

Journal of Biblical Text Research. Vol. 49.

Published Semiannually by

The Institute for Biblical Text Research of the Korean Bible Society; October 2021

Table of Contents

• Paper •

- [Kor.] The Possibility of the Combined Source Texts for The Korean Bible (1911):
Focused on Exodus 4:8 ----- Sok-Chung Chang / 7
- [Kor.] A Suggestion for Translation of 1 Samuel 13:1: The Age of Saul's Accession and the
Historical Significance of 'Two Years' ----- Keungjae Lee / 29
- [Kor.] "She Mourns": An Ecocritical Reading of Jeremiah 12 ----- Yani Yoo / 50
- [Kor.] Zephaniah and Josiah's Reform: A Prophetic Perspective on the Reform of Josiah
----- Hee Sook Bae / 75
- [Kor.] Proposal for New Korean Translation of λέπρα: Focusing on 'Jesus Cleanses λεπρός'
(Mk 1:40-45//Mt 8:1-4//Lk 5:12-14) ----- Ji-Youn Cho / 94
- [Kor.] Interpreting the Gospels in Light of Genre Characteristics of Greco-Roman Biography:
A Fresh Reading of Mark 5 ----- Youngju Kwon / 122
- [Kor.] A Reflection on the Translation of '오직'(only) in the NKRV Romans
----- Tae Sub Kim / 144
- [Kor.] Paul's Understanding of Πίστις: Trust, Faith, or Obedience? — Focusing on the Critique
of T. Morgan's Understanding of Πίστις —
----- SeungHyun Lee / 168
- [Kor.] Interpretation and Translation of 1 John 4:13 ----- Chang Wook Jung / 196
- [Kor.] A Comparison *The New Korean Revised Version Study Bible* with *NKRV, Erklärt-Der
Kommentar zur Zürcher Bibel*: Focused on the Book of Jeremiah
----- Jun Hee Cha / 214
- [Kor.] The Characteristics and Critical Evaluation of the *NKRV, Erklärt-Der Kommentar zur
Zürcher Bibel*: Based on the Epistles ----- Young Sook Choi / 241

• Translated Paper •

- [Kor.] Blaming Eve Alone: Translation, Omission, and Implications of עֵוָה in Genesis 3:6b
----- Julie Faith Parker (Dong-Hyuk Kim, trans.) / 267

• Book Review •

- [Kor.] *Translating the Bible in Plain Language: The Story of the Dutch Bijbel in Gewone Taal*
(Matthijs de Jong, UBS Monograph Series 12, Miami: United Bible
Societies, 2020) ----- Helen Kang / 299

<Abstract>

**The Possibility of the Combined Source Texts for
The Korean Bible (1911):
Focused on Exodus 4:8**

Sok-Chung Chang
(Catholic Kwandong University)

The process of identifying the source texts for the translation of The Korean Bible (『성경전서』, 1911) primarily starts with the premise that the translators used English, Chinese, and Japanese Bibles as their source texts. Furthermore, I already proposed in the previous article concerning Exodus 4:13 that they might have used the LXX. Therefore, this study aims not only to find the source text for Exodus 4:8 but also to consider the possibility that the first Korean Bible was translated under the combined influences from these different translated Bibles and the LXX.

The result of this study could be summarized in three aspects. First, the expression of “the word of the sign (이적의 말)” in The Korean Bible reflects “the voice of the sign” in the English Bibles (KJV, RV) which were based upon the MT. In addition, it overcame the temptation of the Chinese and the Japanese Bibles that translated קוֹל (“voice”) using the word 聲 and adopted the translation of either Morrison’s Version or Bridgman-Culbertson’s Version. It probably wanted to convey that the sign is not merely a voice but speaks the words of YHWH. This kind of exegetical translation would be the unique characteristic of The Korean Bible.

Second, where the MT, Chinese, and Japanese Bibles were mostly translated as “the first” and “the latter”, The Korean Bible translated them as “the first” and “the second”. This fact demonstrates that the translators of The Korean Bible in those days might have used the LXX as one of the source texts. Third, the plausible reason for the translation of “the first” and “the second” would be based on the fact that the narrative of Exodus 4:1-9 flows according to the three signs that Moses was supposed to perform in front of the people of Israel and Pharaoh.

This study shows that the translators of The Korean Bible did not translate the

biblical text *per se*, but they did it in harmony with the narrative of the biblical text. Therefore, The Korean Bible was translated under the influences of the combined source texts available at the time and in consideration of the flow of the narratives in Exodus 4:1-9. The missionaries and Korean helpers together did a superb job in finishing up the first Korean Bible in 1911.

<Abstract>

**A Suggestion for Translation of 1 Samuel 13:1:
The Age of Saul's Accession and the Historical Significance of 'Two Years'**

Keungjae Lee
(Mokwon University)

1 Samuel 13:1 contains important information about the age of Saul's accession and reign of Saul, the first king of Israel. However, many Old Testament scholars doubted the historical reliability of this information. The Hebrew text of this verse does not mention a detailed number regarding the age of Saul's accession, but suggests a relatively short, two-year reign of Saul.

Why is the detailed age of Saul's accession not mentioned in 1 Samuel 13:1a? The reason is that it was not possible to know exactly when Saul, who started as a military leader of the chieftom centered on the tribe of Benjamin became the king of Israel. For this reason, the age of Saul's accession had to be left blank.

Given the historical context where the age of Saul's accession is unknown, the total duration of Saul's reign would neither have been known because information on the age of a king's accession is essential to mention the entire reign of a king. After all, the 'two years' mentioned in 1 Samuel 13:1b does not mean Saul's entire reign lasted two years, but can be seen as referring to a specific two-year period during Saul's reign because the entire content of 1 Samuel 13-14 is far from the situation in the first two years of Saul's reign. For example, a significant number of standing armies were organized (1 Sam 13:2, 15) and the existence of the Philistines cannot be confirmed in Gibeah, the capital of Saul's kingdom, where the Philistine garrison previously stayed (1 Sam 13:2; 14:2). Above all, Saul and Jonathan attacked the Philistine garrison at Geba (1 Sam 13:3, 16) and Michmash (1 Sam 13:23; 14:11, 31), and expelled them from Israeli territory (1 Sam 14:46).

This fact indicates that Saul's reign had passed considerably, and that his system of governance was relatively stable. In other words, it means the last two years after Saul's first victory in the battle against the Philistines (1 Sam 13-14), that is, from the moment he escaped from the political influence of the Philistines until his death at the Battle of Gilboa (1 Sam 31). Through such acts

of Saul in the last two years, Saul is regarded as the first king of Israel who changed the former political dynamics of subordination to the Philistines.

<Abstract>

**“She Mourns”:
An Ecocritical Reading of Jeremiah 12**

Yani Yoo
(Methodist Theological University)

The purpose of this paper is to interpret Jeremiah 12 focusing on three foci (suspicion, identification, retrieval) developed by the Earth Project team. Before dealing with the three foci, this paper observes some impressive ecocritical points in the text. Scholars tend to think that “the one I truly love” (12:7) refers to the Judahites and personifies them as Yahweh’s wife. But in Yahweh’s poetic speech (12:7-13), it is noted that neither the word Judah nor people appear but only earth and its components. All three words, “house”, “heritage”, and “the one I truly love” can be seen as referring to the land. More earth components such as ‘portion’, ‘bird of prey’, and ‘vineyard’ appear in the rest of Yahweh’s poetic speech. Humans are de-centered.

First, in the suspicion section, it can be judged that the interests of the biblical narrator are generally anthropocentric. Earth and its components are represented as passive tools in human-centered theological messages. However, this situation is neither justified nor considered natural. Jeremiah is very concerned about the suffering of earth and its components, and judges human sin as the cause (12:4). The paper also demonstrates that commentaries and interpretations have been anthropocentric. Interpreters including myself have seen earth components as much less subjective and less of their own voice than the ways they are represented by the biblical narrator.

Second, in the identification section, it is observed that the desolate land has her own thoughts and emotions, and so she mourns and blames Yahweh. All including the wicked, lion, thorns, and foreign peoples are inhabitants of the land, so she mourns over the sad reality affecting all creation. I identified most with the land among many non-human characters, so through eco-midrash, I tried to give a voice to the land.

Third, in the section of retrieval, it is observed that the land’s mourning reveals the narrator’s inner thoughts. Although the narrator says through his lips

that the foreign invasion is punishment from God for people's disobedience, he resents such punishment in his heart. The climax of retrieval is found in Yahweh's intense love and hate toward the land, especially when she mourns and blames the deity (12:11). Just as Jeremiah's confessions voice resistance to mainstream theology, blaming the people for the collapse of the state, so the earth voices resistance to Yahweh. When Yahweh complains that no one cares about the desolate land, the deity unwittingly discloses that he responds to the mourning land and cares about her! Yahweh's love and hate extend even to foreign peoples. They are given a chance to return to their homeland and the possibility to become his people. The land like Yahweh provides the possibility that everyone will become one, overcoming dichotomy between friends and foes, and the Judahites and the foreigners.

<Abstract>

**Zephaniah and Josiah's Reform:
A Prophetic Perspective on the Reform of Josiah**

Hee Sook Bae
(Presbyterian University and Theological Seminary)

In general, Zephaniah is considered a forerunner of Josiah's reform, due to the fact that Zephaniah 1:4-6 shows terminological and thematic correspondence to the report of the reform in 2 Kings 22-23. However, recent studies argue for the literary dependence of the Book of Zephaniah on DtrH. This paper accommodates the recent diachronic view to the synchronic reading for the interpretation of Zephaniah 1:2-2:3. Looking back at Josiah's reform, Zephaniah presents it as YHWH's purifying judgement. From this point of view come his words against the leadership of Judah and Jerusalem, that maintained the Assyrian way of life and thinking, and pursued a political-military policy, practicing violence and lies, relying on their silver and gold instead of YHWH (1:7-18). According to Zephaniah, it was against the divine will, embodied in the reform of Josiah. In a word, they nullified the reform. Zephaniah sees that Judah, in the days of Josiah, is still under the divine wrath (2:2). In the hope for the potential salvation of God (2:3), he asks to 'seek the Lord' before the day of YHWH. Paradoxically asking the poor to repent, Zephaniah emphasizes that only the poor and the humble will remain after the judgement. In this way, Zephaniah, like DtrH, explains the fundamental reason for the downfall of Judah and Jerusalem in spite of the reform of Josiah, and presents the possibility of salvation. According to Zephaniah, the end of Judah and Jerusalem was not due to the cultic sins of Manasseh as in the DtrH (2Ki 23:26), but due to the social, political sins of the leadership in the days of Josiah.

<Abstract>

**Proposal for New Korean Translation of λέπρα:
Focusing on ‘Jesus Cleanses λεπρός’
(Mk 1:40-45/Mt 8:1-4/Lk 5:12-14)**

Ji-Youn Cho
(Korean Bible Society)

In order to propose a new proper Korean translation of the Greek term λέπρα, this paper historically reviews the social meanings of its translations in the established Korean versions; critically examines the original root-meanings and changing connotations of both the Hebrew term צָרַעַת and the Greek term λέπρα; and finally, exegetically analyzes ‘Jesus cleanses λεπρός’ (Mk 1:40-45, Mt 8:1-4, Lk 5:12-14).

This paper discusses the fact that the specific disease known today as Hansen’s disease did not exist in the region of Palestine prior to Alexander’s conquest of India in 324 BC, which is supported by archaeological research and Greek literature in the biblical period. Moreover, the biblical descriptions of צָרַעַת and λέπρα are pathologically different from the symptoms of modern Hansen’s disease. In the biblical period, the Greek term ἐλεφαντίασις referred to Hansen’s disease, and צָרַעַת and λέπρα to a number of other undefined skin diseases. Until the 19th century, there had been a confusion between the Latin terms *lepra* and *elēphantiāsis*, and the former term was eventually used as *leprosy* in English.

This paper therefore proposes that λέπρα in ‘Jesus cleanses λεπρός’ (Mk 1:40-45, Mt 8:1-4, Lk 5:12-14) should be translated into the technical term *severe-skin-disease*. This term properly reveals that the skin condition of a person suffering from λέπρα was visibly severe and recognizable by everyone including the priest in the gospels; he was ceremonially unclean, ritually defiled, and excluded from normal relations with other people according to Jewish law. The descriptive expression is also well-connected with the verb *to be cleansed* (καθαρίζω), and appropriately reveals Jesus’ complete healing ministry in the purification system of the biblical period.

This proposed translation therefore is better to properly reveal Jesus’

transformational healing ministry without translating the term λεπτα as leprosy, a term that did not exist in the biblical era and was stained with discrimination and prejudice.

<Abstract>

**Interpreting the Gospels in Light of
Genre Characteristics of Greco-Roman Biography:
A Fresh Reading of Mark 5**

Youngju Kwon
(Korea Baptist Theological University/Seminary)

This article reinterprets Mark 5 in light of the genre characteristics of Greco-Roman biography. Every interpretation is performed with a specific perspective, and this article aims to extract meaning of Mark 5 from the perspective of Greco-Roman biography. The two genre characteristics to which this article gives special attention are (1) the extensive focus on the protagonist and (2) comparison/contrast.

In the episode of a man with evil spirits in the region of the Gerasenes (5:1-20), Mark accentuates two qualities of Jesus, the protagonist of the Gospel as a Greco-Roman biography. First, Jesus is described as the one who can bind Satan and thus release the man from the oppression of evil spirits. Second, Jesus is depicted as the one who has the same authority with God. In terms of comparison/contrast, the episode contrasts Jesus who is a real bringer of peace with Caesar who merely purports to bring peace. The Roman Empire and its emperor, which are not shy about giving massive propaganda for peace, actually turn out to be the oppressor of a subjugated people. By contrast, Jesus and the kingdom of God can grant the real peace to his people.

In the episode of Jairus and the woman with hemorrhage (5:21-43), comparison/contrast is more explicit than in the previous episode. In this episode, Jairus is more supreme than the woman in many respects: socially, economically, and religiously. In terms of social standing, Jairus who is a named man and a synagogue ruler must have enjoyed more privileges in comparison to the unnamed woman. Economically speaking, the text says that the woman with hemorrhage “had spent all she had” while we can assume that Jairus must have had more secure position in terms of financial status. In the realm of religion, Jairus is respected by people, whereas the woman is despised by people due to her illness. Despite of this, Jesus heals the woman before healing Jairus’

daughter. This teaches two things. First, Jesus takes side with the weak rather than the strong. Second, the most important thing that one needs in getting God's grace is faith.

<Abstract>

A Reflection on the Translation of ‘오직’(only) in the NKRV Romans

Tae Sub Kim

(Presbyterian University and Theological Seminary)

The present study attempts to investigate the usage of 오직 (only) in the translation of Romans. In the 4th edition of the New Korean Revised Version (2005), 오직 appears twenty times as a Korean counterpart of the Greek adversative conjunctions like $\delta\epsilon$ and $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ in Romans, e.g., 1:17; 2:8, 13, 29; 3:4, 27; 4:13; 6:13; 7:13; 8:20, 26; 9:7, 8, 11, 16; 11:7; 12:2, 3; 13:14; 14:17. However, 오직 is generally defined in contemporary Korean dictionaries as *only* or *exclusively*, while they seldom include *but* in its semantic force. In fact, the usage of 오직 to translate the Greek adversative conjunctions began to appear from the one-volume edition of *Romans* (1898). This gives rise to the question why $\delta\epsilon$ and $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ were translated not as 그러나 (meaning *but*) but as 오직 (meaning *only*) in the first place.

To settle this issue, the present article considers the following topics: (1) the influence of the five solae of the Reformation; (2) popular Chinese Bibles such as the Delegates' Version, the Mandarin Chinese Bible and the Morrison-Milne Version; (3) the Greek and the English Bibles used by the Board of Official Translators; and (4) the Korean-English dictionaries compiled by H. G. Underwood and J. S. Gale. From this research, it is found that 오직 in Romans has little to do with the five solae, nor does it reflect influence from the Chinese, Greek or English Bibles used by the missionaries. Rather, it is the Korean-English dictionaries written by Underwood (1890) and Gale (1897) that commonly associated 오직 with the conjunction *but* as well as *only*. This explains why $\delta\epsilon$ and $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ were often translated as 오직 in the one-volume edition of Romans (1898), which has left its trace up to Romans in the NKRV (2005).

<Abstract>

Paul's Understanding of Πίστις: Trust, Faith, or Obedience?
— Focusing on the Critique of T. Morgan's Understanding of Πίστις —

SeungHyun Lee
(Hoseo University)

Until now, the word πίστις and the various Greek expressions with it have drawn tremendous scholarly attention from Pauline scholars. They attempted to define the Greek term πίστις in Paul's usage from multiple angles. One of the recent attempts was done by a classicist Teresa Morgan. Morgan argued that Paul and NT writers based their use of the term πίστις upon its common social understanding of trust in relationship in 1CE. Responding to and independently from her, Pauline scholars produced books and articles to tackle Paul's understanding of πίστις. Joining this scholarly conversation regarding πίστις, we therefore would like to explore in this paper Paul's understanding of it with particular attention to its threefold meanings, rejecting the simplistic tendency to define the term uniformly throughout the whole body of his letters. First, the term πίστις means the believers' positive acceptance of the salvation message in Jesus' Gospel on the basis of their cognitive change of its evaluation. In this sense, πίστις means faith in the truth claim of Jesus' Gospel, and reveals the believers' personal confidence in God's salvation accomplished by Jesus. Second, πίστις however means total trust in God, who initiated the salvation and accomplished it through his Son Jesus, and Jesus on the basis of their personal belief in the veracity of Jesus event. God proved his faithfulness toward his people by sending his Son to the world and sacrificing him. Through Jesus event transmitted by Paul's Gospel, that is, through Jesus' death and resurrection, the believers came to trust in the faithfulness of their God and their savior Jesus. And on the basis of their trust, they are able to enter into a new covenantal relationship with God. Finally, the believers' change of mind toward and positive acceptance of God's Gospel, and their trust in God and Jesus require them to show persistent obedience toward God. The πίστις in terms of continuous obedience becomes a new existential realm for the believers and a new life principle. The πίστις in this sense should continue to grow through

various life temptations and trials, and should govern their life as the life principle. In this way, the term πίστις for Paul is a very dynamic one with multiple implications in it. This means that when we interpret Paul, we should not reduce the term πίστις to just one meaning and thereby, limit the dynamics of Pauline theology. Our understanding of Paul will be made proper when we pay attention to particular implications of this term in various contexts of Paul's letters.

<Abstract>

Interpretation and Translation of 1 John 4:13

Chang Wook Jung
(Chongshin University)

The Greek text of 1 John 4:13 reads as follows: Ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκουμεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ μένομεν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν.

Some elements of the text draw our attention: (1) the prepositional phrase ἐν τούτῳ may refer to the preceding verse(s) or the following ὅτι clause; (2) another prepositional phrase ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος requires a proper interpretation. It is not clear why the author of 1 John enlisted this ambiguous expression instead of a simple accusative form τὸ πνεῦμα; (3) the last ingredient emerges in relation to (1), i.e., an appropriate understanding of the conjunction ὅτι in the last clause.

Intriguingly, all the Korean Bible versions regard the first prepositional phrase ἐν τούτῳ as pointing to the last ὅτι-clause, even though it is also possible for the phrase to refer to the content in the preceding verse(s). In addition, Korean Bible translations unanimously render the second prepositional phrase as denoting simply a direct object of the verb δίδωμι: ‘he gave us the spirit’.

Is the translation of Korean versions reliable and appropriate? In order to find an answer, I investigate the usage of the first prepositional phrase in 1 John by looking at scholars’ views and translations of Korean and English versions. Especially, 1 John 3:24b where a very similar sentence to the present verse occurs is closely analyzed and compared with the present verse. I demonstrate that the phrase refers more probably to the preceding verse(s) than the following part. As a result, translators of Bible versions are required to find a way to express such implication.

In addition, I examine scholars’ views concerning the second prepositional phrase, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, and contend that the genitive case indicating *source* or *origin* is connected with the verb *to give* rather than the verb *to know*. I also attempt to demonstrate that the conjunction ὅτι in the last clause needs to be properly understood and translated as *because*.

<Abstract>

**A Comparison *The New Korean Revised Version Study Bible*
with *NKRV, Erklärt-Der Kommentar zur Zürcher Bibel*:
Focused on the Book of Jeremiah**

Jun Hee Cha
(Hansei University)

This essay compares and analyzes of the Book of Jeremiah in *The NKRV Study Bible*; *Stuttgarter Erklärungsbibel* (hereinafter Stuttgart) and *NKRV, Erklärt-Der Kommentar zur Zürcher Bibel* (hereinafter Zürich).

First of all, Stuttgart and Zürich are distinguishable in form and contents. Formal differences appear in the introduction part, paragraph division, and general outline. Differences in content are found in addition to historical, archaeological settings and the other additional contents. Furthermore, Zürich is emerged a number of controversial arguments considerably.

The formal differences are as follows: First, in the introduction part, Stuttgart is written only in descriptive form, while Zürich is occupied by schematic and descriptive forms. Second, in the division of paragraphs, Stuttgart subdivided each content microscopically whereas Zürich macroscopically divided sections and presented the whole picture, and then commented each content in light of the big picture. Third, Stuttgart is focused more on the content of subdivided paragraphs than Zürich, which puts more emphasis on the general overview of inclusive several chapters.

The content differences are as follows: First, Zürich is added many of historical settings comparatively. Second, Zürich supplements a number of recent geographical and archaeological settings. Stuttgart is published in Germany in 1992; Zürich in Switzerland in 2010, reflecting research results over the past two decades. It has many controversial arguments, however, in the introducing and reflecting of recent research.

Stuttgart was translated in Korean in 1997, and *The Good News Study Bible* in 2001, and both are ground-breaking Bible commentaries which presented historical-critical Bible interpretation to Korea, where it has been forming of dominated literalism interpretation. Zürich resolutely accommodated and argued

for the recent historical-critical interpretation, which is rather taking a step forward to the former two bible interpretation in earnest. The contents are to be a stumbling block for some or a stepping stone for others. The superior one-volume commentary, Zürich is not only a daunting challenge but also an outstanding achievement.

<Abstract>

**The Characteristics and Critical Evaluation of the
NKRV, Erklärt-Der Kommentar zur Zürcher Bibel:
Based on the Epistles**

Young Sook Choi

(Westminster Graduate School of Theology)

Bible Societies in various countries began to publish Bibles with notes in addition to translating and revising the Bible, from the second half of the 20th century. Because the annotated Bible contains a short commentary on the text, it helps readers to understand the Bible. It is very convenient and useful because readers can understand the text in a simple way without reading commentaries or theological books. The Korean Bible Society translated what was published by the Reformed Church in Zurich, and brought a new version of *NKRV, Erklärt-Der Kommentar zur Zürcher Bibel* into our hands.

The Korean Bible Society always responsibly verifies works through the hands of experts, so expectations for the new *NKRV, Erklärt-Der Kommentar zur Zürcher Bibel* are very high. The purpose of this article is to examine the special merits and usefulness of the *NKRV, Erklärt-Der Kommentar zur Zürcher Bibel* based on the epistles. In addition, it will be critically evaluated. First, we will look at the background and features of the *NKRV, Erklärt-Der Kommentar zur Zürcher Bibel*. Then, Romans and Ephesians will be selected for interpretation and critical evaluation. Among them, I would like to select only a few texts. Namely, we will deal with the introduction on Romans and Rom 3:21-26; 5:12-21; 13:1-7. And a critical evaluation and new interpretation of Ephesians 2:11-22; 3:14-21; 5:21-33 will also be provided.

<초록>

하와는 혼자가 아니었다 — 창세기 3:6하반 עמה의 번역, 생략, 함의 —

성서 해석자들은 동산에서의 유혹에 굴복한 일에 관하여 하와만 비난하는 경향이 있다. 아담이 창세기 3:1-6에서 그 자리에 있었고 불순종의 책임을 함께 지님에도 그러하다. 본 논문은 영어 역본들이 창세기 3:6하반(“여자가 … 그와 함께 있는 그의 남편에게도 주니, 그도 그것을 먹었다”)을 번역할 때 עמה(“그와 함께 [있는]”)를 번역하지 않음으로써 자주 여자를 고립시켜 온 방식을 드러낸다. 히브리어 עמה는 마소라 본문에 이론의 여지 없이 나타난다. 고대의 본문 증거들도, 불가타를 제외하면, 이 어구에 상응하는 말을 일관되게 보여 준다. 문법서들은 עמה의 기능과 중요성에 관해 의견이 일치한다. 영어에서 특히, עמה는 중대한 정보를 제공하지만, (RSV와 TNK를 포함한) 많은 번역본이 창세기 3:6에서 하와의 남편이 “그와 함께” 있었다고 말하지 않는다. 본 논의를 성서 본문, 히브리어 문법서, 주석서, 고대 자료, 영어 번역본 50편의 창세기 3:6하반의 번역, 번역위원회의 기록물을 살펴봄으로써, עמה와 관련하여 번역자들이 내린 결정들의 역사와 함의와 동기를 탐구한다. 몇몇 번역자는 עמה가 창세기 3:6에서 중요하지 않다고 생각한 반면, 본 논문은 이 단어를 번역하지 못한 것이 중대한 결과를 초래함을 주장한다. 아담이 “그와 함께” 있었다고 언급하지 않는 성서들은 남자를 봐주고 여자를 비난하는 해석을 조장한다.

<Abstract>

***Translating the Bible in Plain Language:
The Story of the Dutch Bijbel in Gewone Taal***
**(Matthijs de Jong, UBS Monograph Series 12,
Miami: United Bible Societies, 2020)**

Helen Kang
(Young Dong Presbyterian Church)

I recall when I first became a mother, that I was very eager to know how I could teach my child to read the Bible all his life. I think the Bible Society for the Netherlands and Flanders had the same worry as myself so that it published the *Bijbel in Gewone Taal*(BGT) for everyone who wants to read the Bible and to understand it. The book *Translating the Bible in plain language: the Story of the Dutch Bijbel in Gewone Taal* is written by Matthijs J. de Jong, and it introduces BGT, and its translation process and principles. The main translation principle of BGT is using plain language in order to achieve comprehensibility and clarification.

This review mentions four contributions of this book and four suggestions. First, as its contribution, this book clearly describes the translation principles and process with specific examples from BGT. Moreover, this book uses BGT-E (English version of BGT) as an example in comparison with other English versions such as NIV, NRS, ESV, CEV, GNB, and so on. This comparison helps to understand how clearly BGT is translated. Second, this book is systematically composed so that the table of contents itself shows what the book focuses on. Chapter 1 introduces translation principles. Chapters 2~4 deal with three main ideas, which are plain language (chapter 2), comprehensibility (chapter 3), and clarification (chapter 4). Chapters 5~6 deal with specific situations which Bible translators often confront. Chapter 7 introduces readers' response to BGT. Third, this book points out that BGT reflects recent biblical exegetical results, some of which are not familiar to ordinary Christians. Fourth, the author of this book did not use difficult words. This attitude matches well with the principles of BGT.

However, there are some points that I wish were added in the book. First, articles introduced in Appendix 211-214 are not accessible to readers who do not

know Dutch. It would be better if abstracts of each articles had been offered. Second, examples of figurative language mostly came from the Psalms and not from the apocalyptic books which have many figurative languages that are hard to understand. I became curious about how they are translated in the BGT. Third, the author seems to lose neutral position in evaluating BGT in some cases. There are some translation examples in this book that I cannot agree with but that the author has a very positive attitude to. Fourth, this book use examples not from BGT but from BGT-E. I wonder how exactly BGT-E reflects BGT.

After reading this book, one will certainly feel the necessity of such kind of translation as BGT. This book *Translating the Bible in plain language: the Story of the Dutch Bijbel in Gewone Taal* should be read especially Bible translators.