Language and Culture Archives

Selected Technical Articles Related to Translation 16

Bruce Moore, editor

©1986, SIL International

All rights reserved.

This document is part of the SIL International Language and Culture Archives.

More resources are available at: www.sil.org/resources/language-culture-archives.

SELECTED TECHNICAL

ARTICLES

RELATED TO TRANSLATION

NO. 16   10-86

CONTENTS

This is the last issue of START. It will be replaced by OPTAT (Occasional Papers in Text Approaches to Translation -- Studies in discourse analysis, translation, and related areas of biblical research, Robert E. Longacre, chief editor). Most issues of OPTAT will consist of articles, but on occasion a lengthy article or short monograph will constitute an entire issue. If you have a subscription to START, you will automatically receive the new journal. Each issue of OPTAT may have twice as many pages as START, so the cost will need to be proportionately higher. If you do not wish to continue your subscription, please advise the bookstore, or if you do not have a subscription but would like to subscribe to OPTAT, please address all communications regarding subscriptions to:

THE SEMITIC KAI

Margaret Manton

[Margaret Manton has a B.A. in Modern Languages and a B.D. in Theology both from London University and an A.L.B.C. (Associate of London Bible College). She also has a Diploma in Education from Leicester University. She has taught theology and biblical languages at Singapore Bible College as a member of Overseas Missionary Fellowship. She is currently giving private tuition (tutoring) in Biblical and Modern Languages and Theology in her own home in Leicester, England, and also checking theological manuscripts for the Evangelical Movement of Wales.]

0 Introduction

Exegetes and translators working from the Greek New Testament have often encountered puzzling uses of the common Greek connective kai, in which the predominant sense as a coordinator "and", an adjunctive "also", or an ascensive "even" does not fit into the analysis of the logical relations between clauses and sentences. It is the purpose of this paper to demonstrate that an understanding of the "Semitic kai," which comes into the New Testament through the influence of the prolific usage of the Hebrew conjunction w', will lend itself to more accurate exegesis and translation. (The author translates directly from Greek and does not follow any version in some of the examples).

"Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed" (John 20:29 KJV).
"I made up my mind to forget everything except Jesus Christ and especially his death on the cross" (1 Cor. 2:2 GNB).
"...a man was there whose right hand was shrivelled" (Luke 6:6 NIV).

The words "and yet," "and especially," and "whose" all translate the same Greek conjunction kai 'and', a particle so common in the Greek New Testament that Moulton and Geden do not even include it in their concordance!

Three Hebrew lexicons consulted give between them not only "and" for the translation of the Hebrew conjunction w', but also "but, since, because, so, then, when, now, or, that, thus, therefore, notwithstanding, howbeit." It looks very much as if the Hebrew conjunction lies behind many of the usages of kai in the New Testament. It is the purpose of this article to examine some of the occurrences of this "Semitic kai" and to try to suggest translations which will show the exact logical connection more clearly than simply "and."

The Hebrew letter waw (w') "means 'a hook', and resembles a hook in shape." (Robertson 1923:1180 quotes Farrar Greek Syntax 1876:196.) The "hooking together" of clauses and sentences results in paratactic sentences (para-taxis = placing together). We are familiar with the following style of Old Testament narrative: "And Samuel died; and all the Israelites were gathered together, and lamented him, and buried him....And David arose,... and went...and there was a man...and the man was very great, and he had three thousand sheep,...and he was shearing his sheep..." (1 Samuel 25:1-2 KJV). Greek with its varied use of conjunctions prefers hypotactic sentences (hypo-taxis = placing under, subordinating one clause to another), but frequently has paratactic sentences connected by kai which, in many cases, appear to reflect Hebrew parataxis. An incident typical of Mark's narrative style has

kai ten times in five verses (Mark 8:22-26). The GNB translation of the
incident has "and" only five times. It has omitted the initial kai and for
four other occurrences has used the adverbs "where," "after," "this time," and
"then."

The w' not only "hooks together" clauses and sentences, but whole
sections of material. It stands at the head of paragraphs and even at the
beginning of narratives with "monotonous frequency" (Zerwick 1963:153).
Harris' Theological Word Book of the Old Testament calls the w' at the
beginning of narratives "a mild introductory particle" and suggests "now" as a
translation. See Exodus 1:1, Ruth 1:1, and Esther 1:1. In the New Testament
this usage is reflected in Revelation. In chapters 12-16 every paragraph and
most sentences begin with kai. GNB has "then" and so does NIV in many cases,
but it often simply omits a conjunction.

The "Semitic kai" is only one of many Semiticisms found in the New
Testament. Moreover, there were such Semiticisms in non-biblical Greek, as
well as in the Septuagint, long before the New Testament was written. Such a
linguistic phenomenon is to be expected, in view of the fact that Greeks and
Semites had been mixing for centuries. Greeks had had Semitic slaves, and the
two races had traded together even before Alexander the Great had popularized
Greek language and culture in the third century B.C.

1 Kai as a connector of words

At its most basic, kai is used as a simple connective between words:
Rev. 7:12 "Blessing, kai glory, kai wisdom, kai thanksgiving, kai honour, kai
    power, kai might,..." (Is not something of the majesty of the passage lost
    with the omission of the conjunction, as in GNB?)
Phil. 4:9 "The things which kai you learned, kai you received, kai you heard,
    kai you saw."

Such a list of words connected by w' is common in Hebrew.
 2 Sam. 17:28-29 "Barzillai...brought beds w' basins w'...vessels w' wheat..."
    (14 items in all!). These verses have a striking example of this.

1.1 The explicative use of kai in the sense of 'namely, that is'

Here kai further explains the preceding words:
Gal. 6:16 "Peace...be upon them kai upon the Israel of God" ("...upon them,
    that is/namely, the Israel of God." This example is given by Zerwick
    (1963:154).
1 Cor. 2:2 "...Jesus Christ, kai this man crucified" (GNB has "...and
    especially his death on the cross").

Brown, Driver, and Briggs (1976:251) speak of the w' as having
"demonstrative force," pointing something out, specifying it.
1 Sam. 28:3 (Samuel was buried) "in Ramah, w' in his own city" ("that is, in
    his own city").
1 Chron. 21:12 "The sword of the Lord w' pestilence" ("the sword of the Lord,
    namely, pestilence"). The following context seems to support the fact that
    "sword" is here being used figuratively. LXX has kai. KJV has "even the
    pestilence," in the sense of "that is, the pestilence." RSV has apposition
    "the sword of the Lord, pestilence" which takes the w' in its explicative
    or specifying sense.

1.2 The use of kai in hendiadys

Hendiadys literally means "one through two." A single concept is expressed by two words linked with the conjunction "and":
Luke 2:47 "They were amazed at his intelligence kai his answers" ("at the intelligence of his answers").
Acts 23:6 "...the hope kai resurrection of the dead" ("the hope of the resurrection of the dead").
Titus 2:13 "...the blessed hope kai appearing..." ("the blessed hope of the appearing").

In this construction, the first noun is subordinated to the other in a genitive relation. Hendiadys is common in Hebrew. The phrase "violence w' robbery" (violent robbery) is found in Amos 3:10; Jer. 6:7, 20:8; Ezek. 45:9. "Loyalty w' truth" (true loyalty) is found in Exod. 34:6 and 2 Sam. 2:6, and in Prov. 16:6 one preposition covers both nouns "in loyalty and truth."

1.3 Kai used to add a part to the whole

Mark 16:7 "...his disciples kai Peter" (GNB has "including Peter").
Acts 1:14 "They continued...with the women kai Mary."

This device serves to emphasize the second of the persons (or things) mentioned.
Isa 1:1 Isaiah saw a vision concerning "Judah w' Jerusalem." Both are in focus, but the emphasis is on the capital city. This verse has a striking example of adding a part to the whole.
1 Kings 11:1 "Solomon loved many...women w' the daughter of Pharaoh" (KJV has "together with").

2 Kai as a connector of clauses and sentences

2.1 Kai meaning 'even' or 'also'

These are the "ascensive" or "adjunctive" uses. The kai marks an advance on what was said previously:
1 Cor. 2:10 "The Spirit searches all things, kai the deep things of God" ("all things, even the deep things of God").
John 7:3 "Go to Judea, so that kai your disciples may see the works..." ("so that even your disciples" or "so that your disciples also").

GNB unjustifiably omits a translation of kai here. Holladay (1971:84) gives an example of this intensifying use of the w', as he calls it.
2 Sam. 1:23 "Saul and Jonathan were...pleasant in their lives, w' in their deaths they were not divided" ("even in their deaths"). LXX has "kai in death."

There is only a slight difference between this "ascensive" or "adjunctive" usage and the explicative use in 1.1 above. The explicative use identifies the words preceding and the words following kai as referring to the same person(s). The ascensive use adds a further thought.

2.2 <u>Kai</u>...<u>kai</u> meaning 'both...and' (again used both at word and at clause level)

Mark 4:41 "<u>kai</u> the wind <u>kai</u> the sea"
John 7:28 "You <u>kai</u> know me, <u>kai</u> know where I am from."
Acts 2:29 "David...both died and was buried."

     Such a usage is found in Numbers 9:14 "One ordinance, <u>w'</u> for the stranger, <u>w'</u> for him that was born in the land" ("both for the stranger and for him..."). LXX has <u>kai</u>...<u>kai</u>.

2.3 <u>Kai</u> often meaning 'but' or, even stronger, 'and yet'

Mark 12:12 "They sought to seize him, <u>kai</u> they feared the crowd" ("but they feared").
1 Cor. 16:12 "I wished...<u>kai</u> he (Apollos) did not wish" ("but he did not wish").
Matt. 6:26 "Birds...do not sow...<u>kai</u> your...Father feeds them" ("they do not sow, and yet, in spite of that, the Father feeds them").
John 1:10 "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, <u>kai</u> the world did not know him" (in spite of the fact that he was in the world and that He made it).

     It does seem that the <u>w'</u> was used in some such contrastive or adversative sense.
Gen. 6:8 <u>W'</u> Noah found favor."

     In typical Hebrew fashion there are several occurrences of the <u>w'</u> in the previous verses of the chapter, carrying the consecutive events of the narrative, which culminates in the Lord's determination to destroy men. Verse 8 begins "<u>w'</u> Noah," which is better translated "but Noah," as in KJV. LXX has "Noah <u>de</u>" (but Noah).

Gen. 17:21 The Lord says he will bless Ishmael and adds, "<u>w'</u> my covenant will I establish with Isaac" ("but my covenant"). LXX has "my covenant de" ("but my covenant").
Lev. 2:12 "You shall offer them to the Lord, <u>w'</u> they shall not be burnt..." ("but they shall not"). LXX has <u>de</u> 'but'.
Ps. 1:6 "The Lord knows the way of the righteous, <u>w'</u> the way of the ungodly shall perish" ("but the way of the ungodly"). LXX has <u>kai</u>.

2.4 <u>Kai</u> introducing a purpose or result clause

Matt. 5:15 (They put the lamp on a stand) "<u>kai</u> it lights..." ("so that it lights"). Here <u>kai</u> has the force of <u>hina</u> or <u>hopos</u> with the subjunctive ("so that"). Vulgate has <u>ut</u> <u>luceat</u> 'so that it lights'.
Matt. 26:15 "What will you give me, <u>kai</u> I will betray him to you?" ("so that I will betray").
Heb. 3:19 "<u>Kai</u> we see that they could not enter" (i.e., we see this as a result of all that has been said in the previous verses). GNB has "We see, then, that they were not able to enter."

     Hebrew examples of the conjunction <u>w'</u> apparently used to introduce a purpose or result clause:

Gen. 12:2 "I will make you a great nation, w̱'̱ ...you will be a blessing" ("so
    that you will be").
Gen. 42:34 "Bring (Benjamin) to me w̱'̱ I shall know that you are true" ("so
    that I shall know").
Jonah 1:11 "What shall we do to you w̱'̱ the sea will become calm?" ("so that
    the sea...").

2.5 Kai used with the sense of a relative pronoun

Matt. 1:21 "She shall bear a son, kai you shall call his name Jesus" ("whose
    name you shall call").
Luke 1:49 "...the powerful One,...kai holy is his name" ("the powerful One
    whose name is holy").
Luke 6:6 "There was a man...kai his hand was withered" ("a man whose hand").

     Holladay (1971:85) gives two examples from Genesis of a similar usage:
Gen. 14:13 "...w̱'̱ they were confederate with Abram" (three men are named).
    LXX has "who were confederate."
Gen. 16:1 "Sarah had a handmaid...w̱'̱ her name was Hagar." LXX has "to whom
    the name" (dative meaning "whose name").
Luke 11:44 "...unmarked graves kai men who walk on them do not know..."
    (i.e., that they are walking on graves). Here is an interesting example
    of an ambiguous statement.

     GNB translates the kai with the sense of a relative ("unmarked graves
which people walk on"). It could express a result: "You are like invisible
graves, and, as a result, men walk over them because they do not see them."

2.6 Kai in a temporal clause in the sense of "when"

Mark 15:25 "It was the third hour kai they crucified him" ("when/that they
    crucified him").
Luke 19:43 "The days shall come kai your enemies shall cast..." ("when
    your enemies/that your enemies").
Heb. 8:8 "The days come kai I will make...." (This quotation in Heb. 8:8 is
    taken from Jer. 31:31.) LXX has kai, but the quotation is not taken
    verbatim from the LXX. GNB has "when" in each of these passages.

     The construction seems to reflect a Hebrew usage of w̱'̱ in a temporal
clause, as in Gen. 22:4 "On the third day w̱'̱ Abraham lifted up his eyes."
Luke 2:21 "When eight days were fulfilled...kai he was called Jesus."
Cf. Gen. 3:5 "in the day you eat of it w̱'̱ your eyes will be opened."

2.7 Kai used in comparison

     Zerwick (1963:152) points out a most interesting construction in 1 Cor.
12:3 "No one speaking by the Spirit of God says, 'Jesus is Anathema,' kai no
one can say, 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit."

     At first sight this appears to be simply a parallel statement. "No one
says this...and no one says that." Zerwick sees more than parallelism here,
but a comparison, with the focus on the second clause. "Just as no one, if he
is speaking by the Spirit of God, can say, 'Jesus is Anathema' (this is
obvious), so no one can say 'Jesus is Lord' but by the Holy Spirit" (this is
Paul's main focus). Kai here co-ordinates "two assertions, of which one is

merely a comparison for the demonstration of the other" (Zerwick 1963:152).
He sees this as a reflection of a common construction with w' in Proverbs.
Prov. 25:3 "The heavens above and the earth below are inscrutable (this is
    obvious). W' the heart of the king is inscrutable." (The latter is what
    the writer wishes to show.)
Prov. 25:23 "The north wind drives away rain w' an angry countenance
    (drives away) a back-biting tongue." (Just as the one, so the other.)

    Although the familiar "Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward"
of Job 5:7 is open to different translations, there is the w' of comparison at
the beginning of the second clause.

    The LXX seems to have missed the w' of comparison in these three passages
(it has de 'but' in each case) but has seen it in the more obvious example in
Prov. 25:25, and gives "Just as" and "thus" at the beginning of the first and
second clauses respectively. Hebrew has "water is pleasant...w' good news..."
LXX has "just as water is pleasant..., thus is good news...."

2.8 Kai meaning 'for, because' (reason clauses)

    Mark 8:3 "They will faint on the way kai some of them have come from a
distance" ("because some...have come from a distance" [without food]). This
is a clear example of a reason clause.

Rev. 12:11 "They overcame him (the accuser of the brethren)...kai they loved
    not their lives to the death" (i.e., because they had not loved their
    earthly life too much to be willing to die" [for Christ's sake]).
Exod. 23:9 "You shall not oppress a stranger: w' you know the heart of a
    stranger" (i.e., "because you know what it feels like to be a stranger,
    from your experience in Egypt").

2.9 Kai meaning 'although' (concession clauses)

Luke 18:7 "But will not God effect vengeance for his elect who cry to him day
    and night kai he delays over them" (i.e., "He surely will avenge them
    even though he delays answering their cries")? If the suggestion of Arndt-
    Gingrich be accepted that the verb makrothumeo in this verse means 'to
    delay', the preceding kai could well have a concessive sense.
Neh. 2:2 "Why is your face sad w' you are not ill?" (even though,
    although). A concessive usage of w' can be discerned in these words of
    Artaxerxes to Nehemiah.

2.10 Kai meaning 'that' (conjunction)

Rev. 6:12 "I beheld...kai there was an earthquake" ("I beheld...that there
    was").
Mark 6:14 "Herod heard...kai they said, 'John the Baptist has risen" (i.e.,
    "Herod heard that they said..."). This reading fits well with the previous
    statement that Jesus' reputation was growing and people were attributing
    his power to John the Baptist. This could be another example, but there is
    a caution here in view of the variant reading. But the other reading may
    be preferable: "Herod heard...and he said" as in KJV.

    GNB, RSV, NASB, NEB, NIV take the subject of "said" as "they" or "some,"
thus supporting this usage of kai as meaning 'that'.

In view of the similarity of literary genre of Revelation and Daniel, it is to be expected that similarities of language exist as well as of content. John's "I beheld...kai there was an earthquake" (above) may be compared to Daniel's "I beheld, w' the same horn made war..." Daniel 7:21.

2.11 Kai in a "mixed" construction

Occasionally kai links a participle to a finite verb:
John 1:32 "I saw the Spirit descending...kai it remained...."
John 5:44 "...receiving glory...kai you do not seek honour from...God."
Col. 1:26 "The mystery, the one hidden from the ages...and now has been
   revealed."

This reflects a Hebrew tendency to change a participle or infinitive construction to a finite verb.

Gen. 27:33 "Where is the one hunting venison w' he brought it to me?" LXX
   has two aorist participles "having hunted and having brought."

2.12 Kai introducing an apodosis in various relations to a protasis

The Hebrew apodotic w' occurs frequently in the Old Testament, indicating a number of relationships with the subordinate clause.

2.12.1 Kai introducing the apodosis in a conditional construction

Rev. 14:9-10 "If any man worship the beast...kai he will drink."
Rev. 3:20 "If anyone...opens the door [kai] I will come in...." The con-
   struction is present in this familiar passage in the United Bible Society
   text 3d ed., though kai is in parenthesis signifying a disputed reading.

Old Testament examples of the same construction with w' are to be found in the following:
Gen. 31:8 "If he said, 'the speckled' w' the cattle bore speckled
   and if he said, 'the streaked' w' the cattle bore streaked."
Lev. 17:16 "If he wash not, w' he shall bear his iniquity."
Gen. 44:22 "w' he leaves his father, w' he will die." This is a good
   example of w' used in both condition and consequence.

2.12.2 Kai in a temporal construction

The phrase kai idou 'and behold' occurs in Luke's writings in apodosis in temporal clauses:
Luke 7:12 "...as he drew near kai idou (the young man of Nain)."
Acts 1:10 "While they looked into heaven,...kai idou two men."

This is an exact "carry-over" from the Hebrew w' hinneh 'and behold', common in the Old Testament. Judges 20:40 and Ruth 2:4 are two examples from the narrative books.

2.12.3 Kai in a question

There are a few instances in the New Testament where kai introduces a question which seems to draw a conclusion or inference from what has previously been said.

Kai tis? 'and who?' (rhetorical questions)
Mark 10:26/Luke 18:26 "...kai who can be saved?" Jesus has said that it is
    harder for a rich person to enter the kingdom of God than for a camel to
    go through the eye of a needle. The disciples draw the rather despair-
    ing conclusion, expressed as a rhetorical question, that no one can be
    saved.
2 Cor. 2:2 "For if I grieve you, kai who is there to make me glad,
    but the one who is grieved by me?" (implied answer--"no one, because I've
    grieved the only people who can cheer me!")

    Blass, Debrunner, and Funk (1970:227) translated as an informal inference
"who then?" (under the circumstances set forth in the protasis). The ICC
(Plummer 1922:48) comments, "The kai accepts the previous statement, and the
question shows what a paradox it involves."

Kai tis? 'and who?' (questions asking for clarification).
Luke 10:29 "Kai who is my neighbor?"
John 9:36 "Kai who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him?" In the
    first, the lawyer says, in effect, "You speak of my neighbor, tell me
    who he is, so that I may love him." In the second, the blind man says,
    "you speak of the Son of Man, tell me who he is, so that I may believe
    on him."

Kai ti? 'and what?' (again a question asking for clarification)
John 14:22 "...kai what has happened, that you will reveal yourself to us,
    and not to the world?" (kai disputed). Judas says, "You've spoken about
    revealing yourself to us and not to the world. So tell us more, how has
    it come about that you will do that?"

    In all these questions, only the one in 2 Cor. 2:2 follows a specific
protasis. This is in the very nature of things, as only here does the person
who asks the question beginning with kai say the words in the protasis.
However, in view of the fact that the others do draw a conclusion or inference
from what has been said or ask for more information, it does seem that the kai
in these cases can be said to be a kai of apodosis. Zerwick (1963:154)
includes kai as a conjunction introducing questions in his section on kai
corresponding to the Hebrew apodotic w', though he does not give any Old
Testament examples. He lists also kai 'how?' (Mark 4:13) and kai 'whence?' =
why? (Luke 14:3). He suggests that there is a kai ti? question in Phil. 1:22
and punctuates "But if living in the flesh is the fruit of my labour kai
what shall I choose? I do not know."

    Only by continuing to live bodily on the earth will Paul have results
from his labours; therefore, he concludes that he does not know which is
best, death or life.

    Questions beginning with w' and an interrogative do occur in the Old
Testament and the following examples seem to show that some inference is
being drawn from what has previously been said:
Gen. 39:9 "...w' how shall I do this great evil?"
    Joseph is saying (vv. 8,9) "My master trusts me, he has given to me
    everything in his house and, therefore, I cannot do this great evil."
Exod. 2:20 "w' where is he?"
    Reuel is saying to his daughters, "In view of the fact that this man did
    this and this for you, we have a duty to him. Find him and call him in."

Malachi 3:2 "W' who shall endure the day of his coming, w' who
    shall stand when he appears?"

        Keil-Delitzsch [1875:459] comment, "The question...has a negative mean-
    ing.... No one endures it...." The coming of the messenger in verse 1 is a
    coming in judgment and, therefore, no one can endure/stand.

2.12.4 _Kai_ linking an imperative and an indicative with the sense of
        'if...then'

    Such a construction has a place under the _kai_ of apodosis, in view
of the fact that _kai_ introduces a consequence which will follow if a command
is obeyed.

    A striking example is found in Jesus' words on prayer in the Sermon on
the Mount.
Matt. 7:7: "Ask _kai_ it shall be given you,
            Seek _kai_ you shall find,
            Knock _kai_ it shall be opened."
    ("If you ask, seek, knock, these results will follow.")

Luke 10:28 "Do this _kai_ you shall live." ("If you do this, you shall
    live").
Rom. 13:3 "Do good _kai_ you will have praise from it" (from authority/from the
    man who exercises authority). ("If you do good, the man who exercises
    authority will commend you.")

    In Hebrew the _w'_ often links two imperatives, with the idea of
"if...then."
Gen. 42:18 (Joseph to his brothers) "Do this _w'_ live."
    ("If you do this, you shall live"--almost an exact parallel in the LXX
    to Luke 10:28.)
Isa. 45:22 "Look unto me _w'_ be saved." ("If you look to me, you will be
    saved".)
Amos 5:4,6 "Seek me _w'_ live....Seek the Lord _w'_ live." ("If
    you seek me...seek the Lord, you will live.") (An imperative which
    seems similar at first sight _Amos_ _4:4_ "Go to Bethel _w'_ sin" is actually
    spoken in irony. "Carry on going to Bethel and sinning.")

2.13 The phrase _kai_ _egeneto_ 'and it came to pass'

    This common phrase occurs at the beginning of sentences and sections, as
in Mark 1:9 (Jesus' first appearance on the scene after John's preparatory
ministry). Other examples are Luke 5:12, 5:17, 6:1. Matthew uses the phrase
kai _egeneto_ followed by "when Jesus had finished," five times, each time at
the end of one of his teaching sections (Matt. 7:28, 11:1, 13:53, 19:1, 26:1).
In addition to _kai_ _egeneto_ there is _egeneto_ _de_ and simply _egeneto_.

    The words are a direct translation of the Hebrew _way_ _hi_ 'and it was'
which appears frequently at the beginning of sentences and sections:
Gen. 41:1 "W' it came to pass...that Pharaoh dreamed."
1 Kings 18:36 "W' it came to pass...that Elijah came near."

2.14 The idiom "what to me _kai_ to you?"

Readers of KJV are often puzzled by Jesus' words to his mother at the wedding in Cana, "What do I have to do with thee?" John 2:4. The idiom also occurs in Mark 1:24 and 5:7. Its literal translation is "What to me and to you?" i.e., "What do you and I have in common?"

A similar phrase occurs in Hebrew in Judges 11:12, 1 Kings 17:18, and elsewhere. The LXX has exactly the same phrase as appears in the New Testament.

The International Critical Commentary (1928:75) on John says that it is a phrase "suggestive of diversity of opinion or interest." NIV translates Jesus' words to his mother as, "Why do you involve me?"

2.15 Discerning conjunctive and coordinating uses of _kai_

A final example follows to show the importance of a right understanding of the _w'_ and the _kai_:

Zerwick (1963:154) draws attention to the passage on divorce in Deuteronomy, together with the scribes' misunderstanding of it in the New Testament.
Deut. 24:1-4 "If a man...takes a wife, and marries her...and she finds no favor..._w'_ he writes her a bill of divorce, and gives it...and sends her, and she goes and becomes another man's wife, and...he hates her, and writes her a bill...and gives...and sends...(or if he dies)." This passage begins, "If a man" followed by a series of conditional clauses, then comes the main clause: "The first husband shall not take her again."

The _w'_ before the first "writes...and sends" is merely conjunctive, in a string of coordinate clauses depending on the initial "if." The law is not commanding divorce. It is saying that _if_ all these things happen, if a woman is divorced and divorced again, her first husband may not take her back.

The scribes read that _w'_ as apodotic. "If a woman finds no favor, then he shall write her a bill of divorce." "Moses," said the scribes in Matt. 19:7 "commanded divorce." Both the LXX and the Vulgate take the _w'_ in this apodotic sense. Jesus hastened to correct their understanding of Hebrew grammar and, therefore, their understanding of the law concerning divorce. It is to be hoped that a misreading of the Hebrew _w'_ does not always have such disastrous consequence!

3 Conclusion

Through examining the Hebrew influence upon the use of _kai_ in the New Testament, we have seen that the Semitic _kai_ may be found in less commonly understood uses. It may function as a logical connective, to introduce purpose, reason, result, concession, a relative clause, or the apodosis of a condition. It may be found in more idiomatic uses such as in hendiadys, questions, explicatives, etc. A clearer understanding of its various usages, of its translation in the Septuagint, and of the _kai_ in the Greek New Testament ought to lead to a more exact understanding of the logical connection between clauses in many passages of the New Testament.

References

Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, eds. 1966.
   The Greek New Testament. London: United Bible Societies.

Allen, Willoughby Charles. 1912. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the
   Gospel According to Saint Matthew. The International Critical Commentary,
   3d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Arndt, W. F., and F. W. Gingrich. 1959. A Greek English Lexicon of the
   New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A translation and
   adaptation of the 4th rev. and aug. ed. of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-
   Deutsches Worterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der ubrigen
   unchristlichen Literatur. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bernard, J. H. 1928. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel
   According to St. John. The International Critical Commentary.
   Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Biblia Herbracia Stuttgartensia. 1977. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. [1961] 1970. A Greek Grammar of the New
   Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and revised
   from the 9th-10th German edition by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University
   of Chicago Press.

Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. 1976. Hebrew and English Lexicon
   of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Farrar. 1876. Greek Syntax. n.p.

Gesenius, W. 1898. Hebrew Grammar.   Ed. and enlarged by E. Kautzsch.
   Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Harris, R. L., G. L. Archer, and B.K. Waltke, eds. 1980. Theological Word
   Book of the Old Testament. Chicago: Moody Press.

Holladay, W.L. 1971. A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old
   Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Keil, C.F., and J. J. Delitzsch. [1875] 1973. Commentary on the Old
   Testament. 4 vols., reprint. Translated from the German. Grand Rapids:
   Wm. B. Eerdmann Publishing Co.

Moulton, J. H., A. F. Howard, and N. Turner. 1968. A Grammar of New Testament
   Greek. Vols. 2 and 3. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden. 1963. A Concordance to the Greek Testament.
   Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Plummer, A., ed. 1922. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second
   Epistle to the Corinthians. The International Critical Commentary.
   Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Robertson, A. T. [1914] 1923. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. 3d ed. New York: Hodder & Stoughton.

The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, with an English translation. 1973. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Vulgate Biblio Sacra. 1956. Joannis evang. Rome: Typis Societatis S. Copyright, Paris: Desclee and Co. 1927.

Zerwick, M. 1963. Biblical Greek. English ed. adapted from the 4th Latin ed. by Joseph Smith, J.S. Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici.

The following translations are referred to by an abbreviation:

GNB   Good News Bible: The Bible in Today's English Version. 1976. New York: American Bible Society.

KJV   Authorized or King James Version. 1611.

LXX   Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, with an English translation. 1973. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

NASB   The New American Standard Bible. 1960. La Habra, CA: The Foundation Press Publications for Lockman.

NEB   New English Bible. 1970. London: Oxford University.

NIV   The Holy Bible: New International Version. 1973. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Bible Publishers.

RSV   Revised Standard Version. 1952. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons.

WHEN SHOULD WE TRANSLATE POIEŌ 'TO MAKE' AS 'TO RECKON'?

John Collins

[John Collins has an S.B. and S.M. in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science from MIT. He has an M.Div., with an exegetical concentration, from Faith Evangelical Lutheran Seminary. He is currently in a Ph.D. program at the University of Liverpool where he is studying Hebrew linguistics. His interests are in linguistics, translation, and hermeneutics, especially as applied to the Old Testament.]

1 Introduction

The goal of this paper is two-fold: first, to provide an exhaustive analysis of the Greek verb poieō 'to do', 'to make' in two of its syntactical relationships; second, to use this analysis to treat more carefully some of the questions raised in Ray Elliott's article, "Two Related Questions: How Long Has God Been A Liar? 1 John 1:10, 5:10, and When Did That Woman Become an Adulteress? Matthew 5:32," Notes on Translation 103 (1984) :34-35.

The translation of Matt. 5:32 is no academic matter, since that verse is extremely important for understanding the biblical standards on divorce and remarriage. I suspect that questions relating to this subject come up frequently in the societies served by SIL personnel, just as they did among the American Indians served by David Brainerd (1718-1747). In the first appendix to his journal, Brainerd tells us that when the gospel message really began to take effect on his beloved Indians,

> ...there was now no vice unreformed,- no external duty neglected.... The abusive practice of husbands and wives in putting away each other, and taking others in their stead, was quickly reformed; so that there are three of four couples who have voluntarily dismissed those they had wrongfully taken, and now live together in love and peace (Edwards 1974, 2:417).

Whether or not one believes that these three or four Indian couples did the right thing (I do not), it is certainly clear that translators must strive to represent accurately the meaning of the relevant passages, since so much is at stake.

In this paper I will first examine the case in which poieõ is accompanied by two accusatives, noting all the places in the New Testament where poieõ has the specialized sense 'to declare'. Then I will examine the situation in which poieõ is used with an infinitive. This last section concludes with a discussion of Matt. 5:32.

2 poieõ + Double Accusative

The verb poieõ is one of the most common words in the New Testament. Depending on its syntactic and semantic context, it can be translated 'to do, accomplish, practice' or 'to make, cause, create'--and with a host of nuances.

The particular syntactic relation to be treated here is,

> poieõ + A + B

where
A is a noun or pronoun in the accusative case;
B is a noun, pronoun, adjective, or participle in the accusative.

Note that word order is not so important in Greek, and thus these elements can occur in any order in the clause. I have laid it out as above since this is the logical order for an English speaker. According to Smyth's Grammar (1980:362), the element A is usually definite (pronoun or article + noun). This is generally true in the New Testament, but even more important is the fact that the context usually makes it clear which accusative is A and which is B. I do not know of a single instance in the New Testament where there is any ambiguity in this regard. Note further that elements A and B can be composite, that is, two or more sub-elements joined by kai 'and' as in 2 Pet. 1:10 and Rev. 17:16 (see below).

2.1 Normal usage (factitive)

This grammatical construction is described in Smyth (1980:362, sections 1612-1615), and in Robertson (1934:479ff.). It occurs about 48 times in the New

Testament.[1] In all but nine of these occurrences, poieõ is used in a
factitive sense; that is, the construction may be rendered,

> to cause A to be/become B.

(In section 2.2 I will treat the special cases.)

Some typical examples of this normally factitive use are (with the
individual elements marked):

> Matt. 3:3 (= Mark 1:3 = Luke 3:4, from Isa. 40:3):
>   eutheias poieite tas tribous autou
>   (B)   (A)
>   'Cause his (God's) paths to become straight!'

> Matt. 4:19: poiēsō humas halieis anthrōpōn
>   (A)   (B)
>   'I will cause you fellows to become fishers of people.'

> 2 Pet. 1:10: spoudasate bebaian humōn tēn klēsin kai eklogēn poieisthai
>   (B)   (A= A1   and   A2)
>   'Take pains to cause your calling and election to become sure.'

> Rev. 17:16: ērēmōmenēn poiēsousin autēn kai gumnēn
>   (B1)   (A) (and   B2)
>   'They will cause her to become desolate and naked.'

Appendix A lists every passage in the New Testament in which this construction
occurs and has this normal usage, together with their translations.

An interesting case is the relationship between Matt. 4:19 and Mark
1:17. Matt. 4:19, given above, is an instance of this construction of poieõ.
Mark 1:17, an identical parallel to Matt. 4:19, is worded just a bit
differently:

> Mark 1:17: poiēsō humas **genesthai** halieis anthrōpōn
>   'I will cause you fellows to become fishers of people.'

Mark's passage has the extra word genesthai 'to become'; Matthew's omission
of this word suggests that it (or einai 'to be') is understood in this
construction. Mark 1:17 is an instance of the construction discussed in
section 3.

2.2 Specialized usage: poieõ 'to declare' (delocutive)

According to the Liddell-Scott Lexicon (1857), poieõ has a delocutive use in
which it may be translated,

> to declare/claim that A is B.

In this part of the paper I will first show how John's writings make use of
this device. Then I will examine four other texts in the New Testament which
may be interpreted as using this device; I conclude that two of them are
actually instances of the factitive use described in section 2.1.

2.2.1 Johannine material

There are seven places in John's Gospel and 1 John in which the referents
of the two elements A and B make it impossible for the author to have
intended to use <u>poieõ</u> in its factitive sense. Consider, for example, 1 John
1:10:

> If we say that we have not sinned, **we make him** (God) a liar, and his
> word is not in us.

The Greek of the bolded portion is

> <u>pseustên</u> <u>poioumen</u> <u>auton</u>.
>   (B)   (A)

There is what I shall call "semantic dissonance" between the two elements A
and B; or, as Elliott puts it,

> God is not a liar, and it is beyond the scope of human beings to
> make Him one (103:34).

Since the emphasis in 1 John 1:8-10 is what one might **say** (verse 8, 'if
we **say**'; verse 9, 'if we **confess** (avow openly)[2]'; verse 10, 'if we say'),
this portion of verse 10 is best rendered:[3]

> we are declaring that God is a liar.

John again uses this device to good effect in the following verses.[4]

John 5:18: <u>ison</u> <u>heauton</u> <u>poiõn</u> <u>tõ</u> <u>theõ</u>
             (B)   (A)
            'declaring that he was equal to God'

8:53: <u>tina</u> <u>seauton</u> <u>poieis</u>
        (B)   (A)
       'Who are you declaring yourself to be?'
       (not as in TEV, "Who do you think you are?")

10:33: <u>poieis</u> <u>seauton</u> <u>theon</u>
           (A)   (B)
        'you are declaring that you are God.'

19:7: <u>huion</u> <u>theou</u> <u>heauton</u> <u>epoiêsen</u>
        (B)   (A)
       'He declared that he is the Son of God.'

19:12: <u>ho</u> <u>basilea</u> <u>heauton</u> <u>poiõn</u>
             (B)   (A)
        'the one who declares that he is a king'

1 John 5:10: <u>pseustên</u> <u>pepoiêken</u> <u>auton</u>
                  (B)   (A)
             'He has declared that he (God) is a liar.'

Westcott (1966) suggests that in John's use this device "carries with it the idea of overweening, unrighteous self-assertion." This is true of the overall construction in these cases; but notice that the idea of "overweening unrighteous self-assertion" is not in the verb poieō when it means 'to declare', but in the semantic dissonance between the two predicates A and B; for example, God and liar (1 John 1:10), man and God (John 10:33). It will be important to remember this in order to evaluate the other places where poieō may mean 'to declare', but where the idea of self-assertion is absent.

2.2.2 Other possibilities

Outside of John's works, there are four places in the New Testament where poieō may have this delocutive use: Matt. 12:33; Acts 2:36; 20:24; 2 Cor. 5:21. I will look at each of them in turn and suggest translations for them.

2.2.2.1 Matt. 12:33

This verse follows the solemn words about the sin of blaspheming the Holy Spirit (Matt. 12:22-32) and precedes a group of verses about the way in which a man's words and deeds reflect his true character. It reads (Greek and formal English equivalence):

> ē **poiēsate** to dendron kalon kai ton karpon autou kalon, ē **poiēsate**
>   (A1)   (B1)   (A2)   (B2)
> to dendron sapron kai ton karpon autou sapron: ek gar tou karpou
>   (A3)   (B3)   (A4)   (B4)
> to dendron ginōsketai.

Either make the tree good and the fruit of it good, or make the tree rotten and the fruit of it rotten: for from the fruit the tree is known.

Should the two verbs poiēsate be rendered factitively (cause to become) or delocutively (declare)? If they are factitive, then verse 33 connects with what follows and speaks of the Pharisees' need of a new heart if they are to produce works pleasing to God. If they are delocutive, then the verse is Jesus' challenge to the Pharisees to make a decision about his person: are his person (the tree) and his works (the fruit) good, or are they rotten? Thus in this case the verse would follow closely on the warning given in verse 32.

Several learned and careful commentators (such as Plummer, Lenski, and Alexander; also the Lexicons of Thayer and of Gingrich and Danker) take them as delocutive, either because they feel this makes a natural continuation of the previous verses or, in Lenski's case, for a theological reason:

> How can Jesus order them either to make themselves morally excellent (kalos) or morally worthless (sapros) when they already were so vicious that he had just warned them against committing the sin against the Spirit? ...no man can make himself a good tree, and every man is already by nature a worthless tree (Lenski 1961, The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel, 485-486).

Whereas Lenski at times brings dogmatics too early into the exegetical process, in this case he has the right idea: the only way to decide whether

this is a factitive or delocutive use is on the basis of the referents of the two predicates.

However, I think that the evidence is in favor of the factitive construction. First, consider the fact that this image of trees and fruits occurs elsewhere in Matthew: in 3:8,10 (words of John the Baptist to Pharisees and Sadducees); 7:15-20 (Jesus' warning about false prophets); see also James 3:11-12 for a similar figure. Further, Luke 6:43-45, in Luke's edition of the Sermon on the Mount, seems to be a composite of Matt. 7:18,16; 12:35. Luke's material as it stands is a general statement of how a man's words reflect the true condition of his heart.[5] In all three of the other uses of the image, then, the idea expressed is the fact that true religion is a matter of the heart. This pattern favors the factitive understanding here, since Jesus frequently made the point that the Pharisees' religion was external (see Matt. 23, especially verses 25-28).

Second, it seems to me unlikely that Jesus would challenge the Pharisees to make a judgment of his **person** (the tree), and then to draw conclusions about his work. In the Gospels it is generally the other way around: his works are the evidence of his Messianic person (see Matt. 9:1-8; 11:1-6; John 10:25-26,38)[6]. Thus the delocutive interpretation is bucking the trend.[7]

Thirdly, Lenski's theological reasoning is not as weighty as it may look. He is building upon the doctrine of sinful man's inability to repent and believe (a doctrine which, in my judgment, is plainly stated in the Bible: John 1:12-13; Rom. 8:6-8; Eph. 2:1-8). However, Calvin--whose view of man's corruption was at least as strong as Lenski's!--takes this as a command that the Pharisees get a new heart. This would be in accord with other passages, such as Matt. 3:2 (John the Baptist: "Repent!"); 4:17 (Jesus: "Repent!"); Acts 2:38 (Peter: "Repent and be baptized!"); 4:19 (Peter: "Repent, then, and turn to God!"); 17:30 (Paul: "Now God commands all people everywhere to repent.").[8]

Finally, I think that verse 33 goes more naturally with verses 34-37. Jesus moves from the image of trees and fruit to the image of vipers' offspring, again emphasizing that actions are consistent with character.

Thus it seems to me best to interpret poieō in Matt. 12:33 factitively: "cause the tree to become good"; "cause the tree to become rotten." Perhaps Jesus is using a proverbial phrase to lead off his accusation that the Pharisees' rejecting him (a rotten fruit) is merely an expression of their inner depravity (a rotten tree). Perhaps in idiomatic English we would say something like, "Where there's smoke, there's fire."

2.2.2.2   Acts 2:36

This second passage in which poieō might have a delocutive meaning reads as follows:

asphalōs oun ginōsketō pas oikos Israēl hoti kai kurion auton kai
                                                      (B1)   (A)
christon **epoiēsen** ho theos, touton ton Iēsoun hon humeis estaurōsate.
   (B2)

Assuredly therefore let all the house of Israel know that both Lord and Christ has God made him, this Jesus whom you people crucified.

Thus the question is, does this mean "God caused Jesus to be/become both Lord and Christ," or is it, "God declared/considered Jesus to be both Lord and Christ"?

Many commentators understand this verse to be a reference to the way in which Jesus' resurrection vindicated his Messianic claims. For example, Lumby (1937) says on this verse,

> Thus closes the argument. Its steps are; Jesus, who has been crucified, has been by God raised from the grave, by God exalted to heaven, and set at his right hand, and thus proved to be the Lord and the Anointed One (that is, the Christ or Messiah).

Whereas this seems to take account of the purpose of the sermon in which this verse appears, there are several serious problems with this view, which render a delocutive interpretation quite unlikely.

Recall that in its delocutive use poieõ may be rendered 'to esteem, consider, declare, reckon'. Thus the idea of "proving" or "demonstrating" is not really in view.

Further, remember that the delocutive interpretation is forced upon us by the relationship between the referents of the predicates A and B, and the incongruity of A being caused to be/become B. This incongruity does not really exist here: the predicate B, Lord and Christ, is a set of titles of the referent of A, Jesus. Thus if we can find a factitive interpretation that makes sense, we should follow it.

Such an interpretation is not too hard to find. First, any suggestion that Peter is saying that God actually conferred Lordship and Messiahship on Jesus by means of the resurrection[9] may be summarily dismissed. It is not necessary to refer to the whole of New Testament Christology, nor to the Christological controversies of the first five centuries (although these are of course important!). It is only necessary to refer to Luke's own writings, to show that this author presented Jesus as being both Lord and Christ all along: Luke 2:11,[10]

> for today in the city of David there has been born for you a Savior, who is Christ the Lord.

As Marshall says on this verse in Acts,

> Nothing suggests that this act of installation took place at or after the resurrection. We have seen that it was because he was the Messiah (cf. 2:22; 10:38ff.) that Jesus was raised from the dead, and it was one who was already called Lord who was summoned to sit at God's right hand (1980:80).

The context will enable us to find Peter's meaning. In Acts 2:31 Peter tells us that in Psalm 16 David spoke not of himself, but of the Christ; and in Acts 2:34 we have a quote from Psalm 110:1, where "the Lord said to my Lord...." Thus in Acts 2:36 Peter is referring back to these two points and tying together the two strands of his argument: God "made" Jesus to be the "Lord" of Psalm 110 and the "Christ" of Psalm 16.

It is possible to take "made" in this verse in the sense of
"appointed/ordained," as do Chrysostom and Newman-Nida. The verb poieõ is
used in this way in Mark 3:14 and Heb. 3:2, albeit with a single accusative.
Thus the meaning would be,

> God ordained Jesus as the Lord and Christ.

However, we can take this more easily as a simple occurrence of the
factitive use of this construction, if we understand with Lenski:

> The reference is to the human nature of our Lord when Peter says
> that "God made Jesus both Lord and Christ," this nature, of course, in
> conjunction with the divine. And "made" includes everything from the
> incarnation to the final exaltation (1961, The Interpretation of The
> Acts of the Apostles, 102).

Thus we arrive at the conclusion the poieõ in Acts 2:36 is factitive, and the
verse may be interpreted,

> Therefore let all the descendants of Israel know this for certain:
> God caused Jesus to become (by means of his incarnation) both the Lord
> and Christ of David's prophecies, the same Jesus whom you yourselves
> crucified!

2.2.2.3   Acts 20:24

This verse occurs in the context of Paul's farewell address to the elders
of the church of Ephesus. He speaks in verses 22-23 of his expectation that
he will suffer hardships; then in verse 24 he says,[11]

> ...all' oudenos logou **poioumai** tēn psuchēn timian emautõ hõs
>   (A)   (B)
> teleiõsai ton dromon mou kai tēn diakonian hēn elabon para tou kuriou
> Iēsou diamarturasthai to euaggelion tēs charitos tou theou.

> But of no account do I make the life valuable for myself, in order
> to finish my course and the ministry which I received from the Lord
> Jesus, to testify regarding the gospel of God's grace.

Here the verb poieõ is in the middle voice, and that would make this verse the
one place in the New Testament where it is used in a delocutive sense in exact
accordance with the classical idiom described in Liddell-Scott. There does
not seem to be any reason not to take the verb as a delocutive here, since
Paul is talking about how he views his own life. Thus we can render the verse
as the TEV does,

> But I reckon my own life to be worth nothing to me, in order that I
> may complete my mission and finish the work that the Lord Jesus gave me
> to do, which is to declare the Good News of the grace of God.

2.2.2.4   2 Cor. 5:21

The final, and by far the most difficult, verse to be considered in this
section is 2 Cor. 5:21. Paul's thrust in 2 Cor. 2:14-6:18 is to defend his

ministry to the Corinthians by showing its effects, its purity and integrity, and its basis in the work of Christ.

In 2 Cor. 5:11-21 Paul tells of the work of Christ for men and the change that believing in Christ has made for himself: it has caused him to become a messenger of the reconciliation accomplished by God through Christ, and he appeals to men to become partakers of that reconciliation. Verse 21 gives the basis of that appeal:

ton mē̃ gnonta hamartian huper hēmō̃n hamartian epoiē̃sen, hina hēmeis
      (A)   (B)
genō̃metha dikaiosunē̃ theou en autō̃.

The one who did not know sin, on our behalf he made sin, in order
that we might become the righteousness of God in him.

The first thing to do is to sort out the parties and the pronouns. "The one who did not know sin" is Christ; and God is the subject of the verb "made." Thus we might translate the first clause,

God made Christ, who did not know sin, to be sin on our behalf, in
order that we....

The next thing to notice is that genō̃metha 'we might become' should probably be translated 'we might be made', since ginomai is often used in place of the passive of poieō.[12] Thus the two halves balance each other: Christ is made sin, we are made God's righteousness.

Since 2 Corinthians is intended to remind the Corinthian church of things Paul had already taught them, and not to break new doctrinal ground, I am justified in limiting my discussion of possible interpretations to only those consistent with what Paul has written elsewhere. Thus, for example, Plummer's (1915) refusal to come to grips with Paul's obvious doctrine of substitutionary atonement (as expressed in Gal. 3:10-13; Eph. 1:7; 1 Tim. 2:5-6) is not only unhelpful, but it is illegitimate.

With all these preliminaries taken care of, it becomes possible to consider one factitive interpretation and one delocutive out of the many that have been suggested. I will conclude that the delocutive is the more likely (although I am not willing to say the factitive is impossible).

(a) The factitive interpretation begins by noticing that in the Septuagint the word hamartia 'sin' can sometimes mean 'sin-offering', as is the case with the underlying Hebrew (see for example Lev. 4:25). Then the first half of the verse becomes "God caused the sinless Christ to become a sin-offering for us."

It is certainly consistent with Paul and the rest of the New Testament to see a parallel between Christ's work and the Old Testament sacrifices. In addition this view has the following points in its favor:

(1) it takes poieō at its face value;
(2) it is simple (but this simplicity is only in the first part of the verse; the second part does not become any clearer);

(3) it has an impressive pedigree of men who have held it: Augustine and Ambrose (fourth century), Cyril of Alexandria (fifth century), Herveius (twelfth century), Erasmus (sixteenth century), and Adam Clarke (nineteenth century). For what it's worth, these men, except for Cyril, are all from the Western Church. Two of the most insightful theologians of the Eastern Church, Athanasius and Chrysostom (both fourth century), take a view similar to my delocutive interpretation.

Clarke gives an excellent presentation of this position. His most telling argument in its favor is that advocates of other views "have confounded sin with the punishment due to sin."[13]

However, this interpretation has the following weaknesses, and these weaknesses add up to make this view unlikely:

(1) the New Testament nowhere else uses hamartia 'sin' in the sense of 'sin-offering';
(2) Paul obviously intends a balance between the words "sin" and "righteousness" in the two parts of the verse, so that even though this may be difficult, we must hold these two ideas in concert;
(3) there is another way of interpreting this verse that is not liable to Clarke's objection above.

(b) An attempt to take a delocutive interpretation immediately runs into the puzzle, How can we say that God "reckoned Christ to be sin"?

The clue comes from noticing that Gal. 3:13 is a parallel verse:

Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law genomenos huper hēmōn katara 'by being made a curse for us', for it is written, "Cursed is everyone who is hung on a tree."

(Note that here, too, ginomai is used as the passive of poieō.) In this verse the underlined word "curse" is a case of metonymy, the abstract (curse) for the concrete (cursed one).[14] Thus it is possible that Paul is using "sin" in 2 Cor. 5:21 as a metonymy for "sinner."

Notice further the balance between the two halves of the verse, as already mentioned. Bengel contends that Christ "was made sin in the same way that we are made righteousness" (1877, 3:385). Thus we are led to suspect that "righteousness" is also used metonymically for "righteous people." Lietzmann (1969) takes these two verses in this way, commenting that "sin," "righteousness," and "curse" are used "pregnantly" for "bearer of sin, righteousness, curse."

Meyer (1884) adds the final insight:[15] as we were made righteous by imputation, so Christ was made sin by imputation (thus taking ginomai in 2 Cor. 5:21b as a delocutive passive of poieō).

So, gathering all this together and making figures explicit, 2 Cor. 5:21 could be translated as follows:

God considered Christ, who was (completely) free of sin, as a sinner in our place, in order that we who are in Christ might be considered as having the righteousness of God.

3 poieõ + Infinitive

I turn now to another syntactic relation of the verb poieõ, of the following structure:

        poieõ + C + D
where
   C is a noun or pronoun in the accusative case;
   D is an infinitive verb.

This construction occurs seven times in the New Testament, including Matt. 5:32.

I will first treat the normal use of this construction, and then ask whether or not its use in Matt. 5:32 fits this normal pattern.

3.1 Normal use

According to Gingrich and Danker and to Liddell-Scott, this construction has the following meaning:

   to cause C to perform D.

Thus, for example, in John 6:10 we find Jesus ordering his disciples,

        poiēsate tous anthrõpous anapesein
                    (C)   (D)
        'Cause the people to recline (for eating).'

The structure may be more complex, as in Mark 7:37, where people declare about Jesus,

        ... kai tous kõphous poiei akouein kai tous alalous lalein
                   (C1)   (D1)   (C2)   (D2)
        'He causes the deaf people to hear and the speechless people to speak.'

Appendix B lists the other occurrences in the New Testament.[16] Note that Mark 1:17 has already been mentioned in section 2.1.

A construction of equivalent meaning in the New Testament is similar to this, but D is now a (subjunctive) clause introduced by the particle hina (and sometimes the accusative C is absent). This is used six times. For example, Jesus says in Rev. 3:9,

        idou poiēsõ autous hina hēxousin kai proskunēsousin enõpion tõn
                  (C)   (D)
        podõn sou kai gnõsin hoti egõ ēgapēsa se
        'Behold I will cause them to come and to bow down before your feet and to know that I have loved you.'

The rest of the occurrences are listed in Appendix B.

3.2 Translating <u>poieõ</u> in Matt.5:32

Matt. 5:31-32 forms a part of our Lord's teaching about marriage, divorce, and remarriage. In verse 32 he states,

> But I myself tell you that everyone who divorces his wife, except in the case of (her) sexual immorality, **makes her to commit adultery**, and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.

The Greek for the bolded phrase is,

<u>poiei</u> <u>autên</u> <u>moicheuthênai</u>.

Elliott (1984) thinks we should understand <u>poieõ</u> in this verse in some sort of delocutive sense, "he declares that she is an adulteress." Is this correct, or is this correctly rendered in our versions, "he causes her to commit adultery"?

In order to answer this, there are some preliminary matters to clarify. The verb <u>moicheuthênai</u> in Matt. 5:32 is grammatically the aorist passive infinitive of <u>moicheuõ</u>. When this verb is used in the active voice, it usually refers to a man's action, with the woman as the direct object:

<u>moicheuei</u> <u>autên</u>   'He commits adultery with her.'

When used in the passive voice, it refers to the woman's part:[17]

<u>moicheuetai</u>   'She commits adultery.'

Several English translations (such as NIV, RSV) attempt to bring this out by expressing the phrase, "he makes her an adulteress." This has one disadvantage for the unwary: it makes the English appear as if this were an instance of <u>poieõ</u> + double accusative, while the Greek is <u>poieõ</u> + accusative + infinitive.

There is no evidence that a delocutive interpretation, such as the one discussed in section 2.2 is possible in this syntactic relation. The nearest thing to it is mentioned in Smyth (1980:476, section 2142). When <u>poieõ</u> is used with an infinitive, and that infinitive is expressing indirect discourse, then <u>poieõ</u> may be rendered 'assume'. Smyth quotes from Plato's Republic (581d).

<u>poiõmetha</u> <u>ton</u> <u>philosophon</u> <u>nomizein</u>
                (C)   (D)
'Let us assume that the philosopher holds'

But we do not appear to have indirect speech in Matt. 5:32, so we must find a more satisfactory solution.

Had we been intended to interpret this phrase as Elliott suggests, it would more naturally have been stated as <u>poiei</u> <u>autê/autèn</u> <u>hõs</u> <u>emoicheuthê</u> 'he treats her as if she had committed adultery', or <u>poiei</u> <u>autê</u> <u>hõs</u> <u>moichalidi</u> 'he treats her as he would treat an adulteress', or **perhaps**, in view of 2.2

<u>poici</u> <u>autēn</u> <u>moichalida</u> 'he makes her an adulteress'. But the syntax we find
in Matt. 5:32 does not lend itself to this interpretation.

The difficulty with this verse arises from the question, How can a man
who has unjustly divorced his wife (and **he** therefore is the culpable party)
cause **her** to commit adultery. Most commentators suppose that Jesus is
assuming that divorce leads to remarriage, and that it is in the act of
remarrying that the adultery occurs. From the following considerations it
becomes clear that this is certainly the Lord's meaning.

First, the idea of remarriage was inherent in the idea of divorce in the
ancient world. The bill of divorce a Jewish man would give his wife had these
words in it (or something like them):[18]

> ...but now I dismiss thee, and leave thee, and put thee away, that
> thou mayest be free and have power over thy own life, to go away to be
> married to any man whom thou wilt,...

(Marriage was after all the normal state of a man or woman.)

Further, the Lord declares that the man who marries the (unjustly)
divorced woman <u>moichatai</u> 'commits adultery'. This man's action is the
counterpart to the woman's <u>moicheuthēnai</u>. This seems to be our Lord's
explanation of Deut. 24:4, in which the divorced-and-remarried woman has been
defiled and is not allowed to remarry the first husband (see Craigie 1976 on
this passage; she has been defiled because the second marriage was an act of
adultery). Jesus says the same in Luke 16:18b.

It is interesting to compare the other passages in the Gospels in which
the Lord speaks of divorce: Matt. 19:1-12; Mark 10:1-12; Luke 16:18. In each
of these cases (Matt. 19:9; Mark 10:12; Luke 16:18a) the Lord says that the
man who divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery. The
man's divorce-and-remarriage is viewed as a single act.

Finally, add the words of the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor. 7:10-11. In verse
10 he forbids a Christian woman to divorce her Christian husband; in verse
11b the Christian man must not divorce his Christian wife. In 11a he
envisions the case in which a woman disregards this command (or perhaps has
divorced her husband before the letter arrived at Corinth). He tells her to
remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband. Thus the divorce was
bad, but in Paul's eyes remarriage would be worse.

I think that all this evidence comes together to vindicate the standard
view that the man causes his divorced wife to commit adultery, since she will
of course remarry. This serves to enhance the guilt of the man who divorces
his wife improperly.[19] All other considerations aside, the presumption is
in favor of <u>poieō</u> being factitive in Matt. 5:32; then, when one has compared
this text with these other four passages, this becomes, in my judgment, the
only natural interpretation.

NOTES

1. The Moulton-Geden-Moulton Concordance (1978) lists Luke 3:8 as an
occurrence of this construction, but this is not correct, and no English
version treats it this way. John the Baptist says, <u>poiēsate</u> <u>karpous</u> <u>axious</u>

<u>tēs</u> <u>metanoias</u> 'bear fruits that befit repentance' (as in RSV). Here the second
accusative, <u>axious</u> 'befitting', is not complementary but appositional to
<u>karpous</u> 'fruits'. Similarly Matt. 3:8.

This concordance also lists Matt. 19:4 = Mark 10:6, which are quoting
Gen. 1:27 from the Septuagint:

<u>arsen</u> <u>kai</u> <u>thēlu</u> <u>epoiēsen</u> <u>autous</u>
'male and female he made them.'

This means
        God created man as male and female.
Or,
        When God created humans, he created a male and a female.

Thus, here too the second accusative complex, <u>arsen</u> <u>kai</u> <u>thēlu</u>, is not
complementary to the first, <u>autous</u>, but appositional.

Note that I have added several references not indicated by Moulton-Geden-
Moulton: Acts 15:17-18; 20:24; 1 Cor. 6:15.

2. See Haas, et al. (1972), on 1 John 1:9; see also Bratcher-Nida (1961) on
Mark 1:5, under <u>exomologoumenoi</u>.

3. Note that Elliott's recommendation, "we are treating God as if he were a
liar" (1984:35), is not quite correct. It will become apparent that in the
seven Johannine uses of this device, the emphasis is on public declaration.
See Plummer (1938) on 1 John 1:10.

Further, it is probably better not to think of this as a "figurative"
use, as opposed to the "literal" (factitive). The delocutive seems to be a
specialization of the factitive.

4. Both Plummer (1938) and Westcott (1966) note that this is a stylistic
feature of St. John. This feature would be evidence that both the Gospel and
the first epistle have the same author.

5. I do not offer an explanation on the precise relationship of the passages
Matt. 7:16-20; 12:33-37; Luke 6:43-45. It is not necessary, though, to
conclude that either Matthew or Luke has tampered with the Lord's original
message. They could easily be reporting different parts of the sermon, or
perhaps one of them has included for convenience a snatch of teaching which
was actually spoken at another time, or perhaps the Lord used the same words
in different situations.

6. This theme is present in all the Gospels, but it is explicit in John,
whose message is that there is so much evidence for the divinity of Jesus that
failure to believe can only stem from inner corruption.

7. This makes the delocutive interpretation given by the fourth-century Church
Father and exegete John Chrysostom (and advocated by Hendriksen with the same
arguments) hard to understand. Their case, to be convincing, would require
Jesus to have said, "Make the tree good, because the fruit is good, etc."; but
this is precisely what he did not say. It seems to me that Jesus said, "If
you want good fruit, you need a good tree."

8. Of course, an Arminian (such as Adam Clarke) would not have this difficulty with the biblical calls to decision and new birth. Someone who takes a more Augustinian view (whether in its Lutheran or Reformed expressions) might consult Jonathan Edwards, "Pressing into the Kingdom of God," Works... 1:654-663. The point here is that the factitive interpretation is compatible with any of the evangelical theological options. (Perhaps it is better to say that such calls to decision are a part of the biblical data of which any system must take account. The data, and not the system, are my concern here.)

9. For example, Cullmann (1963:216).

10. See Ridderbos (1962:19-22) for fuller discussion.

11. Note that I follow the text of Nestle(26)=UBS(3).

12. Perhaps I or someone else will have to write a paper, "When should we translate ginomai 'to become' as 'to be made'?" if there is to be a full treatment. I can make several remarks for starters, though. Blass and Debrunner (1961, paragraph 315) point out that the passive of poieō appears hardly at all in the New Testament (Heb. 12:27), and that the substitution of one verb for the passive of another is the rule with certain verbs in Attic Greek. Moulton and Milligan (1972) (under ginomai) state that ginomai is used as the passive of poieō in the papyri. This is apparent in several places in the New Testament. For example, we hear in Acts 17:24 that God does not live en cheiro-poiētois naois 'in temples made by hands'; while in 19:2 we hear of hoi (theoi) dia cheirōn ginomenoi 'the (gods) made by hands'. The adjective poiētos, formed from poieō, is equivalent to ginomenos, the participle of ginomai. Similarly, in Mark 6:5 we find the expression poiēsai dunamin 'to do a miracle', whereas in verse 2 the people of Jesus' hometown marvel at hai dunameis toiautai dia tōn cheirōn autou ginomenai 'such miracles being done through his hands'. Thus the passive of poiei dunamin is dunamis ginetai.

    Cases in which it seems clear that ginomai should be rendered 'to be done' are Matt. 6:10; John 1:2; Acts 4:28; Heb. 11:3; and probably Gal. 3:13.

13. The typical delocutive interpretation against which Clarke was arguing was that God reckoned Christ as sin, that is, by judging him God gave Christ the treatment our sins deserve. My delocutive interpretation is not exactly the same as this, as I think that Clarke has a point.

14. This sort of metonymy is familiar from Paul's use of the abstract terms "circumcision" and "uncircumcision" to refer to the concrete "circumcised people" (Jews) and "uncircumcised people" (Gentiles), as in Gal. 2:7-9; Phil. 3:3. Note that the Hebrew of Deut. 21:23 (quoted in Gal. 3:13) says literally, "A curse of God is the one hung on a tree"; thus the underlying text has a metonymy in it, which the Septuagint has removed and rendered, "cursed by God...." Whether and how a translator might keep the figure is a matter I am not qualified to address.

15. The most helpful commentaries on this verse are those of Meyer, Bengel, Barrett, and Lietzmann. Chrysostom here and on Gal. 3:13 makes for good reading.

16. Some authorities suggest Acts 17:26; 25:3 as instances of this construction, but these are not likely. In both cases the infinitives after <u>poieõ</u> are probably infinitives of purpose or result.

Acts 17:26: <u>epoiẽsen</u> <u>te</u> <u>ex</u> <u>henos</u> <u>pan</u> <u>ethnos</u> <u>anthrõpõn</u> <u>katoikein</u> <u>epi</u>
                                                                (C)   (D)
<u>pantos</u> <u>prosõpon</u> <u>tẽs</u> <u>gẽs</u>,...

And from one man he made every nation of men that they might dwell on the face of the earth, ...(**Not**, And from one man he caused every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth.... Compare the comments of Newman-Nida.)

Acts 25:3: ...<u>enedran</u> <u>poiountes</u> <u>anelein</u> <u>auton</u> <u>kata</u> <u>tẽn</u> <u>hodon.</u>
                    (C)   (D)

...making an ambush in order to slay him on the way. (Rather than, causing an ambush to slay him on the way. After all, the ambush did no such thing!)

17. See the articles in Gingrich and Danker and in Liddell-Scott. As examples consider Lev. 20:20 in the Septuagint, <u>ho</u> <u>moicheuõn</u> <u>kai</u> <u>hẽ</u> <u>moicheuomenẽ</u>, 'the adulterer and the adulteress' (translating the masculine and feminine forms of the Hebrew participle). Eccles. 23:23: <u>en</u> <u>porneia</u> <u>emoicheuthẽ</u> '**She** committed adultery in immorality'. John 8:4: <u>hẽ</u> <u>gunẽ</u> <u>kateileptai</u> <u>moicheuomenẽ</u> 'the woman was caught committing adultery'.

However, in Hos. 4:3 and Jer. 3:9 the verb is used in the active to refer to the woman. Thus I conclude: The usage of active/passive for the man/woman is not consistent, but when the passive is used, it indicates the action of the woman in adultery.

The Syriac translators recognized this and translated <u>moicheuthẽnai</u> in Matt. 5:32 with a feminine form.

Thus Lenski's attempt to render the phrase in Matt. 5:32, "he brings about that she is stigmatized as adulterous" (1961, <u>The</u> <u>Interpretation</u> <u>of</u> <u>St.</u> <u>Matthew's</u> <u>Gospel</u>, 232-233), will not work. Rather, the Lord says that "he makes her to be the female party in an act of adultery."

Note that the verb <u>moichaomai</u> means the same, but does not make any gender distinctions.

18. See Clarke's comments on Deut. 24:3; see also Encyclopedia Judaica, under "divorce." Of course I am assuming that these later examples also reflect the practice of the first century, but I am not aware of any doubt about that. The Gentile bills had similar statements.

19. For the overall ethical questions of divorce and remarriage, including the matter raised in the Introduction, see Collins' M.Div. thesis or J. E. Adams. Both endorse the traditional Protestant view of the exceptions of Matt. 19:9 and 1 Cor. 7:15.

Appendix A: <u>poieõ</u> + double accusative in the NT

Note: These translations are deliberately formal equivalence.

Matt. 3:3 (=Mark 1:3=Luke 3:4): (see section 2.1)
       4:19: (see section 2.1)
       5:36: ...because you cannot cause one hair to become white or black.
       12:16 (see Mark 3:12): and he charged them that they not cause him to
            become known.
       12:33: (see 2.2.2.1)
       20:12: ...and you have caused them to become equal to us, who have borne
            the burden of the day and the hot sun.
       21:13 (=Mark 11:17=Luke 19:46): ...but you have caused it to become a
            cave of bandits.
       23:15: ...and when he has become (a proselyte) you cause him to become
            a son of hell twice as bad as you are.
       26:73: ...for your speech causes you to become obvious (as one of his).
       27:22 (Mark 15:12): Then what shall I cause this Jesus, who is called
            Christ, to become?
            (Robertson 1934:484, suggests that this is another construction
            to be translated, Then what shall I do to Jesus who is called
            Christ?)
       28:14: ...we will convince him and we will cause you to become free
            of worry.
John   2:11: Jesus caused this to be the beginning of the signs....
       2:16: ...Stop causing my Father's house to be a house of market.
       4:46: So he went again into Cana of Galilee, where he caused the water
            to become wine.
       5:11: But he answered them, "The one who caused me to become healthy,
            that one said to me,..."
       5:15: ...that Jesus is the one who caused him to become healthy.
       5:18: (see 2.2.1)
       6:15: So Jesus, because he knew that they were about to come and to
            seize him in order to cause (him) to become king,... (Note that the
            element A, "him", is implied.)
       7:23: ...are you angry at me because I caused the whole man to be
            healthy on the Sabbath?
       8:53: (see 2.2.1)
       10:33: (see 2.2.1)
       16:2: They will cause you to be expelled from the synagogue....
       19:7: (see 2.2.1)
       19:12: (see 2.2.1)
Acts   2:36: (see 2.2.2.2)
       7:19: ...to cause their infants to become exposed that they might not
            survive.
       15:17-18: ...says the Lord who causes these things to become known
            from of old. (Following Nestle[26]=UBS[3].)
       20:24: (see 2.2.2.3)
       26:28: Will you persuade me in a short time, to cause (me) to become
            a Christian? (Note that element A, "me", is implied.)
1 Cor. 6:15: Then shall I take the members of Christ and cause (them) to
            become the members of a harlot?
2 Cor. 5:21: (see 2.2.2.4)
Eph. 2:14: For he himself is our peace, who has caused the two to become
            one and....

Heb. 1:7 (quoting Psalm 104:4): The one who causes his angels to become
        winds, and (who causes) his servants to become a flame of fire.
2 Pet. 1:10: (see 2.1)
1 John 1:10: (see 2.2.1)
      5:10: (see 2.2.1)
Rev. 1:6: and he has caused us to become a kingdom, (namely) priests to
        God his Father,... (Note that "priests" is apposite to "kingdom.")
    3:12: The one who is victorious, I will cause him to become a pillar
        in the temple of my God....
    5:10: and you caused them to become a kingdom and priests to our God.
    12:15: And the snake put water like a river out of his mouth behind
        the woman, in order to cause her to become swept away by the river.
    17:16: (see 2.1)
    21:5: And the one seated on the throne said, "Behold! I am causing all
        things to become new!"

Appendix B

1. __poieõ__ + accusative + infinitive

Matt. 5:32: (see 3.2)
Mark 1:17: (see 2.1)
      7:37: (see 3.1)
Luke 5:34: But Jesus said to them, "Surely you cannot cause the sons of the
        bridal chamber to fast so long as the bridegroom is with them!"
John 6:10: (see 3.1)
Acts 3:12: ...as if by our own power or piety we have caused this man
        to walk?
Rev. 13:13: And he does great signs, so that he even causes fire to come
        down from the sky to the ground in the presence of men.

2. __poieõ__ + __hina__ + subjunctive

Note: Sometimes the verb is future, not subjunctive (as in Rev. 3:9). It is
disputed whether this shows a trend in popular Greek or else is a feature of
the peculiar style of Revelation.

John 11:37: Surely this one who opened the eyes of the blind man was able
        to cause that this man not die?
Col. 4:16: And when the letter has been read among you, cause (it) to be
        read also in the church of the Laodiceans, and (cause) that you
        yourselves read the (letter) from Laodicea.
Rev. 3:9: (see 3.1)
    13:12: ...and he causes the earth and those dwelling on it to worship
        the first animal,...
    13:15: And it was permitted to him to give breath to the image of
        the animal, so that the image might speak and cause all those
        who do not worship the image of the animal to be killed.
    13:16-17: And he causes all--the small and the great, the rich and
        the poor, the free and the slaves--to give to them a mark on
        their right hand or on their forehead, and (he causes that)
        no one is able to buy or sell,...

References

All Patristic references can be found in the Eerdmans edition of the Ante-
Nicene, Nicene, and Post-Nicene Fathers, 1969.

Adams, J. E.   1981.   Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage.   Grand Rapids: Baker
    Book House.

Alexander, J. A.   [1860] 1980.   The Gospel According to Matthew.   Reprint.
    Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Barrett, C. K.   1973.   The Second Epistle to the Corinthians.   Black's New
    Testament Commentaries.   London: Adam & Charles Black.

Bengel, J. A.   1877.   Gnomon of the New Testament.   5 vols.   Edinburgh: T. &
    T. Clark.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner.   1961.   A Greek Grammar of the New Testament
    and Other Early Christian Literature.   Trans. and rev. of the ninth-tenth
    German ed. incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by Robert W.
    Funk.   Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bratcher, R. G.   1981.   A Translator's Guide to the Gospel of Matthew.   Helps
    For Translators.   London: United Bible Societies.

Bratcher, R. G., and E. A. Nida.   1961.   A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel
    of Mark.   Helps For Translators. Vol. 2.   Leiden: United Bible Societies.

Calvin, J.   1979.   Calvin's Commentaries.   22 vols.   Reprint of Calvin
    Translation Society ed.   Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Clarke, A.   n.d.   Commentaries.   (Reprint from early 19th Century.)
    Nashville: Abingdon.

Collins, C. J.   1985.   Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: A Problem in
    Hermeneutics.   M. Div. thesis, Faith Lutheran Seminary, Tacoma, WA.

Cullmann, O.   1963.   The Christology of the New Testament.   Philadelphia:
    Westminster.

Craigie, P. C.   1976.   The Book of Deuteronomy.   New International Commentary
    on the Old Testament.   Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Edwards, J.   [1834] 1974.   The Works of Jonathan Edwards.   2 vols.   Reprint.
    Edinburgh: Banner of Truth.

Elliott, R.   1984.   "Two Related Questions: How Long Has God Been a Liar? 1 John
    1:10, 5:10 and When Did That Woman Become an Adulteress? Matthew 5:32."
    Notes on Translation 103:34-35.

Gingrich, F. W., and F. W. Danker.   1979.   A Greek-English Lexicon of the New
    Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.   A trans. and adapt. of
    the 4th rev. and aug. ed. of W. Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Worterbuch
    zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der ubrigen urchristlichen
    Literatur by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich.   2d ed., rev. and aug. from

Bauer's 5th ed., 1958. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Haas, C., M. de Jonge, and J. L. Swellengrebel. 1972. A Translator's
    Handbook on the Letters of John. Helps for Translators Series. London:
    United Bible Society.

Hendriksen, W. 1973. New Testament Commentary, Exposition of the Gospel
    According to Matthew. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Hill, D. 1972. The Gospel of Matthew. New Century Bible Commentary. London:
    Marshall, Morgan & Scott Publ.

Hughes, P. E. 1962. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians. The New
    International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
    Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Lenski, R. C. H. [1930-1940] 1961. The Interpretation of... (commentaries on
    the New Testament). 12 vols. Reprint. Minneapolis: Augsbury Publishing
    House.

Liddell, H. G., and R. Scott. 1857. A Greek-English Lexicon. Rev. by H.
    Drisler. New York: Harper Brothers.

Lietzmann, H. 1969. An die Korinther 1/2. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.
    Erganzt von W. G. Kummel. Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

Lumby, J. R. 1937. The Acts of the Apostles. Cambridge Greek Testament.
    Cambridge: University Press.

Marshall, I. H. 1980. The Acts of the Apostles. The Tyndale New Testament
    Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

M'Neile, A. H. [1915] 1965. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. London:
    Macmillan.

Meyer, H. A. W. 1884. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New
    Testament. Vol. 2, The Epistles to the Corinthians. Rev. and ed. by W.
    P. Dickson and W. Stewart. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Morris, L. 1965. The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross. Grand Rapids: Wm.
    B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

_____. 1971. The Gospel According to John. The New International
    Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans
    Publishing Company.

Moulton, J. H., and G. Milligan. [1930] 1972. The Vocabulary of the Greek
    Testament. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Moulton, W. F., A. S. Geden, and H. K. Moulton. 1978. A Concordance to the
    Greek Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Newman, B. M., and E. A. Nida. 1972. A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of
    the Apostles. Helps for Translators. Vol. 12. London: United Bible
    Societies.

Peacock, H. F. 1982. A Translator's Guide to Selections from the First Five
      Books of the Old Testament. London: United Bible Societies.

Pike, K. L. 1974. "The Linguist and Axioms Concerning the Language of Scripture."
      Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation 26(2):47-51.

Plummer, A. [1915] 1982. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to
      St. Matthew. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

_____. 1915. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle
      of St. Paul to the Corinthians. The International Critical Commentary.
      Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

_____. 1938. The Epistles of St. John. Cambridge Greek Testament.
      Cambridge: University Press.

Ridderbos, H. N. 1962. The Speeches of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles.
      London: Tyndale Press.

Robertson, A. T. 1934. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of
      Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman Press.

Smyth, H. W. [1920] 1980. Greek Grammar. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.

Stott, J. R. W. 1978. Christian Counter-Culture. Studies in the Sermon on
      the Mount. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press.

Thayer, J. H. [1889] 1981. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.
      Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Westcott, B. F. [1892] 1966. The Epistles of St. John. Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
      Eerdmans Publishing Co.

SOME INS AND OUTS OF "COME" AND "GO"

Ross McKerras

[Ross McKerras has a B.Th. in Bible from Bible College of New Zealand, a T.
Cert. in Education from Auckland Teacher's College, and an M.S. in Math from
Auckland University. He and his wife, Elizabeth, joined SIL in 1980 and work
in the Pacific Area. Ross is trainer/advisor for the Uripiv language project
and translation coordinator within the Vanuatu working group.]

In an article, "Which Way are we Going?" in The Bible Translator (TBT)
25 (1974):426-431, Paul Ellingworth says how the English words "bring" and
"take" always relate to a particular "point of reference," with "bring"
indicating motion towards that point and "take" indicating motion away from
it. Many languages in the world are similar in this respect, among them
Melanesian languages. However, there are languages that are not direction-
conscious in the same way, among them biblical Greek and Hebrew. (This
present paper does not study the case of Hebrew. See "Where on earth are we?
Problems of position and movement in space," by Noel Osborn, TBT 31

(1980):239-242.   In his discussion he mentions that Hebrew words are often
"neutral," providing no reference to position of speaker and hearer.)   This
has meant that motion verbs have not always been well dealt with by Bible
translators.   Ellingworth (1974:430f.) points out how the Greek word agō is
never translated in RSV by "take" but always by "bring," whereas its meaning
area covers both English words.   An important example he considers is 1 Thes
4:14, where he argues for the translation "take" (GNB) against "bring" (RSV,
NIV, A&G:14 under agō 1a).   The key difference between English and Greek here
is the importance in English of the reference point.   In a conversation, this
is usually determined by the position of the speaker; analogously (but in a
more complicated way) it is determined in a narrative by where the narrator
has "placed" his audience relative to events.

     There are several other motion words in English that operate similarly;
ones coming to mind immediately are "come," "go," and "fetch."   But there are
also motion words in English--like "approach," "arrive," and "carry"--that are
not like this.   The difference is perhaps best illustrated by an example:
whether I say "You are coming to the tree" or "You are going to the tree"
depends on the relative positions or orientation of you, me, and the tree.   On
the other hand, "You are approaching the tree" can stand in for either of the
above sentences, regardless of any reference point determined by my position.
There does not seem to be any pair of Greek or Hebrew words that contrast
quite like "come" and "go" do in English; they operate more like the pair
"approach" and "leave."   (Bruce Turnbull* questioned this statement in view
of the complexity introduced by compounding in Greek.)   Certainly this makes
the situation much more complicated than in Hebrew; e.g., we may note that one
Hebrew word, bo' (qal) nearly always underlies the LXX use of not only
erchomai but also eiserchomai and eisporeuomai, and that yatsa' underlies
both exerchomai and ekporeuomai.   But I stand by (a slightly more cautious
restatement of) my original contention.   Compounding does not seem to be
causing Greek verbs to become any more like English ones in the ways referred
to above.   For examples of the types of meaning-changes introduced when verbs
are compounded, note: 1. stylistic preferences--whereas in John everyone
erchomai to Jesus, in Matthew everyone proserchomai; 2. specialized
differences, as in the case of epilambano below; 3. sometimes no change at
all.   (See the discussion under eiserchomai below.)

     Uripiv (an Austronesian language belonging to the North and Central
Vanuatu group) has three words functioning like the two English words "come"
and "go."   Thus -vini indicates motion towards the speaker, like "come"; -van
indicates motion away from the speaker and hearer, like "go"; and -vinuk
indicates motion away from the speaker and towards the hearer (usually
rendered in English by what I call the "courtesy come," because the speaker
out of "courtesy" adopts the viewpoint of the hearer in speaking to him).

     In other languages the case is much more complicated.   Tila Chol of
Mexico provides an example of this in an article "Tila Chol 'Come,' and 'Go,'

----

and 'Arrive,'" by Daniel A. Hoopert and Viola Warkentin in <u>Notes</u> <u>on</u>
<u>Linguistics</u> 4(1977):11-16.   To aid their study they first clarify the concept
referred to by Ellingworth as "point of reference." They call it "base" and
define it as: "A place with which a person is somehow identified." This
concept helped my understanding of Uripiv, because <u>-vinuk</u> is also used in such
examples as "I will come to your house tomorrow," said when speaker and hearer
are anywhere other than at "your house." Hence the definition of <u>-vinuk</u> can
be generalised as "indicates motion away from speaker's base and towards
hearer's base." Hoopert and Warkentin, for their part, go on to consider
seven Tila Chol verbs serving where Uripiv has the three as outlined above.
In their brief article, they consider only motion of the second person as
perceived by the first person! We look forward to a complete analysis of Tila
Chol verbs of motion from them, but I have not heard whether such additional
work is forthcoming.

      The rest of this paper will avoid that kind of complication by
concentrating on biblical Greek words of motion and by investigating their
translation into English. Most of my initial study was done in John's Gospel,
but afterwards I considered the other gospels, Matthew especially.
      I will begin by considering <u>erchomai</u>, because it is the most common
motion word in John's Gospel with about 150 occurrences. (It also occurs in
six compound motion verbs to be found in the Gospel, which I will examine
later.) For convenience, I will list after each verb, as I begin to discuss
it, the number of times it occurs in different books as follows: <u>erchomai</u>
(111, 86, 99, approx. 150, 55, approx. 130). These numbers show how many
times the verb appears in Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, and the rest of the
New Testament (NT) combined, respectively. My counts were made from <u>A</u>
<u>Concordance</u> <u>to</u> <u>the</u> <u>Greek</u> <u>Testament</u> (1897) by Moulton and Geden.

      So we note first of all that <u>erchomai</u> is used by John far more frequently
than by any other writer (bearing in mind too the order of size, at least in
terms of pages occupied in the UBS 3d ed. Greek NT is: Luke, 120; Matthew,
117; Acts, 112; John, 95; Mark, 80). Certainly one would expect that the
translation of <u>erchomai</u> in John's Gospel would be something beyond the realms
of uncertainty and confusion. Confident that this would be so, I turned in
the four English versions to which I most often refer, to a randomly selected
chapter, Jn 20, where I noticed that <u>erchomai</u> occurs twice in the first two
verses. Imagine my surprise when I found it had been rendered as follows:

	AV	NIV	RSV	GNB
verse 1	cometh	went	came	went
verse 2	cometh	came	went	went

Since all combinations are thus exhausted, I consider my belief confirmed that
no other English translation beyond these four is necessary! Seriously,
though, perhaps the differences can be accounted for as follows: the AV almost
always translates <u>erchomai</u> with the verb "come." The other versions have
tried to follow at least, to some extent, the demands of English narrative.
Notice first that both GNB and NIV make a break between the end of chap. 19
and the beginning of chap. 20. Indeed they both head chap. 20 with the title
"The Empty Tomb." The RSV runs straight on from chap. 19, without leaving a
gap. Therefore, in the RSV we are still in the same scene (using this word
in the theatrical sense) as we were at the end of chap. 19, which maybe
accounts for the choice of "come." However, the NIV and GNB reset the scene,
and as part of this initial resetting, the word "go" must be used; the

reader's attention, like Mary Magdalene, must "go" there. (In passing, note
the relationship of the word "scene" as used here, with Ellingworth's "point
of reference," and Hoopert and Warkentin's "base.") This explains the RSV and
GNB's choice of "go" in verse 2. The scene is shifted to Peter and the
"other disciple." Why then did the NIV choose "come"? It seems to me that
the force of using "come" here in English, where "go" would normally be
preferred, is to give immediacy and vividness to the narrative. Can we say
the same about the Greek? I think the answer to this question must be "yes."
Although it could be argued that the effect is devalued by frequency of use of
erchomai by John, we should note that this is part of his style of always
putting the reader right on the spot.

So in summary, in the above paragraph I have tried to investigate
discourse rules in English that govern the choice between "come" and "go" as
they operate in the translation of Jn 20:1,2. The fact that John could use
erchomai in both verses shows that no such rules operate at least in his
idiolect of Greek. His choice of verb is governed by different factors, which
I will now proceed to discuss.

Firstly let us look at the words for "go" used by John. He uses hupagō,
29 times; it is used in contrast with erchomai, e.g., in Jn 3:8. He uses
aperchomai (a compound of erchomai), 20 times; for contrast with erchomai,
see, e.g., Jn 4:7,8. Then he uses poreuomai, 16 times, contrasting with
erchomai, e.g., in Jn 14:3. Note that erchomai is more than twice as frequent
as these three verbs combined. Note in particular that people always "come"
(erchomai) to Jesus and never "go" with one sole exception Jn 4:47, where the
official "went" to him (aperchomai + pros). This must be seen as putting the
focus on his departing rather than arriving, with the implication perhaps that
he was reluctant to leave the side of his sick son. (So I support the RSV's
interpretation of the ambiguity in verse 46, namely that the official himself
was in Capernaum, contrary to the GNB which has him in Cana.)

But otherwise, as noted, people always "come" to Jesus. (This is also
the case in Matthew, who however uses proserchomai instead of erchomai. See
Gundry 1982:148.) Thus, the spotlight remains right where Jesus is; in
addition there are positive connotations of personal encounter. (Note how
hupagō, e.g., in Jn 6:67, and aperchomai, e.g., in 6:66, can take on negative
connotations.) So Nicodemus "came" to Jesus; yet according to the rules of
English discourse, GNB is correct in translating "went."

The GNB often renders erchomai by "go"; a study of the exceptions
proves enlightening. In 4:5, it does not seem that Jesus was purposely
heading for Sychar, and so "came" is better, because of the connotation of
purpose that the English word "go" often carries. However in 1:11 such
connotations would be quite in order, and "go" should have been chosen. The
English "come" would imply the author is identifying himself with "his own
people," and should be followed by "we did not receive him." As far as the
Greek is concerned, this is not necessarily the case, and an additional reason
here for the use of erchomai could be that the designation of Christ as ho
erchomenos, 'the Coming One,' is in mind (cf. Jn 6:14).

Sometimes, too, erchomai is used to mean 'come/go back' or 'return,' a
sense occasionally made explicit by the GNB; see Jn 7:45; 9:7; 21:22. (Luke
would use instead the more "correct" hupostrephō, a word John never uses.

But see Lk 9:26, where Luke, too, uses <u>erchomai</u> in this sense, under pressure
of a standard expression.)

        Before leaving <u>erchomai</u>, it is interesting to note how A&G deal with
it. They devote two pages to it, giving "come" as the first and major gloss
but "go" as a second. Of particular interest is their discussion of 1 Jn 5:6,
where they say: "The context demands that <u>erchomai</u> be rendered by an
ambivalent term, denoting both 'come' and 'go,' and the English language can
in this instance not furnish an expression of the required kind" (A&G
1957:311).

        Let us now take a brief look at the compounds of <u>erchomai</u>:

<u>anerchomai</u> 'go/come up' (Jn 6:3 and Gal 1:17, 18 are the only NT occurrences).

<u>aperchomai</u> 'go, go off, depart' (35,22,21,20,7,12), with focus on the leaving
or journeying rather than the arriving. Commonly followed by <u>eis</u> +
destination, rarely by <u>apo</u> + origin.

<u>dierchomai</u> 'go through' (2,2,10,3,20,6). Often followed by <u>dia</u>, twice with
<u>eis</u> + goal.

<u>eiserchomai</u> 'enter' (37,31,47,14,33,28). Often followed by <u>eis</u>,
occasionally with <u>dia</u> or <u>pros</u>. <u>eiserchomai</u> <u>eis</u> may be indistinguishable from
<u>erchomai</u> <u>eis</u>. Pope (1984,12:4 f.) would like to preserve <u>eiserchomai</u> <u>eis</u>
alone to mean 'enter a building', but <u>erchomai</u> <u>eis</u> clearly can also mean this;
e.g., Mt 8:14, which parallels Mk 1:29, given by Pope.)

<u>exerchomai</u> 'go/come out' (45,39,44,30,29,32). Fairly frequently followed by
<u>ek/ex</u>, or <u>apo</u> or <u>eis</u>.

<u>epanerchomai</u> 'return' (only in Lk 10:35 and 19:15).

<u>eperchomai</u> 'come upon overpoweringly' (0,0,3,0,4,2).

<u>katerchomai</u> 'go down' (0,0,2,0,13,1).

<u>parerchomai</u> 'pass away, go away, come alongside' (7,4,8,0,3,4).

<u>proerchomai</u> 'go further, go ahead of' (1,2,2,0,4,1).

<u>proserchomai</u> 'go/come to' (52,6,11,1,12,9). With goal in the dative.
Matthew's penchant for this word is a notable feature of his style.
Interestingly, proselytos, which occurs in Mt 23:15, is cognate with this
word; see LXX Ex 12:49.

<u>sunerchomai</u> 'come together, come with' (1,3,2,2,17,7).

<u>suneiserchomai</u> 'go/come in with' (only in Jn 6:22 and 18:15).

Thayer's Lexicon lists also <u>epeis-, pareis-, diex-, antipar-, and peri-</u>
<u>erchomai</u>.

        For now let us examine just one passage whose translation is disputed; it
concerns <u>parerchomai</u> in Mk 6:48. It is usually translated something like

"He meant to pass by them." However, J.B. Phillips rendered: "intending to come alongside them." He defends his rendition thus (See Expository Times, July 1984:304): "[It] certainly can mean 'to pass by,' but I know no other Greek word which could have been used to mean 'come alongside'...[and] seeing that earlier in the verse it is stated that Jesus 'comes towards them,' it does not seem reasonable to suppose that he wished to 'pass them by.'" It is true that no other Greek word occurs in the NT with the specific meaning "come alongside" (in fact erchomai para would be the closest; see Mt 15:29; Lk 8:49). Parerchomai, when used referring to ordinary physical motion, only in one case does it clearly mean 'go past' (Acts 16:8), whereas three cases clearly mean 'come up/alongside' (Lk 12:37; 17:7; Acts 24:7). On the other hand, paraporeuomai could have been used in the unambiguous sense "pass by," as in Mk 11:20, 15:29. (Pope suggests paraporeuomai too should mean 'come alongside', and says Mark would have used paragŏ for 'pass by' [1984, 12:5].)

     Now let us look at poreuomai and its compounds:

poreuomai 'go, go off, depart' (28,0,49,16,39,16). This word seems impossible to gloss differently from aperchomai, however, the use is slightly different. An example of this is given by a study of commands of the form "go and do something" in Matthew. Such commands always use poreuomai or hupagŏ, never aperchomai (the nearest to it is in 14:15). hupagŏ, when used in this way, is always in the imperative (the participle of hupagŏ is rare, and not used by Matthew). So Mt 5:24; 8:4; 18:15; 19:21; 21:28; 27:65; 28:10. However, poreuomai when used in this way is always in the participle form, which is in line with Matthew's preference of putting motion verbs into the participle form when followed by any finite verb. The examples of this are found in Mt 2:8; 9:13; 10:7; 11:4; 17:27; 28:7,19. Two exceptions are found in Mt. 22:9 and 25:9. The only reason that the participle is not used here seems to be that the structure of the sentence has put too many words between the two verbs; the necessity of kai shows this.

     In view of the above discussion, it does not seem possible to maintain, as some have, that the command "go" in Mt 28:19 is not as strong as the command "make disciples."

     Like aperchomai, poreuomai is commonly followed by eis or pros plus goal. It is not used by Mark, except it appears three times in the disputed longer ending to the Gospel.

diaporeuomai 'go through' (0,0,3,0,1,1). An occurrence in the Westcott and Hort text at Mk 2:23 is rejected by UBS 3d ed. Greek NT, paraporeuomai instead appearing.

eisporeuomai 'go in' (1,8,5,0,4,0) (there – referring to entering a nearby place, or a place under discussion). The only occurrence in Matthew is a Markan parallel.

ekporeuomai 'come/go out' (6,11,3,2,3,9). This word is used in the famous expression about the Spirit proceeding from the Father Jn 15:26. It also occurs eight times in Revelation. Note how it occurs together with exerchomai in Mt 15:18 seeming to maintain the meaning distinction between the two root words; we could perhaps translate "That which goes out of the

mouth comes from out of the stomach...." This verse provides the best
counterexample to Pope's contention that "compounds of erchomai are used only
in the aorist, future and perfect tenses, while those of poreuomai are used in
the present and imperfect tenses. This complementary distribution is
apparently general in Hellenistic Greek, as it is mentioned in the article on
erchomai LSJ[9] [Liddell, Scott, and Jones, 9th ed.]. These pairs of compound
verbs should, therefore, be treated as single lexemes" (START 12:4). The
quote from Liddell, Scott, and Jones actually reads: "In LXX and Hellenistic
Greek the place of the compounds, especially ex-, eis- erchomai is commonly
taken by ek-, eis- poreuomai, etc., the fut., aor., and pf. being supplied as
before by eluth- (elth-)" (LSJ[9], 1:694). So while this is "commonly" true, it
is not always true, and in Mt 15:18 ekporeuomai and exerchomai both occur in
the present, with apparent contrast.

paraporeuomai 'pass by' (1,4,0,0,0,0). The use in Matthew is a Markan parallel.

prosporeuomai Only in Mk 10:35, where James and John "came forward" with their
request. Note that in the Matthew parallel, it is the mother of James and
John who comes (proserchomai). Perhaps the poreuomai compound puts the
focus to some extent on the leaving (as did aperchomai in Jn 4:47); if so, we
see in Mk 10:35 a slight emphasis that the two left the group of disciples.
This presages their secret request for special privilege.

   Now to agō and its compounds:

agō 'lead, bring, take, go' (4,3,13,12,26,8). (Used in the last sense by
Matthew, Mark. and John, but never by the purist Luke.)

anagō 'bring or lead up; put to sea' (1,0,3,0,17,2).

eisagō 'bring or lead in' (0,0,3,1,6,1).

exagō 'bring or lead out' (0,1,1,1,8,1).

epagō 'bring upon' (only in Acts 5:28, 2 Pt 2:1,5).

epanagō 'go up; put out' (in a boat) (only in Mt 21:18 and Lk 5:3,4).

paragō 'pass by, go away' (3,3,0,2,0,3).

proagō 'go before, bring/take out' (6,5,1,0,4,4). In Mt 21:31 it is tempting
to read in the meaning "take the place of" (favoured by Hill:298). However,
the best rendering is "go before," carrying the connotation "give the lead"
(cf. A&G:709, under proagō 2a. A&G actually place it under meaning 2b,
"go or come before in time," which is certainly true, but not the full story).
Jesus is in effect saying to them, You were supposed to be the ones to lead;
but those whom you despise most gave the lead, and not even then did you go
(verse 32).

hupagō 'go, go off, depart' (19,16,5,29,0,8). Like aperchomai and
poreuomai, often with eis or pros plus goal. Origin never explicitly
indicated.

Miscellaneous Words

<u>ekballõ</u> 'throw out, bring or take out' (25,18,18,6,5,3). This Greek word,
too, has a kind of directional ambiguity, analogous to the kind of thing
discussed above. The GNB translators appreciated this when they rendered Lk
4:29 in its most natural English way, "They rose up, dragged Jesus out of the
town..." (better than NIV "drove him out," note how NIV chooses "dragged" in
Acts 7:58). In the same way Mt 21:39 would be best translated as "dragged him
out of the vineyard and killed him" (LB). If you "cast" (RSV) or "throw"
(NIV, GNB) someone out, it is usually the last thing you do to them. However,
the translators were no doubt influenced by the parallel passages in Mk 12:8
and Lk 20:15, where the order of the story is reversed, and he was killed
first.

Another important case centres on Mk 1:12, which RSV renders "The Spirit
immediately drove him out into the wilderness." (GNB "made him go," NIV "sent
him out"). Firstly, let us consider the point of reference. Why did the NIV
choose "sent out," implying that the Spirit, so recently given to Jesus,
stayed behind? They recognise in Mt 12:20 that the translation "lead out" is
possible for <u>ekballõ</u>. Secondly, is it implied that the action was forcible?
The fact that every other use in Mark (but one, Mk 1:43) implies force (12
times concerning the casting out of demons, besides 10:47, 11:15, and 12:8) is
not decisive; the context here is very different concerning the Spirit, whose
last action was all gentleness. "Drove him out" is much too harsh for
picturing the Spirit, so recently and graciously given, as pushing and goading
Jesus from behind. However the underlying connotations of forcefulness do add
strength to the <u>euthus</u> 'immediately'. Without delay the Spirit takes Jesus
away from his first triumph to his first testing. Note too that it is part
of Mark's style to use "forcible" words, which the other Synoptists avoid (See
<u>The Gospel According to St. Mark</u>, W. C. Allen 1915:19). Translators must
avoid the temptation to smooth out such stylistic traits. The LB's choice of
the verb "urged" is good. Again let us look at possible alternative verbs;
they all either lack the meaning-component "out" or "away," or else would not
reinforce <u>euthus</u> like <u>ekballõ</u> does.

<u>anagõ</u> 'lead or bring up, bring, bring before' (1,0,3,0,17,2). (Mt 4:1) never
used by Mark.

<u>agõ</u> 'lead, bring, go' (4,3,13,13,26,8).   (Lk 4:1) All uses in Mark except
13:11 mean "go."

<u>paralambanõ</u> 'take, take along, receive, accept' (16,6,7,3,6,12).

<u>ekpherõ</u> 'carry or bring out' (0,1,1,0,4,2).

Further Miscellaneous Words

<u>hẽkõ</u> 'have come, be present' (4,1,5,4,0,11). Used just like <u>erchomai</u>;
paralleled by it in Jn 4:54.

<u>deurõ</u> and <u>deute</u> (pl.) 'come (imperative)' (7,4,1,3,2,4). In John the
imperative of <u>erchomai</u> appears only in 11:34; cf. <u>deute</u> in Jn 4:29.
<u>ginomai</u> This common word which often means 'become' also occasionally takes
on the meaning 'come'. This happens four times in John, namely in 1:6, 6:19,
6:21, and 6:25. It is interesting to note that in each of these cases there

are overtones of diving or miraculous action behind the event. This is not
so, e.g., in Lk 10:32 or Lk 22:40. But in this regard note also how
paraginomai is used to set John on the stage in Mt 3:1 and to bring Jesus to
his baptism Mt 3:13.

anabainō 'go/come up' (9,9,9,16,19,20).

katabainō 'go down' (11,6,13,18,19,15).

metabainō 'go/come over, pass on, leave' (5,0,1,3,1,1).

probainō 'go on' (1,1,3,0,0,0). Mt 4:21 and the parallel Mk 1:19. Luke's
three uses in the sense "advanced [in age]."

surō 'drag (e.g., a net of fish)' (0,0,0,1,3,1). I mention this verb because
the RSV translators have appreciated that a different translation is better in
Rv 12:4 "swept down" (instead of "dragged down").

apostellō 'send' (22,20,25,27,26,12).

pempō 'send' (4,1,10,31,11,21).

akoloutheō 'follow' (24,18,17,18,4,7).

airō 'pick up, take, take away' (19,20,20,24,9,7).

pherō 'carry, take, bring' (6,15,4,14,11,15). One compound of phero is
eisphero. Its occurrence at Mt 6:13 is seen by some as a difficulty; do we
really have to ask God not to lead us into temptation? As has been pointed
out, however, the Hebrew hiphil can mean both 'cause' and 'allow', and
biblical Greek reflects this ambiguity. Thus eisphero could equally be taken
to mean 'do not allow/let us to go into temptation' as 'do not cause us
to...'. Compare Mt 8:21 epistrepson 'let me...go' and Mt 8:31 where aposteilon
could well be rendered "let us go".

lambanō ' bring, take, receive' (53,20,23,42,30,83).

These words have compounds too, often with specialised meanings, e.g.,
epilambanō 'catch hold of, take', with the object always a person, in non-
figurative use.

Abbreviations/References

Allen, W. C. 1915. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London.

A&G Arndt, William F., and F. Wilbur Gingrich, trans. and eds. 1957. A
      Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian
      Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago.

AV   The Holy Bible. Authorised (or King James) version. 1611.

Boos, David. 1983.   Greek Verbs of Motion: Their Source, Destination,
      Arrival, and Reference Point. SIL Translation Dept. Microfiche 93(80-
      0559/83-0559). (I have not yet seen this article.)

The Expository Times. Published monthly by T. & T. Clark Ltd.

Fillmore, Charles J. "How to Know Whether You're Coming or Going."
    University of California at Berkeley. Prepublication draft. (There
    are two other articles by Fillmore which I have not seen: "Deictic
    Categories in the Semantics of Come," published in Foundations of
    Language 2, pp. 219-227, and another article "More on Come and Go."

GNB The Good News Bible (Today's English Version). 1976. British ed.
     London: United Bible Societies.

Gundry, Robert H. 1982. Matthew - A Commentary on His Literary and
    Theological Art. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Hill, David. 1972. The Gospel of Matthew. New Century Bible Commentary.
    London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott Publ. Ltd., and Grand Rapids: Wm B.
    Eerdmans Publ. Co.

Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. T. Jones. 1940. A Greek-English
    Lexicon. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

LB The Living Bible. 1971. London: Coverdale House Publisher Ltd.

LXX The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, with an English translation.
     1973. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden. 1897. A Concordance to the Greek Testament.
    Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

NIV The Holy Bible New International Version. 1978. New York International
     Bible Society.

Notes on Linguistics. Published quarterly by the Summer Institute of
    Linguistics.

Pope, Anthony. 1984. "Some Motion Verbs in Mark." START 12:3-6. Dallas:
    SIL. (I read this article just before submitting the final draft of my
    own paper.)

RSV The Holy Bible The Revised Standard Version. 1952. Edinburgh, New York:
     Thomas Nelson & Sons.

TBT The Bible Translator. Published quarterly by the United Bible Societies.

Thayer, J. H., trans. 1889. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, by
    C. L. Wilibald Grimm. 4th ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

UBS The Greek New Testament. 1975. 3d ed. Ed. Kurt Aland, Matthew Black,
     Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren. London, New York:
     United Bible Societies.

Westcott, Brooke F., and Fenton J. A. Hort. [1881] 1948. In the Original Greek.
    Text revised. New York: Macmillan Co.

A Comment on Ross McKerras's Article "Some Ins and Outs of 'Come' and 'Go'"

Bruce F. Turnbull

[Bruce Turnbull has a B.S. in Chem. Engin., and M.S. and a Ph.D. in Chemistry
all from Case Western Reserve University, and a B.D. from Faith Theological
Seminary. Bruce was a Chemistry professor at the college level for 30 years.
Bruce and his wife, Eleanor, began working with SIL in 1985. Bruce is
currently working in the Translation Department in Dallas with his principal
assignment to complete the Semantic Structure Analysis of James.]

     Mr. McKerras has written an interesting and useful article. Without
detracting from his contribution I should like to comment as follows:

     1) Not all of the verbs of motion used in the New Testament are listed.
Actually, because of the strong tendency in Koine Greek to form compound verbs
by the addition of prepositions to the verb stems, I found nearly 170 motion
verbs, about 80% of them compound. (I have included a number of verbs which
entail movement on water.) Many of these verbs are only used once or a few
times in the New Testament, but they add to the complexity of analysis. In
particular, compound verbs often develop meanings other than their etymologies
imply. Thus anablepo 'I receive sight' and anaginosko 'I read' are not merely
verb stems ('I see' and 'I know', respectively) modified predictably by the
preposition ana.

     2) In view of the complexity mentioned above, it seems that McKerras
overstates the case when he says that Greek verbs are not direction-specific
with respect to some reference point (like "come," "go," "bring," "take") but
are neutral (like "approach," "arrive," "carry"). Obviously some are neutral,
but are they all?

     After properly pointing out that direction-specificity in motion verbs is
a language-specific phenomenon (he briefly describes the situation in Tila
Chol [Mexico] and Uripiv [Vanuatu]), he compares Greek motion verbs with
English "come" and "go."

     Fillmore (Deictic Categories in the Semantics of "Come," see McKerras
references) has analyzed "come" and "go" by means of studying how they may be
used with the deictic adverbials "here" and "there." If we define
"participants" as "speakers" (first person) and "hearers" (second person) and
"nonparticipants" as third persons, we may state Fillmore's rules:

     I.   Whatever the subject or tense of the verb GO may be, the place to
          which one GOES is a place where I am not.
     II. The place to which one COMES is a place where I am or where you are.
     III. The place where a nonparticipant COMES is a place where a
          participant is.
     (Note the language-specific asymmetry which permits each of the following
except # 3:
     1. I will come here again tonight.
     2. I will come there again tonight.
     3. I will go here again tonight.
     4. I will go there again tonight.) Fillmore's approach allows him to give
precise definition to the direction-specificity of "come" and "go." (It may be
of interest to note that only "come," "go," "bring," and "take" fit his rules.

And even then he found some idiolectal variation among informants--who would accept the improper "Let's bring these over there"--and he had to allow for "idiomatic" expressions such as "Do you go to school here?")

     With Fillmore's technical analysis in hand, can we find any Greek verbs which are equivalent to "come" and "go"? Obviously the question is difficult because we cannot find native speakers of Koine Greek to serve as informants. We must use the written data we have, and we will not, in this case, be able to reach "certainty". (Ideally, we should formulate comparable rules for Greek verbs.

     The most frequently used motion verb in the New Testament is erchomai. It is used 636 times, and it is overwhelmingly translated (more than 95%) as "come" in English translations. English translators almost certainly have not used Fillmore's rules, but they are/were competent in English and Fillmore's rules describe English usage. Furthermore, in several passages, erchomai is placed in contrast to poreuomai (Mt 8:9; Jn 14:3), a verb which English translators overwhelmingly render as "go", and never as "come". Recognizing that the semantic ranges of erchomai and poreuomai are not the same as "come" and "go," I suggest they correspond closely and that the Greek verbs do have directional-specificity, although perhaps not identical to "come" and "go." (Note that Fillmore found only two pairs which satisfied his rules.) I could find no case where erchomai/poreuomai necessarily violates Fillmore's rules-- although the crucial usages with the deictic adverbials were lacking in the New Testament. The few times when erchomai is translated as "go" can be explained as either an unusual reference point assumed by the speaker for himself or for the hearer (note how the English translations differ), or else it is due to the lack of complete semantic correspondence with "come."

     3) McKerras discusses at some length the meaning of ekballo in Mk 1:12. The etymology suggests the meaning 'I cast out', and the verb can indeed mean this. However, as mentioned above, compound verbs can take on new meanings, and the context is determinative in deciding on the meaning of a word in each case. Since there are clear attestations of usages which lack any connotation of force (e.g. Mt 9:38; Jn 10:4), there is no difficulty in translating ekballei as 'led', 'sent', etc.

CLAUSE LEVEL FOCUS IN JOHN'S GOSPEL AND PRAGMATIC STRUCTURE

Stephen M. Swartz

[Steve Swartz has a B.A. in Philosophy from Huntington College in Indiana and has done post-graduate work at both the Dallas and Oklahoma SIL schools. He is currently pursuing a Master's degree with the Pacific College of Graduate Studies in Melbourne, Australia. He and his wife, Bev, have worked with SIL as translators among the Warlpiri people of Central Australia since 1978.]

     Recently, in the course of preparing to translate John's Gospel, I have been impressed by several salient features in the Greek text which are also referred to in commentaries. In particular I have become aware of the significance of the ordering of the clause level constituents and the mechanism(s) by which the author, John, selected particular persons/items/ ideas for special prominence or thematicity. However, commentaries and Greek

grammars often speak of such items as being "in focus" or as "marked for special emphasis" without clearly or consistently defining the basis for such statements, for example:

John 5:19   ou dunatai ho huios poiein aph-heautou ouden
             'not (it) is possible the son to do of himself nothing.'
John 5:30   Ou dunamai ego poiein aph-hemautou ouden
             'not can (I) I to do of myself nothing.'

I found the following comments in commentaries and helps available at the time. From Newman and Nida (1980:162), "Here, as in verse 19, the word nothing is in the emphatic position." From Morris (1971:323, footnote 87) quoting Barrett (1955), "the order [both in v. 19 and v. 30] of words lays great stress on ouden." The expressed implication is that the order of the words is what determines the emphasis placed upon the particular constituent ouden.

However in John 9:33 we find ouk edunato poiein ouden 'not (he) is able to do nothing', for which Morris (1971:492, footnote 45) says, "Note the emphatic double negative...." Further on in John 11:49 we find Humeis ouk oidate ouden 'You not (you) know nothing'. Here Newman and Nida state (1980:381) "What fools you are! is literally 'you do not know nothing', in which 'you' and 'nothing' are emphatic." Morris (1971:566, footnote 99) notes for this verse the presence of "an emphatic double negative" but does not make any mention of word order as being the determining principle involved.

Partly on the basis of such examples, two questions present themselves: in John's Gospel particularly, what is the role of word order in determining marked structures, and what is the significance of such marked structures? Such questions are of special significance for those involved in Bible translation. It is difficult enough to transfer words and phrases accurately from one language to another, but even more difficult to make certain that emphasis, prominence, or thematicity at a particular point is handled correctly. Failure to do so can result, at worst, in total incomprehensibility or, at best, in a passage that is either hopelessly bland or unnaturally intense with one element after another being emphasized or thematicized in rapid and incoherent fashion. We need to analyze both the Greek text and the target language to define objectively (with as little recourse as is necessary to "intuition" or the cross-quoting of "authorities") the role of word order in determining themes, topics, and prominence.

My own interest in this area has come about as the result of research I am doing as part of a graduate degree program. During an eight-year period of involvement in translation, Mark's Gospel and half of the book of Genesis have been published. Colossians, James, and most of Acts are in various stages of preparation for publication. I have not attained, by any stretch of the imagination, the proficiency of native-speakers, yet I have developed a "feel" for the language, largely because of my involvement in the translation process which is, of course, dependent upon the input of native speakers. Observing how they reorder and rework my attempts at expressing a passage in language has confirmed over and over again that it is possible to achieve grammatical correctness (getting all the words right) while at the same time failing to achieve pragmatic correctness, thereby losing the flow of what is being said.

What is pragmatic correctness? Languages can be described as being somewhere on a continuum between fixed word-order languages (such as English), which are more syntactically-based, and the so-called "free" word order languages, which are more pragmatically-based--a prime example of which is Warlpiri. In syntactically-based languages, such as English, grammatical subjects and objects are determined primarily by the ordering of the words, and "deviation from the basic syntactically defined word order indicates an unusual situation" (Mithun:69). Subjects of both active and passive verbs normally occur first in the clause, and any deviation from this norm results in a marked structure, the significance of which is variously described in terms of special focus, prominence, or thematicity. In pragmatically-based languages, however, all orderings are marked, the significance of which is described again in terms of special focus, prominence, or thematicity.

Warlpiri, as a pragmatically-based language, presents to the non-native speaker a bewildering array of sentence orderings, apparently selected for no better reason than the speaker's whim. The outsider's conclusion that "any ordering is as good as another as long as all the right words are there" soon founders on the rocks of miscommunication. Warlpiri obligatorily marks by means of pronominal suffixes in every clause the subject and, assuming there is one, either the object or indirect object. None of these three, however, needs be represented by an overt noun or free pronoun. The constituents AGENT, VERB, and OBJECT could, in theory, occur in any one of six combinations. The inclusion in a sentence of various time or locative words increases the potential number of combinations dramatically. Some orderings are, however, much more likely than others. Furthermore, either the AGENT or the OBJECT or both could be deleted from the sentence without the complete loss of information retrievable from the context. Such deletions, made possible by the pronominal suffixes, commonly result in verb-only sentences in Warlpiri of the type (He/she/it) shut (it). Such flexibility presents the translator with the challenge of examining every sentence to ensure that the word ordering reflects in Warlpiri the thematic and emphatic choices found in the Greek text. From a personal point of view, one would like something a little more solid than "intuitive feel" or subjective listener reaction with which to evaluate one's translation.

Though hardly related genetically, Warlpiri and Koine Greek bear some significant resemblances. Due both to the extensive usage of nominal case suffixes and person/number inflection within the verb phrase itself, both Warlpiri and Koine Greek are more flexible than English, at least in terms of word order. It can reasonably be argued that, like Warlpiri, Koine Greek is also pragmatically based, which means that all orderings reflect some degree of pragmatic consideration. Koine Greek is somewhat less flexible than Warlpiri in that, while nouns are clearly marked for NOMINATIVE or ACCUSATIVE case, verb inflection gives clear indication of the person and number of only the subject of the verb and not also, as in Warlpiri, the object or indirect object. Objects and/or indirect objects must be represented by overt nouns or pronouns, otherwise the information is not retrievable from the context.

My thesis research to date has involved the development of an objective means of determining the level of naturalness in a piece of translated Scripture. To do this, I have done extensive statistical analysis of Warlpiri oral, dictated, written, and translated Scripture texts looking at such things as the ordering of syntactic constituents, degree of subordination, use of conjunctions, and the length of sentences. This has proved useful in showing

conjunctions, and the length of sentences. This has proved useful in showing
that, with a very few exceptions, Scriptures translated to date into Warlpiri
fall within acceptable statistical limits when compared with natural Warlpiri
text. That is, the Scripture translation bears a reasonably close resemblance
to natural text. However, such statistical studies fail to show whether we
have been successful in matching the original Greek text in terms of the
pragmatic structure of the Greek. That is, have we maintained the theme or
topic throughout the narrative as did the original author, or have we elevated
some minor participant to a level of undue importance? Have we translated in
such a fashion that the listener fails to get the main point of the narrative,
of the paragraph, or of the sentence?

In John's Gospel, the Greek shows a strong tendency for verbs to occur
clause initially. A relatively high percentage of clauses consist of verbs
unaccompanied by overt SUBJECT nouns or pronouns. Thus, similar to Warlpiri,
overt SUBJECT nouns and especially pronouns bear a significance not paralleled
in English. What is that significance?

Consulting Greek grammars results in a relative paucity of information
along these lines. Chase and Phillips (1961) introduce the various pronouns
throughout their textbook, but without any indication as to how they are used
or why. There is no mention of the salient fact that personal pronouns do not
have to be used, for instance as in English, in order for there to be a well-
formed sentence. Dana and Mantey (1955:122-123) devote a little more space,
but not much, to the topic and have this to say, "The pronominal subject of a
finite verb is ordinarily not expressed, the person and number of the subject
being indicated by the verbal ending. When the personal pronoun is used, it
is for emphasis." They note further (1955:123):

> Winer declares that the personal pronoun "nowhere occurs without
> emphasis" (W. 153). Robertson, however, thinks that "this is not quite
> true of all examples," and cites Gildersleeve in support of his position
> (R. 676). Moulton concurs in this opinion (M. 85). As a matter of fact,
> there appear varying degrees of emphasis, being sometimes perfectly
> obvious, but shading off to where it is very obscure (cf. Jn. 3:10 and
> Lk. 19:2). On the whole, Winer is likely correct, because the simple
> fact that the personal pronoun is a repetition of the subject expressed
> in the verb lends at least some degree of emphasis. The emphasis is
> generally antithetical (Mt. 5:28), though it may be used merely to give
> prominence to a thought (Col. 1:7).

In the above quotation, it must be born in mind that what is meant by
"personal pronoun" can only refer to such pronouns when they are functioning
as SUBJECTS. In such cases, as noted, they provide the same person and number
information as is carried by the verb inflections. Personal pronouns in
either GENITIVE, DATIVE, or ACCUSATIVE case carry person and number
information not provided by either the verb inflection or any other clause
constituent. That is, such personal pronouns carry information that is not
retrievable elsewhere in the clause. Referring to pronouns in the NOMINATIVE
case, I agree that the mere presence of an overt pronoun is of special
significance in that the author intended thereby to lend some sort of
prominence to the SUBJECT. However, there is more to the problem than this.

In the vast majority of first, second, or third person SUBJECT pronouns
in the New Testament, the pronoun occurs first in the clause. This is often

Christos 'Why then do you baptize, if YOU are not the Christ?' Here, as in
all such instances where a noun or pronoun occurs before the verb, I believe
that it is necessary to ask not only why did the author/speaker do so, but
what would be the significance of an alternative ordering? The order of the
conditional clause could easily have been ei ho Christos ouk estin su. Not
only would such a clause-final positioning of su be rare, it would put
inappropriate prominence on ho Christos which in this context has already been
established as the theme. For the speaker to do so would assume, I argue,
that the title "Messiah," in contrast to the class of possible titles or
positions, was being tried out on John the Baptist for appropriateness. This
has already been done in John 1:20 and 21 where the various indentities are
suggested and rejected. The ordering as actually found in John 1:25 Ti oun
baptizeis ei su ouk ei ho Christos assumes the current theme as "the Messiah,"
and draws special attention to the addressee, su, as being but one of the
class of potential owners of the title. As is, the ordering places the
contrastive emphasis on "You!"

        The contrastive and focusing nature of the pre-verb position on nominals
is most clear in John 1:20-21: The ordering Ego ouk eimi ho Christos assumes
"Christ" as the topic under discussion and contrasts John with all the other
potential "Christs." Elias ei assumes "John" as topic and selects "Elias"
out of the class of possible identities which he might have assumed. Ho
prophetes ei su does the same thing; the ordering assumes "John" as topic and
contrasts "the prophet" as one member of the set of possible identities. Here
su lends emphasis to John, but still assumes him as the current topic under
discussion.

        One other set of examples will, I think, give clear proof that any item
which occurs before the verb in John's Gospel is there to indicate thematic
focus, more precisely, contrastive selection out of a set of related items.
Such focusing assumes the presence of another item, idea, or person as the
current theme. In John 6 there are seven occurrences of what is normally
translated into English as "come down from heaven" or "came down from heaven."
A quick check of eight English versions reveals that, without exception, the
ordering of the two major constituents "come/came" and "down from heaven"
always places the verb first. This, however, blurs a subtle but important
pragmatic choice by the original speakers/writer. In John 6:33, 6:38, and
6:41 the ordering is verb/participle-prepositional phrase: (33)katabainon ek
tou ouranou 'he/that which comes down from heaven', (38)katabebeka apo tou
ouranou 'I have come from heaven', and (41)ho katabas ek tou ouranou 'which
came down from heaven'. Verses 33 and 38 report Jesus' words, and vv. 41 is
the Jews' verbatim quoting of those words. In this particular discourse, the
theme of which is "heavenly bread," the contrast has already been made between
earthly bread that spoils and heavenly bread that lasts (27), and between
bread supplied (supposedly) by Moses and that which is really from heaven. So
the notion of the heavenly source of this bread is already firmly established
as theme by Jesus and implanted in his listeners' minds. Therefore, coming to
v. 33, Jesus lays special emphasis not on the source "heaven," which source
is already within the context as a theme, but on "the one coming" from there.
Thus, the initial participle precedes the prepositional phrase. Jesus then
identifies this one as Himself (35). The focus of attention has thus shifted
from the source of the heavenly bread to the One who is that bread. This
focus shift away from the source to the person is clearly indicated in vv. 38
and 41 by the post-verb positioning of the prepositional phrase.

The word order shift found in John 6:42 _Ek_ _tou_ _ouranou_ _katabebeka_ 'Out of heaven I have come down' is, I think, indicative of the sneering attitude of the Jews. Whereas v. 41 was a verbatim quote of Jesus' claim, this is followed on in v. 42 by a discussion of what they presume to know concerning Jesus' real identity; that is, the same Jesus whose father Joseph and mother they well know. This being the conclusion drawn from their experience, the ordering "out of heaven" which now precedes "has come down" shows that they are contrasting Jesus' claim of heavenly origin with one of the set of possible and likely origins, specifically Nazareth--source not person focus. They "know" the person, they are challenging the source. This pragmatic reordering is not adequately reflected in most English translations.

Jesus then goes back through his argument as it were a second time, this time arguing from their point of view and from their assumptions. John 6:50 _ho_ _ek_ _tou_ _ouranou_ _katabainon_ 'the one out of heaven coming down' contrasts the heavenly source with the earthly source of the bread in v. 49. The contrast continues in v. 51 _ho_ _ek_ _tou_ _ouranou_ _katabas_ 'which out of heaven came down'. Note here that he first re-asserts his identity _ego_ (emphatic position) _eimi_ _ho_ _artos_ _ho_ _zon_ 'I (I) am the bread the living' before focusing on the true source. In v. 58 Jesus again contrasts the two sources of the bread, thus the ordering _ho_ _ek_ _tou_ _ouranou_ _katabas_ 'which from heaven came down'. Such variations of orderings can hardly be accidental nor should they be dismissed as mere reflections of John's love for repetitive variation. Each variation in word order is indicative of underlying thematic choices.

What then does this mean for translation? In a language such as English which is not pragmatically based, focus is often indicated not by word order, but through the vocal stress or emphasis on certain words. This is difficult, if not impossible, to reflect in the printed form, but could still be handled through the use of alternative reorderings reflecting pragmatic choices which I believe have been made in John's Gospel. For instance, John 6:42b could be phrased, albeit somewhat unfelicitously, "How, then, does he say that it is from heaven that he came down?" Likewise for John 6:50 "But the bread which from heaven comes down...," John 6:51 "I am the living bread that from heaven came down," and John 6:58 "This, then, is the bread that from heaven came down." At least in this one area concerning pragmatic orderings, the translation problem is somewhat lessened when going from the Greek to a language like Warlpiri because the focusing strategies are similar.

In that few, if any, of the standard commentaries make anything more than passing attempts at addressing the thematic and emphatic choices in each sentence, what can be done? At this point I confess feelings of inadequacy in applying the required analysis to the Greek text. I would hope others more qualified would feel led to address the issue. If what I have argued for in this paper bears any resemblance to what is actually occurring in the Greek, then it bears special significance for all who are translating Scripture into pragmatically-based languages. It further behooves such translators to take the time and invest the energy necessary to investigate more fully these particular aspects of discourse.

REFERENCES

Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Bruce Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, eds. 1966.
    The Greek New Testament. London: United Bible societies.

Chase, Alston Hurd, and Henry Phillips, Jr. 1961. A New Introduction to
    Greek. 3d ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dana, H. E., and Julius R. Mantey. [1927] 1955. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New
    Testament. New York, Toronto: The Macmillan Company.

Mithun, Marianne. "Is Basic Word Order Universal?" (mimeographed paper to
    appear in Coherence and Grounding in Discourse. Ed. Russell Tomlin.
    Amsterdam: John Benjamin's.

Morris, Leon. 1971. The Gospel According to John. The New International
    Commentary on the New Testament. Gen. ed. F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids:
    Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Newman, Barclay M., and Eugene A. Nida. 1980. A Translator's Handbook on
    the Gospel of John. London: United Bible Societies.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

NEW, Now available:

A Directory of Exegetical Aids for Translators compiled by Tony Pope.
    This directory covers reference works, commentaries, and other works that
    should be of help to Bible translators in their exegesis. It is intended
    both for those who are proficient in the original languages and for those
    who are not. It is almost entirely restricted to books in English.

Handbook for Mother Tongue Translator Programs compiled and edited by Jerry
    Allen. The information in this handbook is directed toward personnel
    involved in a Mother Tongue Translator (MTT) program, particularly those
    who are responsible for organizing and conducting a MTT project. An
    attempt has been made to summarize the information so that the handbook
    can be useful in the many varying situations in different countries. It
    is intended as a set of guidelines and ideas--essentially an orienta-
    tion as to what is involved in MTT programs. Another purpose is to give
    an overview of the framework, the components and the dynamics that are
    essential in a MTT program.

A Summary of the Old Testament compiled by Barbara E. Hollenbach. This
    summary was distributed by the Mexico Branch for a number of years, but
    that distribution will now be through the Dallas Bookstore. It is meant
    to help Bible translators to prepare material needed to understand the
    New Testament. Virtually every incident referred to in the New Testament
    has been included in this summary. It can be helpful for those in the
    early stages of translation, whose language situations make it important
    to give more emphasis to the Old Testament.

Bible Translation: An Introductory Course in Translation Principles by
    Katharine Barnwell. (3d ed. rev.). This Bible Translation manual is
    written primarily for those who are preparing to translate the Bible
    into their own mother tongue. It can be used as a textbook... The
    translator should gain an in-depth understanding of the principles of

Bible translation, and ...should be able to apply these principles
effectively to achieve an accurate and meaningful translation" (preface).

Questions for Testing Translations. These questions cover the books of
Galations through Philemon. The main purpose of using questions to test
translations is to discover whether the correct message is being
effectively communicated in a translation, and also to discover any
places in the translation where wrong meaning is being communicated,
or where the meaning is unclear.

—   —   —

FIESTA (FAST INTERACTIVE EDITOR of SCRIPTURE and TEXT ANALYSIS) by John Alsop.
Although it is still being refined, it is now being made available through the
International Translation Department. Also available is the UBS Greek text
with Friberg's grammatical tags in FIESTA database format (9 diskettes) and
the NIV in FIESTA database format (5 diskettes). These are only available to
SIL members for research and study purposes, with the understanding they will
not make copies for third parties or use the database in published form
without prior written permission. If this database is used in the production
of an article or book, please acknowledge the source and mention the use made
of the materials.

NOTE: The Frieberg Greek FIESTA database is designed to run on an MS-DOS
system with at least 640K of internal RAM and it requires a little more then 3
megabytes of dish space to load. The NIV FIESTA database requires at least
327K of internal RAM plus a little over 1.5 megabytes of disk space. The
cost is $2.00 per diskette plus shipping case and postage.

FIESTA is a text processing system that provides a number of interactive
operations for large amounts of text--even a whole New Testament. Some of the
features it provides are: text display, concordance, word lists, word counts,
and spelling change. It is possible to change from one operation to another
at the touch of a function key.

Furthermore, FIESTA allows one to define supra-textual elements, which can
be manipulated in the same way as the textual lexical items. This makes a
powerful combination for text analysis. Not only can one make concordance
searches for these supra-textual elements, but one can make concordance
searches for combinations of supra-textual elements and lexical items. A
natural application of supra-textual elements is grammatical labeled
bracketing. Another is parsing for the Greek New Testament.

Although easily available, the supra-textual elements do not unnecessarily
clutter up a display. FIESTA normally suppresses them in the screen display,
but they are easily called at the touch of a function key. Geoff Hunt
(Horsleys Green, England) is also a distributor of these materials.

The UBS Greek text with Friberg grammatical tags and the NIV English text in
standard format are also available for $2.00 a diskette.

—   —   —

NOTE to START subscribers: This is the last issue of START. You will begin
receiving OPTAT (Occasional Papers in Text Approaches to Translation, edited
by Robert Longacre) in place of START. Each issue of OPTAT may have twice
as many pages as START, so the cost will need to be proportionately higher.

The following cumulative index for START 0-16 is in two parts. The first part is a simple issue by issue listing of all articles by page reference, title, and author. The second part, beginning on page 53, is a "keyword in context" index. Keywords from the title and author citations of part one are listed alphabetically down the center of the page, with context on both sides and the issue number and page reference at the far right. The entries are rotated; that is, when the left context is short, excess right context is displayed at the far left, and vice versa. In such cases, there is a separation of at least three spaces between the end of one and the beginning of the other. If the context is not full enough to identify the article, look up the given issue and page reference in part one of the index to find the complete title and author citation. The keyword index includes entries for every auther and other significant words in titles, thus giving a rudimentary subject index.

Preissue 0, January 1979

Number 1, January 1980

Number 2, August 1980

Number 3, March 1981

Number 4, June 1981

Number 5, October 1981

Number 6, March 1982

Number 7, June 1983

Number 8, September 1983

Keyword index