the law code of Deuteronomy.

Through this study, the writer reveals that the basic layer of this passage is 2 Kings 23:8a $\alpha$  (ויבא את-כל-הכהנים מערי יהודה) which is related with cult centralization. This is the Deuteronomic redactional layer in King Josiah's reign. To this basic layer, v. 8a $\beta\gamma$  (ויטמא את-הבמות אשר קטרו-שמה הכהנים) was added. This exilic Deuteronomic redaction emphasized the defilement of local high places where the priests had offered sacrifices and which were rebuilt in exilic period. The final redactional insertion in this passage is v. 8a $\delta$ , v. 8b $\alpha\beta$ , v. 9ab, which are the post-exilic Deuteronomic redactional layer. The expression *from Geba to Beer-sheba* in v. 8a $\delta$ , the w<sup>e</sup>qatal form of נתץ and השערים in 8b $\alpha$ , מזבח יהוה, כהני הבמות, עלה אל-מזבח in 9a and אחיהם in 9b leads us to assume v. 9 as post-exilic Deuteronomic redaction.

The writer suggests to translate השערים in v. 8b $\alpha$  into *hirsute rainstorm god* and כי אם in v. 9b into *unless*, which solves the discordance between this text and the Deuteronomic code.

<Abstract>

## **Did Hellenism Influence the Septuagint Proverbs?:**

### **A Focus on Proverbs 9**

Jung-Ja Kim

(Graduate Schools of Baekseok University)

This study intends to clarify that LXX Proverbs 9 is faithful to the Masoretic text and is an annotative translation with the Torah's addition. Some scholars claim that Hellenism influenced the wisdom (Sophia) in Proverbs 1-9. Scholars have been discussing the difference between LXX Proverbs and Masora. However, a study focusing on the text of Proverbs 9 is yet to be conducted. The conclusions of LXX Proverbs 9 can be better understood when analyzed with the Masora. Different outcomes were uncovered from the translations, and LXX Proverbs 9:6, 10, 12, and 18 were found to contain content that was not found in Masora. The existence of another version (Vorlage) is assumed to have been the reason for the discrepancy. However, it is difficult to recognize Vorlage's existence, given the Israelite tradition of respecting the authority of the Hebrew Bible. In addition, there may have been structural differences between Hebrew and Greek. When the LXX Proverbs Chapter 9 and Masora were translated and analyzed, it was found that LXX was a faithful translation of Masora, and the Torah comment was added. It is a false hypothesis that Hellenism influenced chapter 9 of Proverbs (LXX). Instead, Proverbs 9 of the LXX handles the hermeneutic role of Israel's wisdom literature reasonably well.

<Abstract>

**A Critical Study of the Terms ‘Sokjoe’ and ‘Hwahae’  
in the Pauline Epistles:  
With Particular Attention to the Problem of Interpretating  
ἱλαστήριον and καταλλαγή**

Seo-Jun Kim

(Presbyterian University and Theological Seminary)

The present article examines the terms ‘sokjoe’ and ‘hwahae’ (‘hwamok’) used in Korean Bible translations, particularly in Paul’s epistles. It first investigates the meanings of the Greek expressions behind ‘sokjoe’ and ‘hwahae’ (‘hwamok’), namely ἱλαστήριον, καταλλαγή, and καταλλάσσω, in light of their usage in various ancient writings available in Paul’s time. Then based on the results of this investigation, it examines the theological meanings of those terms in Paul’s epistles to reconsider the validity of their Korean translations.

With regard to the Korean translations of ἱλαστήριον in Rom 3:25, neither the New Korean Revised Version (NKRV) nor the Revised New Korean Standard Version (RNKSV) provides precise translation. A survey of the use of ἱλαστήριον in the Septuagint reveals that its central meaning is *to cover, close, or wrap*. It can also mean *block or countervail*. In the Septuagint, it refers to various objects that cover or wrap (Exo 25:17-22; 31:7; 35:12; 38:5,7 ff; Lev 16:2,13-15; Num 7:89; Eze 43:14,17,20; [Symmachus] Gen 6:16; Amo 9:1). In the context of Hellenistic religions, it refers to an object that functions to block divine wrath (*Cos* Nr. 80; *Cos* Nr. 347; *Bullettino del Museo dell'Impero Romano* Nr. 11) ; *SEG* LIV 796; *Lindos 2. Inschriften*, Nr. 425; *Tempelchronik von Lindos* B 49, Z. 48-50; Dio Chrysostomus, *Or* 11,121; Josephus, *Ant*, 16.182). In Rom 3:25 and 4 Maccabees 17:21-22, the same word is used in relation to the blood and the death of a person, which function to cover the sins of sinners and block God’s wrath. When Paul in Rom 3:25 mentions Jesus’ blood while presenting Jesus as ἱλαστήριον put forward by God, this word conveys the meaning of Christ’s death, namely that the blood shed by Christ is able to cover human sins or block/countervail divine wrath.

A survey of the καταλλα-word group shows that it is clearly distinguished

from the ἱλασ-word group, and that it basically signifies the restoration of peace by ending hostility, namely reconciliation (‘hwahae’) rather than simply warm relationship among members (‘hwamok’). Paul uses καταλλαγή and καταλλάσσω to refer to the event of reconciliation between God and man through Christ Jesus. Just as δικαιοσύνη, frequently used by Paul, describes one aspect of salvation, καταλλαγή and καταλλάσσω also describe another aspect of salvation that God achieved through his Son, Jesus, namely that God resolved hostility between God and humanity through his Son, and that there is therefore no need to fear God’s wrathful judgment on sin and injustice.

In summary, ἱλαστήριον, καταλλαγή, and καταλλάσσω in the Pauline epistles describe different aspects of the meaning of Jesus Christ’s death on the cross. While ἱλαστήριον directly communicates the role and the meaning of Christ’s death, καταλλαγή and καταλλάσσω refer to an event that results from his death. In view of this clear semantic distinction between ἱλαστήριον and καταλλαγή / καταλλάσσω, we are thus not justified to conflate the meanings of these two words, and use both ‘sokjoe’ and ‘hwamok’ for the translation of ἱλαστήριον. Furthermore, we need to remember the particular meanings of Christ’s death expressed by Paul’s specific choice of the words, ἱλαστήριον, καταλλαγή, and καταλλάσσω. It is by understanding these meanings clearly that we can come closer to the original representation of salvation that Paul communicated two thousand years ago.

<Abstract>

**Metaphor of “Leaven and Paschal Lamb”:  
A Translation and Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 5:7**

Young-in Kim  
(Seoul Theological University)

This paper will explore the meaning of metaphors *leaven* and *Paschal Lamb* in 1 Corinthians 5:7 in Korean Bible translations. Corinthians 5:7 is an important verse that contains metaphors of the Christology from early Christianity.

When the verse is divided into 5:7a and 5:7b, both parts are connected through καὶ γάρ which entails the metaphors of *leaven* and *Paschal Lamb* respectively. The conjunction καὶ γάρ has the function to exhibit the latter as the cause of the first metaphor. However, this important conjunction is often omitted in Korean Bible translations including the 『개역개정』 (New Korean Revised Version). Of course, it is included in the first complete version of the Korean Bible, 『예수성경전서』 (Corean New Testament) in history.

However, this καὶ γάρ is a phrase that is not easy to interpret so the majority of later manuscripts and some modern translations try to understand it by adding ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. It is also the only passage in the New Testament that explicitly refers to the death of Jesus as the *Paschal Lamb*. The addition by later generations is therefore seen as a paraphrase and an interpretation of the understanding that Jesus Christ is the *Sacrificial Lamb* and correctly the *Paschal Lamb*.

As the Jewish community already shows the functional integration of the Paschal Lamb and the Sacrificial Lamb by the time of prophet Ezekiel, it can be speculated that in early Christianity, the interpretation of Jesus' death was strengthened to include the concept of Sacrificial Lamb and Paschal Lamb. It is therefore consequently obvious to Paul that Jesus Christ, who was the *Sacrificial Lamb* is also the *Paschal Lamb*. This is why Paul only wrote καὶ γάρ between *Leaven* and *Paschal Lamb* without any additional explanation.



<Abstract>

## **A Reflection on the Translation History of 1 Corinthians 13:13**

Tae Sub Kim

(Presbyterian University and Theological Seminary)

1 Corinthians 13:13 is one of the most well-known verses in the New Testament to Korean Christians. While previous studies have approached it chiefly with exegetical interests, the history of its translation into Korean has been given little attention. Thus, the present research attempts to overview the Korean Bible versions in terms of the changes made to its translation and to discover the underlying reasons for such alterations.

1 Corinthians 13:13 as it now stands in the NKRV (New Korean Revised Version, 1998) is in fact different from the one in the early versions published before 1900. When compared with the CNT (Corean New Testament, 1887), the 1 Corinthians (one-volume edition, 1898) and the KNT (Korean New Testament, 1900), it is found that there are two major differences between these early versions and the NKRV: (1) while the former translates  $\nu\nu\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$  as having the temporal sense *now*, the NKRV renders it as a logical conjunctive *thus*; (2) the NKRV has the adverb *forever* which does not appear in the original Greek at face value.

In fact, such changes in the translation of 1 Corinthians 13:13 took place from the KNT (1904). Since this epistle as included in the KNT (1900) was based on the individual draft, the Board of Official Translators needed to revise it. According to their list of references, three NT commentaries are found: Meyer's Commentary on the NT; Ellicott's Commentary on the NT; and Alford's Greek NT. It is interesting to note that these three commentaries commonly argue against the temporal sense of  $\nu\nu\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$  considering it as a logical conjunctive. As a result, they advocate eternal existence of the triad (faith, hope, love). This being so, it is more probable than not that the official translators were influenced by these commentaries when they developed the revised version. This may illuminate the reason behind the changes in the KNT(1904)'s translation of 1 Corinthians 13:13.

Given that its translation has not been changed greatly since then, it can be

said that the KNT (1904) is the watershed in the translation history of 1 Corinthians 13:13. Although KNT (1904) has not received due consideration for its numerous spelling errors, its value in the history of the Korean Bible should not be underestimated.

<Abstract>

## Translation of James 2:18 and 4:5-6

Hyeon Woo Shin  
(Chongshin University)

James 2:18 quotes a saying (σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις) of an opponent with the phrase *But someone will say* (Ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις). As in 1 Corinthians 15:35; Romans 9:19; and 11:19, the opponent's saying may be a question: "Do you have faith?"

The counter-argument of James begins with καὶ γὰρ, which can mean *but I* as in John 17:11. James says that he has works which prove his faith.

The repetition of καὶ γὰρ, makes the construction of *both A and B*, and the use of ἐγώ (I) makes an emphasis in contrast to σύ (you).

These considerations lead us to translate James 2:18 as follows:

Someone, however, will say.

"As for you, do you have faith?"

As for me, however, I have works.

Show me your faith without works.

As for me, however, I will show you faith with my works.

James 4:5 begins with ἢ (otherwise), which supposes an opposition of an opponent (who claims that a friend of the world does not become God's enemy) as in 1 Corinthians 6:19; 10:21; and Romans 3:29. In these passages, rhetorical questions seem to follow ἢ. Accordingly, πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ κατῴκισεν ἐν ἡμῖν may also be a rhetorical question of James. In this sentence, τὸ πνεῦμα ('the spirit') whom God has made to dwell in us may refer to the Holy Spirit as in 1 Timothy 1:14 and Romans 8:11. If God is the subject, τὸ πνεῦμα (which God made to dwell in us) refers to the human spirit of those who became friends of the world. Such an interpretation, however, does not fit with 1 Timothy 1:14 and Romans 8:11 where the Holy Spirit is described as dwelling in us.

μείζονα δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν also seems to be a rhetorical question. "Does God, however, give (the friends of the world) more grace?"

These considerations enable us to translate James 4:5-6 as follows:

5 Otherwise, do you think that the Scripture says in vain?

Does the Spirit whom God made dwell in us desire (us who have become the friends of the world) jealously?

6 Does the Spirit, however, give (us) more grace?

Therefore, the Scripture says.

“God opposes the proud but gives grace to the humble.”

<Abstract>

**A Study on the Consistency Problem of Some Translated Words  
in the New Korean Revised Version:  
Notes on the Translation of Anthropological Terms and  
*Pneuma* Meaning the Holy Spirit**

Sung Jong Oh  
(Formerly Prof. of Calvin University)

This paper is an attempt to confirm that the same anthropological terms in the original text were translated inconsistently in the New Korean Revised Version, and to suggest that they be translated consistently into more appropriate Korean words. 신약전서 (1906/1911), the first authorized New Testament was influenced by the Chinese Wen-li Version (Delegates' Version). 신약전서 has undergone several revisions, and finally, the NKRV (NT) was published in 1998 after a major revision. The NKRV (NT) seeks the principle of an essentially literal translation (like NRSV and ESV) so as to get an effect of reading the original text in Bible study and for preparation of sermons. Unfortunately, there, however, is a weakness due to anthropological words that are inconsistently translated into various words. This is because it failed to correct the influences of the Wen-li Version and the early Korean versions. We expect this to be confirmed when we compare the translated words in the relevant passages of NKRV with those of Wen-li, NRS, ESV, and LUT.

There may be semantic overlap between anthropological terms in some cases. However, the Greek words καρδία, πνεῦμα, ψυχή, and νοῦς/νόημα in general have their own meanings. Accordingly, they were respectively translated as *heart*, *spirit*, *soul*, and *mind* in a uniform manner in the English Bibles. But in the NKRV (NT), καρδία is translated as 마음 (in sense of *heart*), but πνεῦμα, ψυχή, and νοῦς/νόημα were also translated as 마음 in about four dozen cases. These three Greek anthropological words could be best translated consistently into Korean as 영 (spirit), 영혼 (soul), and 정신 (mind) respectively.

In the case of *pneuma* (πνεῦμα), which is used alone in sense of the Holy Spirit, there are several examples of it being translated into *spirit* in NKRV (NT), which could lead to misunderstanding its meaning as human spirit. In this case, I think it would be best to translate it as 'the Holy Spirit' uniformly.



<Abstract>

**Biblical Performance Criticism and Bible Translation:  
James A. Maxey and His Contribution**

Ki-Min Bang  
(Kangnam University)

The purpose of this paper is to introduce a new paradigm of Bible Translation to the Korean church community. James A. Maxey who was a Lutheran Bible Translators missionary for more than twenty years in Cameroon suggests that Bible Translation may be performed better through oral performance and contextualization. This paper summarizes his idea and two crucial points, and evaluates them for Korean Bible translation in the future.

First of all, this paper discusses assumptions and problems in previous Bible Translations that ignore orality in the original text and target language context, especially in uncivilized countries and communities. Then it introduces a brief history of biblical performance criticism as this emerging new discipline may still be unfamiliar to many in Korean scholarly societies. After that, two critical points of James A. Maxey's argument are discussed and appreciated.

The first important point in Maxey's work is that the community in the New and Old Testament had an oral culture. More than 90% of the population were illiterate. Nevertheless, previous scholarship has often ignored the orality but focused on the literary understanding of the Bible. Maxey points out the importance of orality for New Testament studies and for an African context of Bible Translation based on common arguments and contributions from Biblical Performance Criticism scholarly group. The second important point is the importance of contextualization. Although there is some opposition to contextualization and syncretism, recent missiologists including Robert J. Schreiter and Steve Bevans argue that contextualization and inculturation are significantly necessary parts for Bible Translation and mission.

Maxey's two points may provide the Korean church community with many potential contributions and challenges together. His understanding of oral (including paralinguistic and extralinguistic) performance and Bible Translation may provide Bible translators with some fresh insights, improve Bible

Translation in the mission field, and also make younger Korean generation who prefer modern media over traditional written media have greater access to the Bible and its message. However, his points of contextualization and inculturation may still need some additional time to be accepted by the Korean church community, but are still worth trial for the marginalized communities such as the deaf and people with other disabilities.

<Abstract>

## Historicality of Classics and the Difficulties of Their Translation

Sung-Hoon Kang  
(Seoul National University)

There seem to be three defining characteristics of being a classic. (1) Universality: Classics deal with universal questions; their value transcends individual societies. (2) Fundamental reflection: Classics do not turn away from the problems of the given society; they rather go deeper to the roots of the problems. (3) Forming the framework of thinking: Classics help people to form and reshape their framework of thinking. And these defining characteristics of classics are sources of special difficulties in translating them.

Roughly speaking, different languages presuppose different world-views, and this is what makes translation in general a difficult task. But the three characteristics above amplify the difficulties in translating classics. Differences in world-views are more clearly revealed when we are dealing with universal questions. Similarly, fundamental reflections make the differences in world-views more visible. Moreover, fundamental reflections tend to touch on the core of a given world-view, and may cause slight changes in it. Cumulative changes in the world-view result in the change of the framework of thoughts itself. And the changes in the framework of thoughts itself may even cause a change in the grammatical structure of the language. To sum up, classics have historicality, and that makes translation of classics a particularly difficult task.

I discuss two cases of the difficulties in translating classics: *sōphrosunē* and third-person imperative. *Sōphrosunē* was a very important concept in the Greek religion, as embodied in the delphic maxim, “Know thyself”. Plato seems to have reflected fundamentally and continually on this concept. In the *Charmides*, he takes it as knowledge of what one knows and what one does not know. In the *Protagoras*, he takes it, in effect, as knowledge of goodness and badness. And in the *Republic*, he takes it as the agreement between the parts of the soul concerning which part should rule and which part should be ruled. And there is simply no word that can correctly translate *sōphrosunē* that covers all these conceptions.

As to the third-person imperative, while there were abundant usages of it in Ancient Greek, the very idea of giving orders to a third-person seems illogical to most of us modern people. But it seems to me that there are third-person imperatives in Korean as well. Although grammarians deny its existence and try to give alternative explanations for sentences that look like third-person imperatives, I argue that there are such sentences that cannot be explained away in that way. The upshot is that you should not translate Greek third-person imperatives automatically as ‘Let X do Y’.

<Abstract>

**A Textual-Critical Analysis of Achsah’s Story  
With Focus on the Characterization**

Yonghyun Cho  
(Hanil University & Presbyterian Theological Seminary)

In this paper, I argue that the textual variants of the Masoretic Text (MT), the Septuagint (LXX), and the Targum give rise to different characterizations in the story of Achsah. This textual-critical analysis of Achsah’s story focuses on the differences of the three texts and their subsequent characterizations rather than the demonstration of the variants’ existence. The story of Achsah has attracted the biblical interpreters’ attention because unlike other biblical females, she is described as an able strategist and a shrewd negotiator who pluckily requests her father for a field and gains it in contrast to her husband Othniel who appears as a passive figure in the MT. Yet the portrayal of Achsah’s incitement of Othniel in the MT Joshua 15:18 and Judges 1:14 is ambiguous and thus gives rise to a conundrum, ‘who incited whom?’

Concerning the ambiguous description, the LXX attempts to harmonize it by changing the object of the incitement to the feminine pronoun and adding Othniel in the place of the subject (ἐπέσεισεν αὐτὴν Γοθονιήλ). Such a change of the subject solves the textual dilemma of the MT by providing the reason why Achsah asks her father for a field. However, the LXX ironically characterizes Othniel as the greedy son-in-law who is not satisfied with his bride’s dowry, unlike the previous depiction as the honorable hero who spearheaded the attack on the Canaanite city.

The Targum reconciles the MT with the LXX by defining the action of Achsah as advice or counseling through the verb, **ומלכתי**. The Targum thus neutralizes the sexual connotation of the transaction between Achsah and Othniel in the MT, making her a more positive character. However, the Targum also does not furnish any reason for the sudden disappearance of Othniel. Therefore, the LXX and the Targum seek to resolve the textual tension of Achsah’s story in the MT where there are several ambiguities. While the LXX changes the subject of the action to incite, the Targum mitigates the effect of the



incitement by using the neutral term. Consequently, the LXX emphasizes the subjectivity of Othniel, whereas the Targum gives rise to the highly positive description of Achsah. Such modifications are comparable to the equivocal statement of the MT.

<Abstract>

### **Is the Old Testament Too Old for Christian Ethics?**

Youngju Kwon

(Korea Baptist Theological University/Seminary)

This article examines the issue whether the Old Testament is still relevant for Christian moral life. Affirming the relevance of the Old Testament for Christian ethics is not an easy task due to a number of problems that the OT does have. These problems can be categorized broadly into three: historical (i.e. Old Testament ethical teachings are directed to particular people in particular time and place), hermeneutical (i.e. the Old Testament itself presents various viewpoints on the same ethical issue), and moral (i.e. the Old Testament, from time to time, either allows or sanctions immoral values and actions). This article, having examined these problems in turn, argues that they can be reasonably resolved so as to reclaim the Old Testament as an authoritative source for Christian moral life. In other words, the historically conditioned nature of the Old Testament does not necessarily mean the irrelevance of the Old Testament teachings for Christian moral life, but it reminds us that both rigorous exegesis and imaginative application are required for finding analogies between the Bible world and our world. Concerning hermeneutical and moral problems, they, despite their differing nature, can be equally resolved by a proper understanding of how God reveals his will and purpose in an imperfect human world. In doing so, the present study investigates how an evolutionary approach, a principle of condescension, and a canonical approach, respectively, may enrich our understanding on this issue. Then the article will end with some proposed guidelines for using the Old Testament as an ethical resource.

<Abstract>

**The Art of Biblical Performance:  
Biblical Performance Criticism and the Old Testament Narratives**

Travis West  
(Western Theological Seminary)

For centuries, the Bible's essential identity as a book has been taken for granted as a self-evident truth by scholars and lay people alike. But should it be? *Is* the Bible a book? Well, it is, and it is not — it is much more than a book. For significant portions of its history, the narrative contents of the Bible were not primarily encountered in written form, but rather through embodied recitation by a performer or a group of performers, who incarnated the story before a live audience. Biblical performance criticism (BPC) is an emerging, interdisciplinary approach to interpreting the Bible that takes seriously both the Bible's oral history and its vitality as the Word of God. It provides a process whereby scholars, pastors, and lay people alike can come to deepen their understanding of a biblical text through embodied performance.

In this article, I argue that the cultural realities of ancient Israel combined with a reassessment of the biblical narratives from the perspective of BPC suggest that the art practiced by the biblical composers was not of an essentially literary character, but rather of a *dramatic* character, which came to expression in performance. The narrative texts contained in the Hebrew Bible are more akin to dramatic scripts than a purely literary form of writing. The ancient crafts of drama and *performance* are evident in the texts we receive. Embodied reenactments of the biblical dramas — through body and voice in space and time before a gathered audience — demonstrates the “living and active” character of the word(s) of God (Heb 4:12). The art of biblical performance is to show, rather than tell.

Thus, I will argue that a fuller understanding of Israel's performance tradition will lead to a greater appreciation of Israel's dramatic and theological achievement. I will demonstrate this by applying BPC to the brief story of Moses striking the rock in the wilderness, found in Exodus 17:1–7. Embodied engagement with this drama through performance clarifies the conflict that

drives the story; attends to the critical role played by dialogue, gestures, spacing, and tone of voice in shaping the theological affirmation of the story. Further, I will demonstrate how the bodies of actors responding to the stage directions embedded in the “script” reveal a surprising act of love on the part of God, which stands at the heart of the drama’s climax and resonates with the heart of Christian theology — a climax that will be missed if it is not *seen*.

<Abstract>

**Book Review - *The Threat to Faith: An Exegetical and*  
*Theological Re-Examination of 2 Thessalonians 2*  
(Charles H. Giblin, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967)**

Hyung Dong Kim  
(Busan Presbyterian University)

Charles H. Giblin's *The Threat to Faith* presents an exegetical and theological re-examination of 2 Thessalonians 2. This book consists of three parts. Part One investigates the state of the question; Part Two contains the exegesis of 2 Thessalonians 2 and concludes with a commentary on the whole of that passage; and Part Three presents fuller theological reflections consequent on the exegesis.

The situation referred to at 2 Thessalonians 2 is a case of deception or serious danger of deception regarding Paul's teaching on the day of the Lord. The *Sits im Leben* of 2 Thessalonians is the threat to faith. With regard to specific problem like the κατέχον/-ων, there is discontent. The general meaning of 'to restrain' or 'to hold back' is defended for κατέχω. But Giblin demonstrates that κατέχω is used in the sense of "holding fast" though certainly not "holding off." At the same time, he argues that the term alludes to pagan cult practices, particularly that of pseudo-charismatic activity in which something or someone "takes hold of" or "seizes" another. He demonstrates the apocalyptic schema on the 2 Thessalonians 2:6-7, which is one of the most baffling and difficult passages in the Pauline Epistle. 2 Thessalonians 2 shows there is a progression in the law of apocalyptic dialectic. τὸ κατέχον must be personalized as well as concretized in order to express its ultimate self-evidence. This figure does not "hold it back" but rather prefigures and anticipates the revelation of "the lawless one." This study indicates that the κατέχον(-ων) is a threat to faith.

With regard to some theological implications, Giblin situates 2 Thessalonians in the main current of Paul's theological thought, and argues that this letter authentically represents Paul's thought. He proposes "the eschatological principle," which is basic to Paul's theology as a whole. He exemplifies how the eschatological principle could be engaged with Paul's soteriology, apocalyptic, and the understanding of Paul's theological development.

<Abstract>

**Book Review - *Katechon: II Thess 2,1-12 im Horizont  
apokalyptischen Denkens***

**(Paul Metzger, BZNW 135, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005)**

Eun-Geol Lyu  
(Hoseo University)

In seiner 2004 in Manz angenommenen Dissertation versucht Paul Metzger, den unter Exegeten äußerst umstrittenen Sinn des Katechon in 2Thess 2,6.7 zu erhellen und ihn mit apokalyptischen Parallelen zum Vergleich zu bringen. Nach der gründlichen Exegese des Textes kommt der Autor zu einem Ergebnis, dass das Katechon als Macht zu verstehen sei, die Wirkung des Widergottes in letzten Zeiten verhindert (vgl. 2,4). Jedoch sei diese Rolle des Katechon auf die Frist beschränkt, nach der es aus dem Weg geräumt werden sollte, und der Widergott erneut zu wirken beginnen würde. Metzger vergleicht dann dieses Katechonbild mit der Problematik ‘Parusieverzögerung’ in der jüdischen und christlichen Apokalyptik und sucht die Kontinuität dazwischen.

Mezgers Arbeit könnte man kritisch hinterfragen, auch wenn man ihren Beitrag genügend anzuerkennen vermöchte. Es bleibt vor allem unbegründet, ob in der übrigen Apokalyptik wirklich eine solche Kontinuität besteht. Denn die Katechonvorstellung ist derart einzigartig, dass die Wendung sonst kaum ausdrücklich belegt ist. M. E. hätte der Titel ‘Parusieverzögerung in der Apokalyptik’ also besser gepasst.