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ABSTRACT

This study integrates three independent subjects—translation theory, Mandarin aspect, and Greek aspect—for the purpose of formulating a working theory applicable to translating the New Testament. Aspect is treated here as a grammatical category—as opposed to Aktionsart—and is described as the locutionary agent’s subjective viewpoint expressed morphologically by a verb. The primary objectives are defined in terms of grammatical translation of Greek aspect into Mandarin aspect at the discourse level. However, major Bible translation issues pertaining to lexical, phonological, formal, and functional elements, as well as translating conditional statements and figurative speech, are also considered. A historical overview of the Chinese Bible is provided as a way of introducing major issues related to linguistic, conceptual, and logistical challenges.

Porter’s tripartite model of aspect in Greek, defined in terms of the binary oppositions [+perfective], and [+imperfective] vs. [+stative], is adopted. Aspect in Mandarin closely resembles that in Greek, except that the privative opposition [+remote] does not exist in Mandarin. Also, unlike the tense-forms in Greek, morphologically expressed aspect morphemes (e.g. -le, IDVCs) are largely optional in Mandarin. Thus, notions of markedness and grounding become pertinent when the 0 morpheme is used instead of morphologically expressed aspect morphemes to translate all five tense-forms in Greek: the more heavily marked disyllabic verbs are preferable in translating the present and imperfect, whereas the less heavily marked monosyllabic verbs are preferable to translate the aorist. The most heavily marked four-character set phrases are utilized to reflect both
the stative aspect and discourse function of the perfect and pluperfect as frontgrounding tense-forms.

It is argued that morphologically expressed perfective and imperfective aspect morphemes are preferable to the ø morpheme. The more heavily marked two-morpheme aspect compounds (e.g. zài...-zhe) are employed to reflect the foregrounded prominence indicated by the present and imperfect tense-forms. The proposed theory provides the translator with a powerful tool, which is tested in the two sample passages in John 18–19 and 1 Corinthians 15. Provided also are critical reviews of over sixty Chinese Bible versions, Nestorian, Manichaean, Catholic documents, and a translation written according to the proposed theory.
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<td>The author's translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>Josiah Goddard's NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GURY</td>
<td>Gury Karpov's Orthodox NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GÜ</td>
<td>Medhurst/Gützlaff/Bridgman's version (NT 1837)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKBS</td>
<td>Hong Kong Bible Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC</td>
<td>Joseph Hsiao's Catholic NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Theodore E. Hsiao's NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBS</td>
<td>International Bible Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDVC</td>
<td>Imperfective Directional verb-complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG</td>
<td>St. Ignatius Monastery's Gospels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBS</td>
<td>Japanese Bible Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCV</td>
<td>Japanese Colloquial Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>Griffith John's easy wenli version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNM</td>
<td>Griffith John's Mandarin NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRV</td>
<td>Japanese Revised Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJV</td>
<td>King James Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Living Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS</td>
<td>London Missionary Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LÜ</td>
<td>Lü Chen-chung’s version (1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>Lassar and Marshman’s version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>Robert Morrison’s version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSV</td>
<td>Medhurst and Stronach’s version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>New American Bible (Catholic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASB</td>
<td>New American Standard Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBSS</td>
<td>National Bible Society of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV</td>
<td>New Chinese Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIV</td>
<td>New International Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSV</td>
<td>New Revised Standard Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLT</td>
<td>New Living Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>Peking Committee’s NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAGUET</td>
<td>Raguet’s NT (Japanese; Catholic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCUV</td>
<td>Revised Chinese Union Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL/TL</td>
<td>Receptor language/Target language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>Resultative verb-complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Studium Biblicum Franciscanum’s version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>Schereschewsky’s easy wenli version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Source language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-MOR</td>
<td>Morrison’s transcript of the Sloane MS #3599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYD</td>
<td>Sydenstricker’s NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBS</td>
<td>Taiwan Bible Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEV</td>
<td>Today’s English Version (= Good News Bible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNIV</td>
<td>Today’s New International Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRNT</td>
<td>Taisho Revised New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBS</td>
<td>United Bible Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV</td>
<td>Union Version (Mandarin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVB</td>
<td>Union Version (Baptist wenli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVE</td>
<td>Union Version (easy wenli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVW</td>
<td>Union Version (wenli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Verb complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANG</td>
<td>Wang Hsüan-chen’s NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBS</td>
<td>Worldwide Bible Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>Wu Ching-hsiung’s version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAN</td>
<td>Yan Fu’s Mark 1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZHU</td>
<td>Zhu Baohui’s NT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TYPOGRAPHICAL CONVENTIONS

a. Chinese Characters, Punctuation, and Style

The term “Chinese” generally refers to both the language and writing style. In the discussions of verbal aspect, it is used interchangeably for the most part with “Mandarin.” Dialectical differences in Chinese are not considered. For the sake of consistency, Chinese characters are represented in traditional form as opposed to in simplified script, which has been implemented in China since 1956. *Hanyu Pinyin* 漢語拼音 is adopted here as the standard system for transcribing Chinese. To avoid confusion, the current study follows a modified system of style and punctuation: a full character-sized comma [ ’ ] for a comma, a full character-sized semicolon [ ; ] for a semicolon, a stroke [ ‾ ] for connecting a series of words, a small circle [ 。 ] for a period, a full character-sized exclamation mark [ ! ] for an exclamation, a full character-sized question mark [ ? ] for a question mark, and two full character-sized vertical dots [ : ] for a colon. Emphasis is marked by a dot (e.g. 既爾髮皆色見數) or circle (e.g. 也都歷歷可數) above the character. Direct quotations are marked by the symbols [ ‘ ] and [ ’ ], and [ „ ] and [ ‾ ] for a quotation within a quotation. Parenthetical statements are enclosed by pointed brackets [ ⟨ ] and [ ⟩ ]. Textual variants and other notes are included in the text, and are indicated by square brackets [ [ ] and [ ] ]. Notes are written in font half the size of a full Chinese character; for example, 有一些人已死去 (1 Cor 15:6). Proper names—with the exception of耶穌基督 (Jesus Christ), 神/上帝 (God), 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)—are underlined (e.g. 約翰). Book titles are enclosed by double pointed brackets (e.g. 《創世紀》).
Chapter and verse breaks in the translated text will follow conventional practice, for example, 《約翰福音》第十八章 refers to John 18. Two spaces equivalent to two Chinese characters are inserted in front of the text to indicate the beginning of a new pericope. For the sake of convenience, all Chinese texts (in Chinese characters and transliteration) are represented in the western left-to-right, top-to-bottom format. Also, Chinese script is consistently presented in traditional characters.

b. Tetragrammaton

The so-called “term question,” that is, whether to call God Shàngdì 上帝, Shén 神, or Tiānzhǔ 天主, has persisted throughout the history of Chinese Bible translation. The main issue seems to be related to the lack of uniqueness of these terms in Chinese. The challenge must have faced the translators of the Septuagint, for the existing Greek word ἄ掺 has been used to refer to the pantheon of pagan deities. In fact, early Protestant translators of the Bible adopted a traditional practice known as táitōu 抬頭 (lit. “lifting the head”), which is similar to the effect of capitalizing the first letter of the word “God” in English. One form of táitōu, called nuótái 襷抬 (lit. “shifting”), is the practice of leaving a space equivalent to a Chinese character in front of the person’s name so as to show respect. For example, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is often referred to as Xiān zōngtōng Jiàng gōng 蒋公 (lit. “late President Chiang gōng”). Some Chinese versions (e.g. GÜ, SJ, BB, UVE, UVB, UV 1988, SYD, NCV) have taken advantage of nuótái, but with exclusive reference to God. Nuótái seems to provide a plausible remedy

---

2 Gōng denotes a respectful address to an elderly man.
to the current terminological debate for God in Chinese, and hence will be adopted as a consistent form to refer to God, or Shên, in the study.

c. Chinese Pronouns for the Divinity

Besides nuótái, another useful but controversial device that may amplify the uniqueness of God in Mandarin Chinese is the personal pronoun Tā 祂 is a relatively recent invention of a Mandarin third-person singular pronoun used exclusively with reference to God in the Christian Bible. It first appeared in Wang Hsüan-chen’s Mandarin New Testament in 1933. The Mandarin divinity personal pronoun 祂 is a modification of three existing Chinese pronouns: 他 (masculine singular, “he”), 她 (feminine singular, “she”), and 牠 (neuter singular, “it” as in animals) all of which are pronounced tā. The radical 亻 (“person”) in the common masculine singular pronoun 他 has been replaced with the radical 神 (“divinity”) to form the new pronoun 祂. 祂 should not to be confused with it which has the radical 衣 meaning “clothing.” While some versions use this pronoun exclusively for God (LÜ 1946, 1952, CPB), others have extended it to reference Jesus (WANG, BT, HS, CNT, CLB, CRV, SB), and even the Holy Spirit (CRV, SB, CLB). The second-person singular pronoun nǐ 你 is formed in accordance with the

---

4 Wang 王宣忱, The New Testament. With the exception of CNT, the divinity pronoun 祂 was not used in early Catholic versions prior to recent publication of the CPB and the electronic version of SB. See Chinese Pastoral Bible. Unfortunately, the online version of the SB grossly misrepresents 祂 with 祂. This negligence is unacceptable in Bible translation. See Dian zì sheng jing.
5 The two Mandarin pronouns 她 and 牠 were also new characters, but both appeared in writing a few decades earlier than 祂. See, for example, Mathews, Chinese-English Dictionary, s.v; Mathews, Mathews’ Chinese-English Dictionary, s.v.
6 In his 1970 Bible edition, Lù Chen-Chung dropped 祂 from use entirely. Lù 吕振中, Holy Bible.
7 E.g. Heb 10:15 reads Shènglíng yè dāi wǒmén zuò jiànzhèng, yīn wéi Tā shuō-guò 聖靈也對我們作見證，因他說過・・・ (CRV); the SB online version has Shèngshén yè gěi wǒmén zuòzhèng, yīn wéi yī shuō-guò 聖神也給我們作證，因他 (sic) 說過: the CLB has Shènglìng yè xiàng wǒmén zuòzhèng, Tā shōuxiān shuō 聖靈也向我們作證，他首先說. The UV (新標點和合本) does not use 祂 in the biblical text; only once in the subject heading Shèn wèi Tā érzi zuò de jiànzhèng 聖為祂兒子作的見證 (“God’s Testimony for His Son,” 1 John 5:6). However, this is likely a typographical error, since the revised UV
same principle as 上, but is less commonly used. Only the CLB version has used 聖 to refer exclusively to God and Jesus. One objection to the use of 聖 is that it is a word that already existed (variant form of 上) and is used as a surname with the alternative pronunciation 仍.

However, despite the creative and inspiring efforts of these new Chinese pronouns, 祂 and 祀, which emphasize the uniqueness of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity, many oppose their use in Bible translation. The arguments are largely theologically motivated, but linguistically inspired. Most importantly, from the linguistic point of view, the use of the divinity pronouns in Mandarin is unwarranted by the Greek and Hebrew of the original biblical texts. For this reason, the personal pronouns 祂 and 祀 are not adopted in this dissertation.
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Since its beginnings in the seventh century C.E. to the early twentieth century, the enterprise of Bible translation into the Chinese languages had been long dominated by western Christian missionaries.\(^1\) Legacies of heavy western influence are still felt today, even though the task of translating the Bible into Chinese has been largely undertaken by native speakers. English, in particular, has become the single most important language in defining the essential character—as well as identifying the fundamental problems—of the Chinese Bible. In many instances, English serves not simply as a medium language to access reference materials (notably the KJV), but as the source language from which the Bible is translated into Chinese, as has been the case since the first Chinese New Testament appeared in 1814.

One of the most significant impacts of heavy reliance upon the English language in the Chinese New Testament may be identified in terms of the treatment of Greek verbs. To illustrate the extent of the problem, imagine a scientist who tries to study gorillas and pigs by examining jellyfish. The scientist is the translator, whereas gorillas, pigs, and jellyfish represent Greek, Chinese, and English, respectively. The jellyfish resembles the gorilla insofar as they both have ligaments for maneuvering their bodies. Both Greek and English have verb endings, but the former are used to grammaticalize aspect, whereas the latter are used to indicate temporal location, just as the ligaments of the jellyfish are meant to survive in water, not in land as the gorilla. On the other hand, gorillas and pigs are similar because they are both mammals whose limbs have been adapted to walk on

---

\(^1\) This dissertation was written when the author used the name Liang-her Wu. Subsequent publications by the author are under the name Toshikazu S. Foley 原井敏和 (フォーリー・としだず).
land, just as verb suffixes in Greek and Chinese are utilized to express aspect. Therefore, a Chinese Bible version based on the translator's knowledge of English and Greek verb systems is doomed to be, to say the least, problematic. This problem is especially apparent when translating the stative aspect in Greek by the Mandarin perfective aspect marker -le Ɂ. According to traditional grammarians (e.g. Burton, Gildersleeve, Robertson), the perfect tense-form in Greek is often translated by the perfect tenses (e.g. have + past participle) in English.²

In other words, a good Chinese Bible translation demands that the translator conduct a thorough study of aspect in both the target and the receptor languages. The obstacles in Chinese Bible translation persist today not because of a lack of interest in the subject, but rather because of a vacuum in the scholarship of direct interaction between Greek and Chinese. While not surprising, it is frustrating to observe that, while many newer Chinese versions (e.g. NCV, CRV) emphasize the importance of fidelity to the original languages, none of them incorporates modern linguistic research of aspect in either Greek or Chinese, not to mention aspect in relation to discourse analysis.

The current dissertation integrates three independent subjects—translation theory, Mandarin verbal aspect, and Greek verbal aspect—for the purpose of formulating a working theory applicable to Bible translation. Aspect is defined here as the locutionary agent's (i.e. speaker's, writer's, or utterer's) subjective viewpoint (perfective, imperfective, or stative) expressed morphologically by a verb. The primary objectives and scope of the study are defined in terms of grammatical translation of New Testament Greek aspect into Mandarin aspect at the discourse level. However, it is necessary to also

² See 4.2.4, p. 201 below.
consider major Bible translation issues pertaining to lexical, phonological, formal, and functional elements. In order to demonstrate that the proposed theory can be successfully applied to actual Bible translation, two New Testament passages from different literary genres are chosen: the Passion narrative of the Gospel of John (John 18–19) and Paul’s exposition on the resurrection of the dead (1 Corinthians 15). Over sixty Chinese (including twenty-two Mandarin) versions are critically reviewed. To my knowledge, this is the first monograph-length research into verbal aspect in Greek and in Chinese, with special reference to Bible translation. In addition to aspect, this dissertation attempts to contribute toward the understanding of general aspectual studies, the history of Bible translation and Christian missions in China, and the general practice of Bible translation.

Chapter outlines of the dissertation are as follows: Chapter 1 provides an overall introduction to the subject of the dissertation, with the purpose and scope clearly stated. The chapter concludes with a brief outline of the content of each chapter.

Chapter 2 divides into two parts. The first part provides a comprehensive account of the history of the Chinese Bible, from the arrival of the Nestorian missionaries in China in the seventh century C.E. to the present day. Major issues addressed here include those related to the linguistic, conceptual, and logistical challenges of translating the Bible into Chinese. The second part of the chapter surveys modern translation theories, including critical assessments of major approaches, in particular, by Nida and Catford. Chapter 2 concludes with the methodology of translation theory used for the current study.

Chapter 3 introduces general studies of verbal aspect and examines, in particular, aspect in Mandarin Chinese and New Testament Greek. Aspect is treated here as a grammatical category as opposed to a lexical category or Aktionsart. Porter’s tripartite
model of aspect in Greek is adopted. Similarly, aspect in Mandarin is defined in terms of binary oppositions: [±perfective], and [±imperfective] vs. [+stative]. The difference between the two languages is that the privative oppositions [±remote] found in the imperfective and stative aspects in Greek do not exist in Mandarin. Also, unlike the tense-forms in Greek, morphologically expressed aspect morphemes (e.g. -le 了, zài 在, -zhe 著, as opposed to the ø morpheme) are largely optional in Mandarin. In addition to critical reviews of major approaches to Mandarin aspect, this chapter also surveys early Chinese grammars, especially those by Morrison and Edkins, who were directly engaged in translating the Bible into Chinese. For Greek aspect, the chapter reviews seven monographs published within the last two decades, including those by Porter, McKay, and Fanning. The chapter concludes with outlines of aspect in Mandarin and New Testament Greek, including a detailed treatment of aspect and its relationship to grounding and markedness at the discourse level.

Chapters 4 and 5 primarily deal with the grammatical translation of Greek verbal aspect into Mandarin aspect. Chapter 4 treats five tense-forms (aorist, present, imperfect, perfect, pluperfect) in Greek in the indicative mood, while Chapter 5 treats those in the non-indicative (imperative, infinitive, subjunctive, optative, participles). Discourse considerations, such as the grounding and markedness of Greek tense-forms in relation to prominence and cohesion, are given special attention. It is argued here that, as a general rule, morphologically expressed perfective and imperfective aspect morphemes—either single or compound—are preferable to the ø morpheme. The more heavily marked two-morpheme aspect compounds (e.g. zài...-zhe) are employed to reflect the foregrounded prominence indicated by the Greek present and imperfect tense-forms. On the other hand,
the most heavily marked Mandarin four-character set phrases with the \(\varnothing\) morpheme are utilized to represent the discourse function of the Greek perfect and pluperfect tense-forms as frontgrounding device. However, in contexts where the \(\varnothing\) morpheme is used (for example, due to stylistic considerations) the more heavily marked disyllabic verbs are preferable in translating the Greek present, whereas the less heavily marked monosyllabic verbs are preferable in translating the aorist. In addition to the grammatical translation of Greek verbal aspect into Mandarin aspect, syntactical issues, such as translating different types of Greek conditional statements and different uses of the participles (including periphrastic constructions), are also addressed.

Chapters 6 and 7 provide platforms for testing the validity of the proposed theory of translating New Testament Greek verbal aspect into Mandarin verbal aspect. Two passages from different literary genres are chosen: the Passion narrative of the Gospel of John (John 18–19) and Paul’s exposition on the resurrection of the dead (1 Corinthians 15). Both chapters conduct a first-ever critical and comprehensive review of the writings of the Nestorian, Manichaean, and Catholic missionaries, as well as over sixty Chinese Bible versions. Although the current study primarily focuses on the grammatical translation of aspect, it also addresses several issues crucial to the practice of Bible translation, particularly those regarding phonetic transcription, the translation of key biblical terminology, and figurative speech.

Chapter 7 also serves as the conclusion for the study. The current dissertation has sought to demonstrate that the proposed theory can be successfully applied to translating New Testament Greek aspect into Mandarin aspect. It is argued that Mandarin aspect morphemes not only reflect the corresponding aspect of Greek verb forms, but also
closely represent the discourse functions of the Greek. Provided in chapters 6 and 7 are two summary tables of Mandarin aspect morphemes that are used in five representative Mandarin versions and FOLEY (the author’s own translation) to translate the Greek verb forms in John 18–19 and 1 Corinthians 15. These data provide empirical evidence that the translators of these sample versions have been unacquainted with the discourse functions performed by aspect in either Mandarin or Greek.
CHAPTER 2 BIBLE IN CHINESE: ITS HISTORY, ISSUES, AND RELATION TO MODERN TRANSLATION THEORIES

2.0. Introduction

The subject of Chinese Bible translation is immense and multifaceted. This chapter begins by first tackling the history of and major issues in Chinese Bible translation (2.1). The second section continues with a critical survey of literature in translation studies with special reference to translating the Bible (2.2). The section concludes with a proposed methodology of the translation approach for the rest of the study (2.2.4).

2.1. History of and Major Issues in Chinese Bible Translation

2.1.1. Introduction

This section aims to address major issues related to linguistic, conceptual, and logistical challenges within the framework of a historical survey of Bible translation activities in and outside of China. Primary sources consulted in current investigations include manuscripts and printed versions of the Bible or parts of the Bible in Chinese from archives and libraries, both public and private, from around the world. A comprehensive chronology of the major Chinese versions of the Bible is included in the appendix. Critical reviews of the Chinese versions will be used for discussions and applications in later chapters.
2.1.2. Pioneering Work of the Nestorians and Their Contributions

2.1.2.1. The Nestorian Stele

Bible translation into the Chinese languages began in the seventh century C.E. A reliable source that supports the evidence of the introduction of the Christian faith is the Nestorian Stele from the eighth century. Nestorians were members of a Christian sect that originated in Asia Minor and Syria, and who were later condemned as heretics by the Council of Ephesus in 431. This monument was erected in Chang'an (modern-day Xi'an) in 781 to commemorate the propagation of the Christian faith during the Tang Dynasty (618–906 C.E.). It was composed in Chinese but with a few lines in Syriac by a Nestorian monk named Adam (also known as Jingjing). Adam recounts the arrival of Bishop Alopen in Chang'an in 635 with 530 religious documents in Syriac. Strong evidence suggests that early Nestorian missionaries probably had begun translating at least parts of the Bible into Chinese almost immediately upon their arrival in the mid seventh century.

---

1 This section was originally presented at the SBL/AAR/ASOR 2007 Upper Midwest Regional Meeting held at Luther Seminary, St. Paul, MN, April 13–14, 2007.
2 The Nestorian Stele is also referred to as the Nestorian Monument, Nestorian Stone, Nestorian Inscription, or in its original Chinese title Daqin jingjiào liüxing Zhōngguó běi 大秦景教流行中國碑, literally “Memorial of the Propagation in China of the Luminous Religion from Daqin.” For monograph-length treatments of the Nestorian Stele, see Holm, Carus, and Wylie, The Nestorian Monument; Saeki, Nestorian Monument; P'an, Nestorian Tablet; Feng 靳承均, Nestorian Stele; Pelliot, L’inscription nestorienne. See also various essays in Drake, “Nestorian Literature,” 609–14; Saeki, Nestorian Documents, 7, 11, 27–31, 360–62; Kung, Christian Religion, 16–23.
3 The original Nestorians were identified with the Assyrians. Some believe that their presence in China lasted from around the seventh to tenth centuries. In 1898 Modern Nestorians in Iraq were received in the communion of the Russian Orthodox Church. See Holm, Carus, and Wylie, Nestorian Monument, 35–38.
4 Alopen is known only by his Chinese name “Aluoben” 阿羅本. Saeki suggests it might be the Chinese translation of “Abraham.” See Saeki, Nestorian Documents, 258.
2.1.2.2. Evidence of the Nestorians' Biblical Translation Activities

a. List of Biblical Books

To support the claim that the Nestorians were actively involved in translating the Bible into Chinese, one has to examine the internal evidence from the Stele as well as ancient documents directly related to the Nestorian missionary work in China. First, the most apparent clues of possible existing translations of the Bible in Chinese can be found in the ancient Nestorian documents dated to the early eighth century. Although none of the biblical texts have been preserved from the Tang Dynasty, there are translated titles of canonical books into Chinese that had been discovered in the last century. In 1908, Paul Pelliot discovered over 11 Chinese documents and fragments at Dunhuang Stone Cave in Shazhou, an ancient town 100 miles off the present caravan road to Chang'an. Among these documents is an anonymous work of the early tenth century entitled the Zunjīng or the Diptychs. The Diptychs mentions God, the Holy Trinity, and names of saints (including David, Hosea, the Four Gospel writers, Peter, and Paul). It also contains a list of several canonical writings as well as apostolic and early ecclesiastical/theological teachings, called jīng or "sūtras." The identification of these sūtras remains highly conjectural; however, several of them, such as the Book of Moses, Zechariah, Epistle(s) of St. Paul, and Revelation are clearly

---

5 Pelliot, Mission, 37–38; Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 65.
6 According to Saeki, the Zunjīng is “a list of living benefactors, as well as of the dead who were commemorated in the Divine Liturgy, and whose names were inscribed on the two-leaved ivory tablets.” He suggests the English titles such as “Praise-sūtra” or “Nestorian Book of Praise, dedicated to the Living and the Dead.” See Saeki, Nestorian Documents, 258.
7 For a comprehensive list of Nestorian documents, see Saeki, Catalogue.
8 In Chinese there is no distinction between plural and singular nouns.
canonical. Other sūtras appear to be early church rules and catechism. These may include the Apostles’ Creed (師利海經), 10 Ceremony and Rule Book (儀則律經), Catechism (述略經) (the “Sūtra of Definition”), Baptismal Hymn (三威讚經), 11 and Doctrine of the Cross (慈利波經). 12

The total number of 27 books mentioned on the Nestorian Stele (經留二十部, v. 25) is likely to be merely coincidental to that of the New Testament writings. Both P.Y. Saeki and James Legge argue with great conviction that the twenty-seven books mentioned on the Stele are the canonical books in the New Testament. 13 If one accepts their conclusion, the question must be raised concerning the fact that Nestorian Christians only considered a total of twenty-two books of the New Testament writings as canonical.

b. Evidence from the Nestorian Documents

Second, supporting evidence for the Nestorians’ involvement in Bible translation into Chinese came from the Stele where the actual activities were mentioned: fūn jīng jiàn sì, cūn-mò zhōu hāng (翻經建寺, 存殁舟航) (“With the translation of the Scriptures and the building of convents, we see the living and the dead. All sailing in one Ship of Mercy”). 14

---

9 Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 68–70; Saeki, Nestorian Documents, 274–75. See also Chiu, Tracing Bible Translation, 9–10. Chiu’s list of biblical books in the Diptychs is derived from secondary sources, which often take great liberty and thus erroneously identify several sūtras to be canonical. One example is Ephram-sūtra (邁拂林經), which Chiu erroneously identifies as Ephesians. See Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 70.

10 Shiilhāi 師利海 is the Chinese transliteration of the Syriac word ܡܐܠܢܐ, meaning “apostle.” See Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 69. In ancient Chinese it may have been pronounced as [.ši ˈli̯ ˈtɕʰai̯], as Karlsgren suggests. Karlsgren, Analytic Dictionary, s.v.


12 Cilipō 慈利波 is the transliteration of the Syriac word ܢܐܫܟܐ, meaning “cross.” In ancient Chinese, it could have been pronounced as [.dži̯ ˈli̯ ˈpu̯]. Karlsgren, Analytic Dictionary, s.v. See also Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 70; Legge, Nestorian Monument, 7, n. 10. For additional comments, see 2.2.3, p. 45 below.

13 Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 196.

14 Nestorian Stele, verse 88. English translation is from Saeki. See Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 172. Saeki reports that Jingjing has cooperated with the Kashmir monk Prajña 聲若 to prepare a Chinese translation of the Shatparamita Sūtra (波羅蜜經) in the late eighth century. See Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 72–75.
It is significant that the author of the Diptychs refers to the Gospel evangelists as *fāwàng* 法王 ("catholicos," "saint," lit. "law-king") or *fāzhǔ* 法主 ("law-lord"), the title reserved strictly for the chief priests of a Buddhist sect in China. Nestorian missionaries in China also employ Buddhist terms such as *sēng* 僧 ("Buddhist monk," e.g. on the Nestorian Stele) for Christian monks, *sēngjiā* 僧伽 ("sangha") for Apostles, *dàdè* 大德 ("bhadanta") for bishops, and *sì 寺 ("Buddhist temple") for Christian congregations and monasteries. With few exceptions, however, all subsequent Christian missionaries and Bible translators in China rejected the usage of Buddhist terms and other current religious terms (including those of Taoism and Confucianism) in Christian context. An example of an exception would be Nestorian usage of the term *jīng* (lit. "text," "classics," or "sūtra"), which is retained by Chinese Christians, both Catholic and Protestant, to refer to the Bible, *Shèngjīng* 《聖經》 ("sacred classics").

**c. Further Evidence**

Third, the fact that Buddhist terms were employed on the Stele and other ancient Nestorian documents in Chinese suggests that the Assyrian missionaries may have begun from a very early stage upon their first arrival in Chang'an to translate Buddhist texts into

---

135, 186. See also Drake, "Nestorian," 617. Drake, however, holds a conservative attitude towards the actual translation and literary work undertaken by the Nestorians.


17 "Taoism" refers to "Daojiao" 道教 in Chinese, and is more often spelled "Daoism" in literature appearing in the last twenty years.

18 Ricci has used *Tiānzhǔjīng* 天主經 ("Classics of the Lord of Heaven") to refer to the Bible. See Ricci, *Tiān-chu Shih-i*, 454, line 594.
Whether or not the Assyrians knew enough Sanskrit or Pali to complete the task is another matter, however it clearly indicates that the missionaries were at least well acquainted with Buddhist scriptures in Chinese translations. One could argue that this may also be indicative of their view of translating Buddhist texts as a starting point toward their ultimate goal of translating biblical texts.20

2.1.2.3. Contextualizing the Christian Message in the Chinese Language

Nestorian missionaries in China during the seventh and eighth centuries not only heavily employed terms from Buddhism, a foreign religion introduced to China in the early first century C.E., but also borrowed extensively from indigenous religious traditions in China, especially Taoism. This particularly open and tolerant attitude toward non-Christian religions with regard to biblical translation, as we shall see, is rarely shared by later missionary translators of the nineteenth century. Some of the examples of employing Buddhist and Taoist terms in Christian contexts are shown below. The most noticeable terms adopted are those that refer to the Three Persons in the Holy Trinity in Chinese. Unfortunately, with rare exceptions, the Nestorians’ innovative efforts of indigenizing Christian concepts by means of employing existing religious terms in Chinese were altogether rejected by later missionaries and Bible translators.

2.1.2.4. Naming the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity in Chinese

The Nestorians explored many innovative ways to render the Holy Trinity in Chinese. The most commonly found Nestorian Christian terminologies are examined here:

19 Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 74.
20 Marshall Broomhall reasons with Saeki that “if the Assyrian monks could spare time to translate Buddhist works as well as their own literature, how much more time must they have given to Bible translation!” Broomhall, Bible in China, 20.
a. God

- \textit{Huángfǔ Āluóhē} 皇父阿羅訥 ("Imperial-Father Alahā"): Āluóhē is the Chinese transliteration of אֱלֹהִים, the Syriac word to render God (אֱלֹהִים). In ancient Chinese, 阿羅訥 could have been pronounced as [`.ā lā xā].\textsuperscript{21} It appeared on the Nestorian Stele and the Diptychs of the eighth century.\textsuperscript{22} Āluóhē was used also to transliterate an essential figure in Buddhism, Arhat\textsuperscript{23} (or "Arhan"), meaning "the Fruit of Buddha" (főguó 佛果).\textsuperscript{24}

- \textit{Fó} 佛 ("Buddha"): used exclusively by Bishop Alopen in the \textit{Hsü-T'ing Messiah Sūtra} or the \textit{Jesus-Messiah Sūtra} in the beginning of the seventh century.\textsuperscript{25} Fó is an indigenous word in Chinese meaning "to resemble" (e.g. as in fāngfū 仿佛, "similar to"). In Chinese Buddhism, however, it is generally understood as "completely conscious, enlightened."\textsuperscript{26}

It could be argued that the Buddhist missionaries deliberately picked this particular Chinese character to introduce the new concept of Buddha on the basis of its etymology. The character fó 佛 is formed by the radicals 人 ("man," "human") and 弗 ("not"), and therefore fits nicely with the Buddhist teaching of one's denying and dismissing human passions and desire. While this conclusion may seem possible and illuminating, many

\textsuperscript{21} Karlgren, \textit{Analytic Dictionary}, s.v.
\textsuperscript{22} See Saeki, \textit{Nestorian Documents}, 42.
\textsuperscript{23} Arhat is more commonly referred to as "luohan" 羅漢 in Chinese as well as Japanese. Eitel and Takakukuwa define Arhat 阿羅漢 as "one who deserves oblations" which is "explained by 佛果." An arhat is someone who is exempt from birth 不生 (i.e. from transmigration), or "conquers all passions" 殺貪, or "deserves worship" 應候. See Eitel and Takakukuwa, \textit{Handbook}, 16.
\textsuperscript{26} Soothill et al., \textit{Dictionary}, 225.
standard Chinese lexicons have supported the etymology that the character 弗 is used simply to give the pronunciation of the word rather than anything else. 27

Alopen also uses the term zhūfó 諸佛 ("Buddhas") to refer to the "saints and angels" in the Jesus-Messiah Sūtra. 28 In Buddhism, zhūfó jiā 諸佛家 ("all Buddhas’ home") refers to the home of all Buddhas, that is, the "Pure Land." 29 On the Nestorian Stele, on the other hand, the term miàozhòngshèng 妙眾聖 ("mysteriously giving existence to multitudinous sages") 30 was clearly an adoption of a Taoist term that frequently appeared in the I-Ching to refer to deified folk heroes, "all the gods." 31

- Tiānzūn 天尊 ("celestial being," "god," "heavenly-reverend"): a common Taoist term adopted by Bishop Alopen to refer to the Heavenly Father in the Discourse on the Oneness of the Ruler of the Universe《一神論》in the beginning of the seventh century. 32 Today Chinese Christians prefer the term tiānfù 天父 ("heavenly father").

- Zhēnzhǔ 真主 ("true lord"): a Taoist term used by Adam on the Nestorian Stele. 33

---

27 See for example, Duan and Xu, Shuo wen jie zi zhu, 370.
29 Soothill et al., Dictionary, 450.
30 Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 187.
31 Miǎo zhòngshèng yì yuán zūn zhé 妙眾聖以元尊者。Saeki translates it “bestowing existence on all the Holy Ones.” Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 187. Legge’s translation reads “by His spirit to give existence to all the Holy Ones, Himself the great adorable.” Legge, Nestorian Monument, 3.
32 For an English translation, see Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 174–93. For comments on Tiānzūn and its relationship to other terms for God, see Haneda, “Jesus-Messiah Sūtra,” 441–44. The Discourse on the Oneness of the Ruler of the Universe is now in possession of the Japanese curator Tomeoka Kenzo 寺岡慶蔵 (1871–1918) and is given the date 641 C.E. by Saeki. See Saeki, Nestorian Documents, 114, 21, 24. See also Haneda, “Remarks on the Discourse,” 225–39. Tomeoka is also cited Tomioka, by Moule in Moule, Christians in China, 8 n. 67. See also Drake, “Nestorian,” 681–85.
33 真若。當然真寂。先先而無元。自受真聖。後後而妙有。悲玄極而造化。妙眾聖以元尊者。其唯我三一妙身無元真主向尊而說教。 (Behold! There is One who is true and firm, who is ever incomprehensible and Invisible, yet ever mysterious existing to the last of the lasts; who, holding the Secret Source of Origin, created all things, and who, bestowing existence on all the Holy ones, is the only unoriginated Lord of the Universe—is not this our Aloha the Tribune, mysterious Person, the unbegotten
b. Jesus/Messiah

- **Shizūn** 仏尊 ("universal-reverend"): used by Bishop Alopen to refer to the Lord Jesus Christ in the *Discourse on the Oneness of the Ruler of the Universe* in the beginning of the seventh century.\(^{34}\)

  *Shizūn* is one of the ten and the last of the “epithets of the Buddha” *Buddha-bhagavat* or *Lokanātha*, meaning the “enlightened one who is honored by the people of the world.”\(^{35}\) A similar term, *pūzūn* 普尊 (“universal-reverend”), appeared in Bishop Cyriacus’ document of the early eighth century in China called the *Nestorian Motwa Hymn in Adoration of Trinity* 《大秦景教三威蒙度讚》.\(^{36}\)

- **Yingshēn huàngzì Mishīhē** 應身皇子彌施何 ("Incarnated-royal son-Messiah"): appeared in the Diptychs.\(^{37}\) *Mishīhē* is the Chinese transliteration for the Syriac **כְּרֵסֶת** or for the Hebrew אֲבִית. In ancient Chinese, 彌施何 could have been pronounced as [m, mjē, sje, xā].\(^{38}\) *Yingshēn* is a Buddhist term used to translate the Sanskrit *nirmāṇa-pākāya*, meaning “any incarnation of Buddha.”\(^{39}\)

The Nestorian Stele uses a similar expression to refer to Jesus:

我的三分身尊彌施何。我身真威。同人出代。神立熊座。室女誕聖。
於大秦景宿告祥。波斯鴉權以來賓。


\(^{35}\) Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary, s.v.

\(^{36}\) Saeki, *Nestorian Documents*, 258; text and trans.: 66–68.

\(^{37}\) For the Chinese text, see Saeki, *Nestorian Documents*, 74. An alternative transliteration of Messiah in Chinese, 速師何, also appears in the *Jesus-Messiah Sūtra*.

\(^{38}\) Karlgren, *Analytic Dictionary*, s.v.

\(^{39}\) Soothill et al., *Dictionary*, 458.
Where one Person of our Trinity, the Messiah, who is the Luminous Lord of the Universe, folding up Himself and concealing His true Majesty, appeared upon the earth as a man. Angels proclaimed the Glad Tidings. A virgin gave birth to the Holy One in Ta'chin. A bright Star announced the blessed event. Persians saw the splendor and came forth with their tribute.\(^{40}\)

c. Holy Spirit

- \textit{Yuánfēng} 元風 or \textit{xuánfēng} 玄風 (lit. “original/abstruse wind”): a Taoist term used by Bishop Alopen to refer to the Third Person of the Holy Trinity in the \textit{Discourse on the Oneness of the Ruler of the Universe}. This term disappeared from Christian literature soon after the great persecution of the Nestorian missions in China in the mid ninth century. Today Chinese Christians prefer the term \textit{Shènglíng} 聖靈 (“Holy Ghost”).

- \textit{Jīngfēng} 淨風 (“pure wind”): a Buddhist term that appeared on the Nestorian Stele. The adjective \textit{jīng} was used to translate the Buddhist word \textit{vimala}, which means clean and pure. As a noun it refers to “the place of cleansing, the latrine, etc.”\(^{41}\)

An earlier term, \textit{liángfēng} 涼風 (“cool wind”), which was a neutral term unconnected to any religious tradition in China at the time, was used by Alopen in the early seventh century.\(^{42}\) An alternative term for the Holy Spirit also found in ancient Nestorian documents is \textit{lúhé níngjūshā} 羅訥穌沙, which in ancient Chinese would have been pronounced as ㄆ,nieng,kju,sa].\(^{43}\) It is a transliteration of אשתך, the Syriac rendering of the Hebrew שותך, meaning the “Holy Spirit.” Its abbreviated form, \textit{lúhé}, appeared in Bishop Cyriacus’ \textit{Sūtra Aiming at Mysterious Rest and Joy} 《志玄安樂經》 in the beginning of the eighth century.\(^{44}\)

\(^{40}\) English translation is from Saeki, \textit{Nestorian Documents}, 54–55.

\(^{41}\) Soothill et al., \textit{Dictionary}, s.v.

\(^{42}\) Saeki, \textit{Nestorian Documents}, 259.

\(^{43}\) Karlgren, \textit{Analytic Dictionary}, s.v.
2.1.2.5. Other Borrowed Religious Terms to Express Christian Concepts

There are several key expressions that the Nestorians borrowed from indigenous Chinese religions. Bishop Cyriacus employed the Taoist term 'wuwei' (lit. "non-action") in his "the Sūtra Aiming at Mysterious Rest and Joy" to refer to the virtue of performing charitable deeds in secret (e.g. Matt 6:4). Interestingly, early Buddhist missionaries in China also adopted it to explain the concept of Nirvāṇa. As Buddhist missionaries later introduced the technique of transliteration, Nirvana (nirvāṇa, lit. "separation from life and death," i.e. exemption from transmigration or "extinction") became more commonly referred by its transliterated form nièpán/nihuán.

2.1.2.6. New Technique of Transliteration

In addition to borrowing from existing terms in China during the Tang Dynasty, the Nestorian missionaries also adopted the new technique of transliteration from their Buddhist predecessors in order to introduce new religious concepts to the Chinese in their native tongue. Examples include Yishù/Yishù for "Jesus", Mishīhē/米希訥 for "Messiah" (see above), and shādān/shāduōnà/粟多那 for Satan, all of which appeared in Alopen's documents. Perhaps since the practice was still in an experimental stage, standard orthography of such transliterated words did not exist. "Apostle Paul," for example, was rendered Bāolíng 寶靈 (lit. "treasured spirit") on the Nestorian Stele but Bāolù 寶路 (lit. "treasured path") in the Diptychs. Inconsistency in transliterating proper names may have caused confusion among the new converts, and presented a challenge.

44 Saeki, Nestorian Documents, 8–9, 258–59.
45 Wright, Buddhism in Chinese History, 36; Yang 範森富, "Christianity," 46.
46 Eitel and Takakuwa, Handbook, 109; Soothill et al., Dictionary, s.v.; Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary, s.v.
47 For a survey of Chinese transliterations of Jesus, see Zetzsche, "Indigenizing," 141–55.
not just to the Nestorians, but also to the Manichaeans, who first arrived in China near the end of the seventh century, and to the Catholic and Protestant translators in the modern period. 48

2.1.2.7. End of the Nestorian Missions

The Nestorians’ Christian influences in China came to an abrupt end after an Imperial Edict of 845 began to take effect to forcefully shut down all Christian missionary activities. Without the imperial protection of the Chinese court that it had enjoyed in the previous two centuries, Christianity in China practically disappeared by the end of the tenth century. As Saeki and others have pointed out, the Nestorians’ failure was largely due to their lack of native Chinese leadership and their isolation from the mainstream Church. 49 This was certainly not the case for the other foreign religions contemporary to the Nestorians’ missionary activities in China, namely Buddhism, Islam, Manichaeism, and Zoroastrianism, which also endured a series of severe persecutions. 50 Buddhism, and to a certain extent Islam, not only survived the persecutions, but flourished and grew steadily with large numbers of native adherents throughout China.

---

48 The Manichaeans are not treated in detail in this study mainly due to fact that none of the three extent texts dating from early ninth to tenth centuries, the Incomplete Religious Scripture of a Persian Religion 《波斯教残綫》, the Lower section: Hymnscroll《下部謡》or the Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light《摩尼光佛教法儀略》, contains any canonical biblical translations in Chinese. However, the Manichaean transliterations of biblical proper names such as the three persons of the Holy Trinity will be consulted here. The original Chinese texts can be found in Luo, ed., Lost Books, vol. 3; Luo, ed., Rare Treasures, vol. 2; Takakusu and Watanabe, Tripitaka, vol. 54, 1270–86. For the Chinese texts with French translation, see Chavannes and Pelliot, “Deuxième partie,” 261–394; Chavannes and Pelliot, “Un traité Manichéen retrouvé,” (1911) 499–617; Chavannes and Pelliot, “Un traité Manichéen retrouvé,” (1913) 99–199. For studies of Manichaean terminology, see Yutaka, “Manichaean Aramaic,” 326–331; Bryder, Chinese Transformation. For other subjects concerning Manichaeism in China, see my bibliography.

49 Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 159. See also Zetzche, Bible in China, 25; Spillett, Catalogue, x.

50 For historical surveys of Manichaeism in China, see, for example, Chen 陳垣, “Study of the Entry of Manichaeism,” 203–39; Lieu, Manichaeism in Central Asia and China; Lieu, Polemics against Manichaeism. On Zoroastrianism in China, see Chen 陳垣, “Study of the Entry of Zoroastrianism,” 27–46. For a general introduction to Zoroastrianism, see Boyce, Zoroastrians.
2.1.3. Early Catholic Biblical Translation Activities

It would take nearly three centuries before another Christian mission reached China and resumed the activities of Bible translation into the languages of China. In the late thirteenth century, Giovanni da Montecorvino (1247–1328) founded the first Catholic mission to China in Cambaluc (Peking), and allegedly had translated the New Testament and Psalms from the Vulgate and Greek editions into Mongolian, the official language of the Yuan Dynasty (1260–1368). During the early sixteenth century, Matteo Ricci (1552–1610) and other Catholic missionaries were also involved in translating biblical texts (e.g. the Ten Commandments) and ecclesiastical writings into Chinese.

The most significant and influential contributions by early Catholic translators were probably those made by Jean Basset (1662–1707). Basset had translated the Gospels, Acts, Pauline Epistles, and parts of Hebrews from the Vulgate into Chinese. Since the eighteenth century, several revisions of Basset’s translation had appeared in many Catholic liturgical writings. Several of Basset’s manuscripts have also survived (known as the Sloane Manuscript #3599) and subsequently were made available to pioneer Protestant translators, including John Marshman and Robert Morrison.

---

51 No copies of this translation have survived. See, for example, Allegra, “Translation,” 99; Gálik, Influence, Translation, and Parallels, 81.
52 Garnier and Feng, “Chinese Versions,” 156; Chiu, Tracing Bible Translation, 12. Among Catholic religious writings in Chinese in the seventeenth century, Ricci’s T’ien-chu Shih-I, or The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven, is of special interest to Chinese Bible translation. Ricci was born in the year when the great Jesuit missionary of Asia, Francis Xavier died. Ricci first arrived in China in 1582 and remained there until his death in 1610. For the original Chinese text of the T’ien-chu Shih-i together with an English translation and notes, as well as introductory essays of Ricci’s life and work in China, see Ricci, T’ien-chu Shih-i.
54 Spillett, Catalogue, xi.
55 The Basset manuscripts were discovered by John Hodgson of East India Company in Canton in 1739, and were sent to Hans Sloane (1660–1753) of the Royal Society in London. See Moule, “Manuscript,” 23–33. Some MSS are now in Hong Kong University (Fung Ping Shan Library), and a copy of the MSS in the
Early efforts by Catholic missionaries had evidently influenced modern translators, but only to a limited extent. Some of the most apparent influences include the transliteration of biblical names (e.g. Yēsū 頌 for “Jesus”) and the rendering of religious terminologies into Chinese (chuándào 教道 for “evangelism”). 56 Louis de Poirot (1735–1813) had reportedly translated almost the whole Bible from the Vulgate into Mandarin and Manchu. 57 Unfortunately, de Poirot’s Bible, extant only in manuscripts, was virtually inaccessible to later translators. 58 The Catholic Church would not see another version of the whole Bible in Chinese until 1968 when Gabriele M. Allegra and his committee published their translation at Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (SB). 59 This 150-year gap of inactivity was filled by the new vigorous forces of Protestant missionaries. Their combined efforts of translating the Bible into Chinese were marked by great creativity, devotion, and productivity, as well as lasting influence upon the Christian faith in China.

---

56 Ricci, T’ien-chu Shih-i, e.g. 448, line 580; 452, line 589. Other terms include shèngdiàn 聖殿 for “temple,” tiāntáng 天堂 for “heaven,” diyù 地獄 for “hell,” and jiāohuì 教會 for “church.” See Ricci, T’ien-chu Shih-i, e.g. 410, lines 524, 322, 379; Ortiz, Commentary, 6. For a discussion of the rendering of Jesus into Chinese, see my chapter 6.
57 Moule, “Manuscript,” 33; Chiu, Tracing Bible Translation, 14–15. Moule cites de Poirot’s death as 1814.
58 The MSS were destroyed in 1949, but some copies of the MSS had survived and were made available by Gabriele M. Allegra for Studium Biblicum Franciscanum in Hong Kong. See Allegra, “Translation,” 98; Zetzsche, Bible in China, 27.
59 For a brief introduction to the SB, see Allegra, “Translation,” 97–105; Camps, “Father Gabriele M. Allegra,” 55–76.
2.1.4. Protestant Translators and Their Proposed Solutions to Key Issues (Part I. Wenli Versions)

2.1.4.1. Morrison/Milne (MOR) and Marshman/Lassar’s (MAR) Versions

The modern period in the history of Chinese Bible translation began when the first Protestant missionary, Robert Morrison (1782–1834) of the London Missionary Society (LMS), arrived in Canton in 1807.60 Morrison had initially worked independently, assisted by native Chinese. In 1810, he published his newly translated Book of Acts from the Greek into Chinese, and Luke in the following year. Around this time Baptist missionaries John Lassar (1781–ca. 1835) and Joshua Marshman (1768–1837) had also begun their translation work.61 In 1814, Morrison published the first-ever complete New Testament in Chinese.62 Less than a decade later, two different versions of the whole Bible in Chinese were published: one by Morrison and William Milne (1785–1822, also of LMS) in Malacca, Malaysia (MOR, 1823), the other by Lassar and Marshman in Serampore, India (MAR, 1822).63

It seems incredible that in such a short time with limited resources these missionaries, being gifted and devoted as they were, were capable and competent enough to engage the daunting task of translating the Bible into not the vernacular but the classical style of the

---

60 For biographical accounts of Morrison, see Morrison, Memoirs; Townsend, Robert Morrison; Ride, Robert Morrison.


63 Morrison and Milne, Holy Bible; Marshman and Lassar, Holy Bible. For a biographic sketch of Marshman, see Fenwick, Biographical Sketches.
Chinese language. One must bear in mind that the early Protestant missionaries did not work from scratch. Indeed, in translating the Bible into Chinese, they had built their efforts upon foundations laid by the Nestorian and Catholic missionaries centuries before. Both Morrison and Marshman, in particular, made their own translations based on Basset's version.64

2.1.4.2. Medhurst/Gütlaff/Bridgman Version (GÜ)

In 1836, the Chinese government prohibited the public distribution of Christian literature. This did not deter a zealous new generation of Bible translators, such as Karl Friedrich August Gütlaff (1803–1851), Walter Henry Medhurst (1796–1857, LMS), and the American missionary to China Elijah Coleman Bridgman (1801–1861, ABCFM), from continuing their work.65 Together the three missionaries collaborated with the assistance of Robert Morrison's son, J.R. Morrison (1814–1843), to translate the entire Bible from the original languages into Chinese. The first edition of the New Testament was printed in Serampore, India in 1836, and was chiefly translated by Medhurst under the assumed name Shàng dé zhě 尚德者 (“one who esteems virtue”).66 Less than two years later, the Gütlaff/Medhurst/Bridgman version of the Chinese Old Testament was privately issued and circulated in the coastal cites of China.

64 Darlow and Moule, Historical Catalogue, vol. 2, part 1, 188. See also Zetzsche, Bible in China, 51.
66 This edition was again privately printed in Batavia (Jakarta) a year later. Subsequent revisions by Gütlaff also appeared in Singapore. See Darlow and Moule, Historical Catalogue, §2480; Zetzsche, Bible in China, 62; Wylie, Memorials, 31. Gütlaff used the pseudonym "Philo-Sinensis" in his Notices on Chinese Grammar. For a review of this work, see 3.2.2.2.c, p. 88 below.
It was Gützlaff who saw the need to train native Christian leaders in order to evangelize China. Unfortunately, this Prussian missionary's visions were not favorably welcomed by the majority of Protestant missionaries at the time. Not only this, the Medhurst-Gützlaff-Bridgman’s version of the Bible was rejected by the Bible society on grounds of their “extremely lax” translation principles. Worse yet, Gützlaff’s name and those of two other translators of the 1836 edition of the Chinese New Testament became linked with Hong Xiuquan (1813–64) and the Taiping Rebellion (1850–64).

2.1.4.3. Terminological Question

Quite unlike the Nestorian translators more than ten centuries before, Morrison and Milne refer to the Bible as the Shén tiān shēngshì (《神天聖書》) (lit. “god-heavenly sacred book”) as opposed to jīng (“classics,” “sūtras”). Instead of using Huangfu Āluōhé (“Imperial-Father Alāhā), Tiānzūn (“heavenly-reverend”), Zhēnzhū (“true lord”) or Fō (“Buddha”), Morrison and Milne introduced a monotheist Supreme God by the familiar Chinese term Shén. Shén is used in different religious contexts in China, including Buddhism, Taoism, and Confucianism, with a wide range of meaning, however it comes close to the English word “god.” The Chinese title of the Medhurst-Gützlaff-Bridgman edition of the 1836 New Testament reads Xīn yīzhào Shēngshì (《新遺詔聖書》) (lit. “The Sacred Book of the Newly Bequeathed Oracles”). Like Morrison and Milne, the Bible

---

68 The Bible society had also pointed out their tendency to “substitute human paraphrase for the simple statements for the Word of God” and demanded that copies be withheld from circulation. See Zetzsche, Bible in China, 63.
69 Hong converted to Christianity and claimed to receive a call in 1837 to be the “messiah.” He led an open rebellion with strong native supporters to establish his visions of a Christian kingdom in China that lasted for fifteen years. According to Zetzsche, he had used Gützlaff’s edition of the Chinese Bible “as a basis for the first edition of Taiping Bible,” which appeared in 1853. See Zetzsche, Bible in China, 72. For an introductory essay on the subject, see Bohr, “Jesus, Christianity, and Rebellion,” 613–61.
70 This English translation is by Marshall Broomhall. See Broomhall, Bible in China, 74.
is called *shū* (a general term for “book”) and not *jīng*. What makes it uniquely significant was that the term *Shàngdǐ* ("supreme ruler," used in Taoism to refer to the mystical Emperor Jade, or *Yǔhuáng Dàdì/Yǔhuáng Shàngdǐ* 玉皇大帝/玉皇上帝) was first introduced by Medhurst to refer to God. This is the origin of the controversial debate that continues to this day. Today the Bible Societies continue the tradition that started in the nineteenth century to print two editions of the same version of the Chinese Bible: one uses *Shàngdǐ* and the other *Shén* for God.\(^71\)

2.1.4.4. Delegates’ Version (DV)

Christian missions in China in the second half of the nineteenth century enjoyed protection by treaties. It was during this period that biblical translation in Chinese reached its peak: more than 300 editions were published in Mandarin between 1862 and 1949.\(^72\) While the number of editions seems impressive, a great majority of them contained only parts of the Bible (especially the Psalms or parts of the New Testament), which were translated by one or a few individuals working independently. These individuals often represented western Protestant missions in the treaty ports of the coastal areas in China.\(^73\) One notable exception was the *Delegates’ Version* (DV) of the New

---

\(^71\) For a summary of the debate, see Eber, “Interminable Term Question,” 139–42. Eber’s comment on Medhurst’s original pioneering concept of Bible translation not being “bound to the letter of the basis text but to its meaning in a non-Christian culture” is not entirely true, for we have already seen the examples of Nestorian translators discussed above.

\(^72\) Galik, *Influence*, 93.

\(^73\) The Mandarin pronunciations of many transliterated biblical names such as “Christ” and “Luke” do not correspond to their actual sounds in the original Greek. This is a clear indication that most Protestant missionaries worked with Southern or coastal dialects. See Reinders, *Borrowed Gods*, 76.
Testament in classical Chinese (1852; Old Testament, 1854). The DV was the most frequently reprinted and widely circulated Chinese version in the nineteenth century.

Five British and American representatives (including Medhurst, Bridgman, and later Milne) from different church affiliations and mission locations were appointed to produce a version intended for the use of all Protestant missionaries in China. For more than half a century, the DV remained in print and was widely circulated even outside China. The DV also helped to standardize the transliterations of many biblical names from the Hebrew and Greek into Chinese. For their unprecedented attempt to resolve the terminological debate in Bible translation, these delegates ought be credited with the influence the DV brought on easing conflicts and divisions regarding ideology and nationality among the foreign missionaries in China.

...for the greatest part of the lines of ideological division coincided with those of nationality. For its role as a catalyst for conflict, therefore, the Delegates' Version was surely the most influential version...no other translation of the last century was held in such high esteem by a greater part of the missionaries in China, and no other translation had such an influence on the perception of the missionaries in regard to stylistic needs of Bible translation.

---

74 As a result of the split in the Anglo-American translation committee, the Old Testament portion of the DV was prepared by British missionaries only (LMS). See Zetzsche, *Bible in China*, 97–103.


76 The five delegates were: W.H. Medhurst (LMS), Bishop W.J. Boone (AEMB), and W. M. Lowrie (APMB), represented Shanghai and Ningpo. Lowrie was replaced by W.C. Milne (LMS) after his death. John Stronach (LMS) represented Amoy. E.C. Bridgman (ABCFM) represented Canton and Hong Kong. See Darlow and Moule, *Historical Catalogue*, vol. 2, part 1, 188–9; Zetzsche, *Bible in China*, 77–110; Kramers, *Chinese Bible Translation*, 10. Together the delegates worked closely with Chinese assistants, including the famous scholar Wang Tao (or “Wanglan-King,” 1828–97); cited as in Garnier and Feng, “Chinese Versions,” 182.


2.1.4.5. An Account of the Plethora of Chinese Versions

To account for the plethora of different Chinese versions that appeared in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, one must consider the conceptual as well as linguistic issues that confronted each translator. These issues are highly complex, involving Chinese writing styles, theological concerns (e.g. terms for baptism), translation principles, textual basis, and interdenominational cooperation. Some of these challenging issues still perplex translators today. These issues will be discussed within the framework of historical accounts of modern Chinese Bible translation.

2.1.4.6. Questions about Writing Styles in the Chinese Bible

From the mid nineteenth until the dawn of the first quarter of the twentieth century, the enterprise of Bible translation in Chinese was at its peak. More versions of the Bible (or parts of the Bible) had been translated into the Chinese languages (including those into regional dialects) during this period than all previous versions combined. It was also during this period that Protestant missionaries began to print Bibles translated into the regional dialects of China. For the purpose of this dissertation, issues of dialectical differences in translation will not be discussed. The discovery of the lingua franca by Protestant missionaries in the eighteenth century had critical implications in resolving the question of regional dialects in China. As a result, newly translated versions in Mandarin (Peking colloquial, or guānhuà 官話, lit. “official tongue,” or guóyǔ 國語, lit. “national language”) have since become increasingly popular and more widely circulated throughout China.

However, before the official abolishment in 1905 of the Imperial Examination System (kējǔ zhìdù 科舉制度), which led to the rapid decline in the use of classical (shēn wénlì
都文理, “high wenli”) or literary (qiān wénli 浅文理, “easy wenli”) style in Chinese writing, some missionaries still preferred this style of writing in their translation work.80 Until 1856, when the first Mandarin New Testament was published on the basis of the DV, all Chinese Bible versions were in either classical or literary style.81 Those translations in classical style include Josiah Goddard New Testament (GO, 1853), Bridgman and Culbertson’s Bible (BCV, 1863),82 Chalmers and Schaub’s New Testament (CSV, 1897), and Dean’s Bible (1868), as well as the first (and only) Eastern Orthodox Chinese New Testament by Gury Karpov (GURY, 1864).83 Those in literary (easy wenli) style appeared later, which include Griffith John’s New Testament (JOHN, 1885) and part of the Old Testament (Gen–Song, 1905), Burdon and Blodget’s New Testament (BB, 1889; based on the PK), and Schereschewsky’s Bible (SJ, 1902).84

Before the turn of the century, a committee of translators planned a new version, called the “Union Version” (UV), in three distinctive writing styles: high wenli (New Testament,

---

80 Throughout this study, “wenli versions” refers to Chinese Bible versions written in either high wenli (classical) or easy wenli (literary) style.
81 This version was prepared by W.H. Medhurst and J. Stronach on basis of the DV in Nanking Mandarin (see 2.1.5.1.a, p. 30 below). See also Darlow and Moule, Historical Catalogue, §2745.
82 Hykes notes that the BCV was published in 1862, the first version of the complete Bible translated for and published by the American Bible Society. He adds that the BCV “is more faithful and literal rendering of the original than the Delegates’ Version, but of lower and less elegant style.” See Hykes, American Bible Society in China, 7.
83 For bibliographical reference to each publication, see Chronology in the Appendix. Archimandrite Gury Karpov’s (d. 1882) name is cited M. Goury in Darlow and Moule, and Gowry (or Guō Sui 郭遂) in Broomhall, Garnier and Feng, and Kramer. See Darlow and Moule, Historical Catalogue, §2543; Broomhall, Chinese Empire, 382; Garnier and Feng, “Chinese Versions,” 162; Kramers, Chinese Bible Translation, 4.
84 John, New Testament in Easy Wenli; John, Old Testament in Easy Wenli; Burdon and Blodget, New Testament in Easy Wenli; Schereschewsky, Holy Bible in Easy Wenli. Schereschewsky’s easy wenli Bible is sometimes referred to as the “two-finger version” (二指版) or the “one-finger Bible” after an illness left him paralyzed in September 1881 save for the middle fingers of his hands. Hykes, American Bible Society in China, 27; Chiu, Tracing Bible Translation, 24; Muller, Apostle of China, 201–08, 63; Eber, Jewish Bishop, 147.
1907), easy wenli (New Testament, 1905), and Mandarin (Bible, 1919) (see 2.1.5.1.b. below).

2.1.4.7. Chinese Translation for βαπτίζω/βάπτισμα

The use of the Chinese word "xi" ("to wash") to translate βαπτίζω or βάπτισμα can be dated as early as the eighth century. The Nestorian missionary Alopen had used the term in the baptism of Jesus by John (Mark 1:9–11; Matt 3:13–17; Luke 3:21–22) in the Jesus-Messiah Sūtra (vv. 171–73):

And now John thought it proper to make the Messiah enter the Jordan. The Messiah, after finishing the washing, came out of the water, when the "Cool Wind" descended from the Heaven in appearance of a dove and sat upon the Messiah, whilst (a voice) sounded in empty-space, saying "The Messiah is my son; all the people in the world must do what is told by the Messiah, obeying His command to do good." 85

Alopen uses two different terms in reference to Jesus’ baptism: xi and rùtāng. 86 It is likely that Alopen uses rùtāng to refer to the movement into the baptismal font—in this case, the Jordan—and not the sacrament of baptism. However, rùtāng does suggest the idea of immersion into water. Morrison and Milne followed this tradition, as did Basset more than a century before them and all Catholic missionaries. Marshman and Lassar, both English Baptists, however, prefer zhàn 騨 ("dip into," e.g. John 1:25, 1813 ed.) or cui 浸 ("dip into water/oil," e.g. 1:26) or the verb compound zhàncui (1:33). 87 These

85 Verse division and English translation are provided by Saeki. See Saeki, Nestorian Documents, 141–42. For Chinese text, see Takakusu and Watanabe, Tripitaka, vol. 54, 1286–88; Saeki, Nestorian Documents, Appendix 25–26.
87 Zetzschke, Bible in China, 54, n. 140; Garnier, Chinese Versions, 31.
terms were adopted by Chalmers and Schaub for their New Testament version in 1897. In spite of that, later Chinese Baptists prefer the more common word *jin* 洗 ("immerse," "soak") as opposed to *zhàn* or *cui*. One example can be seen in the Baptist edition of *wenli* New Testament (Union Version) printed in 1925.  

Baptist missionaries' insistence on the term for baptism caused discordance with other translators from other Protestant missions. As a result, versions done by Baptist missionaries, such as Goddard’s New Testament (GO, 1853) and Dean’s Bible (1868), had relatively small circulation in China.  

When they were invited to join the translation committee for the Delegates’ Version, the Baptist missionaries promptly rejected the invitation and decided to follow their own way of translating the Bible.

2.1.4.8. Interdenominational Cooperation

One translator that best exemplified the conflicts involving interdenominational cooperation in Chinese Bible translation is Griffith John (1831–1912, LMS). John was well respected among the missionary communities in China where he had served for fifty-seven years. In 1890 he had declined the invitation to serve as the English chairman in the executive committee of the Union Version. John could not agree to the committee’s decisions about the textual basis (Revised Version, 1885) and the translation principles. He also insisted that a common Chinese version should serve as a basis for the committee.

It is a terrible loss in the history of the whole Bible translation enterprise in China that such a gifted and devoted translator chose not to be part of what was about to become the

---

91 Zetzsche, *Bible in China,* 206–09. For John’s biography, see Robson, *Griffith John.*
culmination and, arguably, the single most influential version of the Protestant Bible translation in China, the Union Mandarin Version (UV, 1919). John, however, was credited with being the first to translate the New Testament into easy wenli (JOHN, 1885).

2.1.5. Protestant Translators and Their Proposed Solutions to Key Issues (Part II. Mandarin Versions and Translations by Native Speakers)

2.1.5.1. Mandarin Versions

a. Early Mandarin Versions

The first New Testament in vernacular Chinese appeared in 1856, when two members of the DV committee, Medhurst and Stronach, decided to introduce a Mandarin edition (called Nanking Version). Right around this time, William C. Burns (EPM) also published the Psalms in Mandarin (BURNS). In addition to his New Testament and parts of the Old Testament in easy wenli, Griffith John had also published the New Testament in Peking Mandarin (1889, JOHNM). Early in 1878, the first Mandarin Bible appeared. Its New Testament portion (1872, PK) was done by the Peking Committee, which might explain why John did not want to be part of it. The Old Testament part (1874), however, was a one man version, translated from the Hebrew by S.I.J.

---

92 Medhurst and Stronach, New Testament in Southern (Nanking) Mandarin. See also Darlow and Moule, Historical Catalogue, §§2744-45; Broomhall, Chinese Empire, 389.
93 Burns, Psalms in Mandarin. Early Bible translators differentiated two Mandarin dialects, Northern (Peking and Shangtung) and Southern (Nanking). This distinction is no longer maintained today, at least in written form of the language. See Darlow and Moule, Historical Catalogue, vol. 1, part 2, 181.
94 John translated the Old Testament as far as to the Song of Solomon. See Broomhall, Chinese Empire, 384.
96 J.S. Burdon and H. Blodget, who themselves were committee members of the Peking Mandarin New Testament (1872), also published a version in easy wenli on basis of their Mandarin New Testament in 1889.
Schereschewsky. Interestingly, like John, Schereschewsky had also declined an invitation to serve on the UV committee, and went on to translate the entire Bible into easy wenli (1902). After the deaths of John and Schereschewsky, Mandarin increasingly became the writing style of choice in subsequent versions. These Mandarin versions include the UV (1919), Sydenstricker’s New Testament (1929, SYD), and Wang Hsüan-chen’s New Testament (1933, WANG).

b. Union Mandarin Version (UV)

Besides the DV, very few Chinese editions that appeared in the last centuries shared the same prestige and enjoyed such long lasting influence upon Chinese Christians as did the single version that came to be known as the Héhéběn 《和合本》, or its 1919 original title, the Union Mandarin Version.

The UV was a product of a carefully planned translation committee that combined the efforts of dedicated missionaries and native workers. The mission committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS) assembled in Shanghai in 1890 consisted of ten foreign missionaries and was chaired by Calvin W. Mateer (1836–1900) of the American Presbyterian Mission. Their goal was to “give to China, not a one-man version, but the very best version that the united scholarship of the various Missions could produce.” Three Union versions in different Chinese literary styles were planned

---

97 Darlow and Moule, Historical Catalogue, §2683. For brief introductory comments on Schereschewsky’s translation of Genesis into Mandarin, see Eber, “Translating,” 219–233.
98 Eber, Jewish Bishop, 152.
99 In this study, the UV refers to the Union Mandarin Version.
100 The names are: Calvin W. Mateer (chair), J.L. Nevius, H. Blodget, Chauncey Goodrich (chair after Mateer’s death), George S. Owen, J.R. Hykes, T. Bramfitt, Frederick W. Baller, Spencer Lewis, and S. R. Clarke. See Broomhall, Bible in China, 187; Hykes, American Bible Society in China, 17–18, 35–38.
101 This is a quotation from William Wright, editorial secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society at the Shanghai Missionary Conference in 1890. Broomhall, Bible in China, 88.
(high wenli, easy wenli, Mandarin), however, only the high wenli and Mandarin versions include the complete Bible. In the end, the Mandarin version enjoyed far greater success achieving its aims than the two wenli versions.

The translation principles of the UV were revolutionary and helped set the guidelines for a quality Chinese Bible version for the next generation. These guidelines included the preference for a standardized “universal” language rather than local dialects to ensure a wider audience. The most important decision was their insistence on the literal rendering of biblical metaphors and figures of speech rather than paraphrasing the concepts into equivalent Chinese, which had become a normal practice among previous translators. In 1919, the UV translation committee presented the complete Bible with a revised New Testament in Mandarin Chinese. In the next eighty plus years, the UV was to become the most popular Bible ever published in the Chinese language, and its lasting influence upon Chinese Christians could, to some degree, be comparable to that of the King James Version on English-speaking Christians.

Since the first edition of the UV appeared in 1919, less than a dozen completely new versions of the Chinese Bible have been produced. It is fair to say that none has actually equaled the unprecedented undertakings of the UV translation committee. This explains why the UV still remains the most popular version of the Bible in the Chinese-speaking world today. Undoubtedly, frequent political unrest and war had a drastic impact upon the Chinese way of life—especially after the Chinese Communist Party took over the nation and expelled all western missionaries in 1949—throughout the twentieth century.

---

102 Broomhall, Bible in China, 93; Zetzsche, Bible in China, 325.
103 This is a popular opinion shared by many Chinese Christians today. The UV, however, has not had the same degree of impact upon Mandarin as the KJV has upon the English language.
History has repeated itself. As with the Nestorian predecessors, the whole enterprise of Chinese Bible translation depended upon western missionaries. Therefore, after the Chinese Communist Revolution, translators had to work outside of Mainland China.

2.1.5.2. Bible Versions by Native Speakers

a. Friedrich Wilhelm Asseng and Ho Chin-Shan

The earliest native Chinese translator of a biblical book is credited to be Friedrich Wilhelm Asseng (1792–ca. 1829). Asseng had left his native Canton to go to England in 1821. Three years later he moved to Halle, Germany, where he taught Chinese and became a Christian. In 1828 he translated Luther’s *Kleiner Katechismus* as well as Mark and Luke from Luther’s Bible into Chinese. Another fellow Cantonese named Ho Chin-Shan (1817–71) had also translated and published his versions of Matthew (1854) and Mark (1856) with revisions by his teacher James Legge.105

b. Yan Fu and His Translation Theory

Asseng’s translation exists only in manuscripts, and, along with Ho’s version, it has very little value because of its poor literary quality. The case was completely different for Yan Fu (1853–1921), who was encouraged by the BFBS to produce a translated version of the Bible that would eventually become a great classic in Chinese literature. Yan had established himself as one of the greatest Chinese scholars at the turn of the twentieth century and had studied in England before serving as a first class advisor to the Board of Education in Peking. His previous translations of English work on political economy and ethics had become the standard texts in Chinese on the subject. Unfortunately, Yan had

---

no knowledge of biblical languages and, hence, he depended on the English Revised
Version. Furthermore, he translated only the first four chapters of Mark (1908).106

As a non-Christian scholar, however, Yan made some significant contributions to
Chinese Bible translation. From his previous experience translating English scholarly
texts to the literary Chinese, Yan formulated a translation theory on the basis of the three
criteria: xin 信 ("faithfulness" [of basis text]), dá 達 ("conveyance" [of meaning]) and yǎ
雅 ("elegance" [of style]).107 Yan's criteria are frequently used by Chinese authors today,
Christians and non-Christians alike, in their discussions of translation.108

c. Zhu Baohui

One of the most prominent native translators in the early twentieth century was Zhu
Baohui.109 Zhu had received theological education at Nanking Theological Seminary and
had been the key Chinese assistant to the American Southern Presbyterian missionary
Absalom Sydenstricker (1852–1931) in his translation of the New Testament into
Mandarin (1929).110 After Sydenstricker's death, Zhu published his own independent
translation of the New Testament in 1936, with financial support by Sydenstricker's
daughter, the American author and Nobel Prize-winner, Pearl S. Buck (1892–1973).

106 Yan's version is in Chinese classical writing style. Spillett, Catalogue, §223; Yan, Mark 1–4.
107 English terms for Yan's criteria are from Zetzsche. Zetzsche had pointed out that Yan's translation of
Huxley's Evolution and Ethics had "formed the basis of a Chinese translation theory which is used up to
the present day to judge translations, including Bible translation." See Zetzsche, Bible in China, 129. Yan's
discussion on the three criteria for translation can be found in the preface to his translation Huxley's book.
See Huxley, Tian yan lun, Preface to the translation, 1.
108 See, for example, Chiu, Tracing Bible Translation; Kramers, "Future Prospects," 150–60.
109 Besides Zhu, early native translators also included the aforementioned Wang Hsüan-chen (1933,
WANG). Wang was an assistant to Mateer, and, although he was credited with being the first Chinese to
translate the entire New Testament into Mandarin, his version undoubtedly was based upon the UV.
For this reason, Wang's version is not treated here. See Wang 王宣忱, New Testament (Wang Hsüan-chen's
Version).
110 See the Preface in Zhu 朱寶惠, New Testament Translated from the Original. See also Zetzsche, Bible
Zhu’s Mandarin version departs from Sydenstricker’s at several points. Unlike his former mentor, who relies on von Soden (1913) and James Moffatt (1922), Zhu uses a number of critical Greek editions as basis texts and consults many versions. Also, Zhu’s chief aim for the translation is to provide supplementary material for his Greek students. Therefore, his version has been noted by some for its fidelity to the Greek original, and has been more recently reprinted (Hong Kong, 1993, 2007).

d. Catholic and Other Protestant Translators

Due to political and social instability in China from the 1930s until the 1950s, several native translation projects were either delayed or forced to be abandoned. “The Bible Treasury New Testament in Mandarin” (1941, BT), for example, never published its final revisions. Some translation projects were carried on to Taiwan or Hong Kong after the Chinese Communists took over China in 1949. These include four Catholic versions (two of which are by native speakers) by Litvanyi et al. (CNT, 1949), St. Ignatius Monastery (Gospels, IG, 1954), Joseph Hsiao (NT, HSC, 1960), and John C.H. Wu (Psalms [1946] and the NT [1949] in high wenli, WV) as well as two Protestant versions by Theodore Litvanyi et al., Catholic New Testament; Four Gospels (St. Ignatius Monastery’s Version); Hsiao 蕭靜山, New Testament; Wu 吳烋熊, New Testament; Wu 吳烋熊, Psalms. Wu (1899–1986) was able to secure his patronage from Chiang Kai-shek to continue working as an independent translator in the 1940s. He was also appointed by the Generalissimo as the Chinese Minister Plenipotentiary to the Vatican (1946–49), during which time he completed his version of the New Testament in wenli. See Gállik, Influence, 84; Gernet, China and the Christian Impact, 239. See also the official website of the Embassy of the Republic of China (Taiwan) to the Holy See.
E. Hsiao (NT, HS, 1967) and Lü Chen-chung (Bible, LŪ, 1970). Among these versions, Lü’s Bible has especially stood the test of time and has been reprinted recently (Hong Kong, 2004).

e. Post-1970s Versions

Since the 1970s, several newer versions of the Chinese Bible appeared with financial sponsorship by the Bible Societies. With very few exceptions, these versions have been criticized for their heavy reliance on English versions as a textual basis, examples of which include the Today’s Chinese Version (1979, TCV) from the TEV (1976) and the Chinese Living Bible (1979, CLB) from the Living Bible (1971, LB). As China reopened her doors, new committee versions that have appeared since 1980 have specifically targeted the Mainland Chinese audience. These include the New Chinese Version (NCV, 1992), the Dynamic Chinese Translation (DCT, 2006), and a new Catholic edition, the Chinese Pastoral Bible (CPB, 1999). Several revision projects (e.g. CLB, UV) as well as new Mandarin versions, including the Chinese Contemporary Version (CCV) and Chinese Standard Bible (CSB), are currently under way.

---

115 Hsiao 蕭楨芛, New Testament; Lü 吕振中, Holy Bible.
116 *Holy Bible: Today’s Chinese Version; Chinese Living Bible*. Marián Gálik has pointed out that the *Today’s Chinese Version* was not translated according to the principle of Eugene A. Nida’s dynamic equivalence as he had in mind for the “original.” Gálik, *Influence*, 84. See Bratcher, *Good News Bible; Taylor, The Living Bible, Paraphrased.*
117 The CPB is a Chinese version of the Christian Community Bible. See *Christian Community Bible; Chinese Pastoral Bible*. The DCT is based on the NIV (1984) and NASB (1977). Unlike the CPB and DCV, the NCV is a new Mandarin translation from the original Greek and Hebrew.
118 The New Testament portion of the revised UV (RCUV) has been published. *New Testament (Revised Chinese Union Version)*. Parts of the New Testament of the CCV and CSB have also appeared. *Christian Community Bible; Holy Bible (Chinese Contemporary Version); Gospel of John (Chinese Standard Bible); Paul’s Letter to the Romans (Chinese Standard Bible).*
2.1.5.3. Canon of Chinese Versions

Chinese Bible versions translated by Protestant missionaries and native Christians contain sixty-six canonical books. The first complete Catholic Bible in Mandarin Chinese by Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (SB) contains seventy-three books, including the additional seven titles known as the Apocrypha or Deuterocanonical books. These include Baruch, Tobit, Judith, 1–2 Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus. The Chinese Anglican Church has also published Cijing Quanshu《次經全書》in a separate volume with a total of fifteen books commonly known as the Old Testament Apocrypha.119

2.1.6. Conclusion

This section begins with a chronological survey of the Chinese Bible from the Nestorians of the eight century to the present day. Major issues related to linguistic, conceptual, and logistical complexities are addressed through critical evaluations and reflections within the framework of historical narratives of missionary translation activities in and outside China. The insights gathered in the process of the historical survey will be used to support further investigations of translation theories in the following section.

2.2. Translation Studies

2.2.1. Introduction

The theory and practice of translating from one language to another has probably existed since God confused the language of humans at the Tower of the Babel (Gen 11:1–

119 Most of the apocryphal books in this volume are translated into wenli Chinese by Throop and Waung, based on R.H. Charles’ 1913 edition Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Other books are translated into Mandarin by H.F. Lei and others. See Throop and Waung, Apocrypha.
9). It is an ancient practice that predates the invention of any writing system. The translation of the Christian Bible from the original Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek into other languages, however, presents a daunting task and remains as controversial and challenging today as it was in the third century B.C.E when the Septuagint appeared.

This section provides a critical overview of modern approaches to translation studies with a particular focus on verbal syntax and discourse considerations applicable to translating the Bible into Chinese. Beginning with the theory proposed by Nida, this section also covers recent contributions by scholars from major schools in translation studies.120

2.2.2. Eugene Nida and Dynamic/Functional Equivalence

2.2.2.1. Introduction

Translation studies only began to receive modern scientific treatment after the Second World War. Unfortunately this means that, as pointed out above, most existing Chinese versions of the Bible translated prior to the end of WWII would not have benefited from modern linguistic insights in the field of translation. Nida, an American linguist and a representative of modern translation theorists, on the other hand, has made a fruitful and lasting impact on the translation principles of many new versions of the Bible in English as well as in other major and minority languages around the world.

In his 1964 publication, *Toward a Science of Translating: with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*, Nida sets out to formulate his

---

theory, which he coined the principle of "dynamic equivalence." This book, together with the co-authored title *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, became the seminal volumes for several equally influential works, including the UBS *Monograph Series* and the *Translator's Handbook* series, both of which utilize Nida's translation theory. Nida argues for a binary opposition between two fundamentally different translation principles: formal equivalence vs. dynamic equivalence. He defines the former in these terms:

Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. In such a translation one is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept. Viewed from this formal orientation, one is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language. This means, for example, that the message in the receptor culture is constantly compared with the message in the source culture to determine standards of accuracy and correctness.

For the latter he states:

A translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture; it does not insist that he understand the cultural patterns of the source-language context in order to comprehend the message.

According to Nida, the principle of dynamic equivalence, or functional equivalence as he later renamed it, is specified by the three key elements that would define a good translation: equivalence (with respect to the source language, SL), naturalness (with respect to the receptor language, RL), and closeness ("which binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation").

Nida's approach to translation can be understood and perhaps best appreciated by his orientation in the Evangelical faith. He favors functional equivalence because he thinks it

---

121 Nida, *Toward a Science.*
122 Nida and Taber, *Theory and Practice.*
123 Nida, *Toward a Science,* 159.
124 Nida, *Toward a Science,* 159.
125 See Preface in Nida and de Waard, *Functional Equivalence.*
provides the best chance to reach people who have little or no exposure to the Christian faith. His overarching concerns are getting the biblical message understood in the language of such groups of people. Thus, he sees the role of the translator as a “pioneer, midwife or teammate.”\(^{127}\) This statement is later modified in terms of “a secondary or immediate source involves primarily communicating the intentions of the original author.”\(^{128}\)

2.2.2.2. Semantics Domains

The strength of Nida’s functional equivalence theory that can be of potential help in Chinese Bible translation lies in his analysis of the relationship between surface structure and kernel sentences of the SL.\(^{129}\) Reducing or transforming the message of a SL into simple kernel sentences can guide translators to make practical decisions in realizing Nida’s theory of translation. In fact, kernel sentence analysis can be understood by Nida’s views on lexical semantics. Correct meaning of a lexical unit in any context, he argues, “is that which fits the context best.”\(^{130}\) He continues,

> In any one context a lexical unit is likely to have only one meaning rather than several – except for “marked” lexical unit called “double entendre” (e.g. living water); The literal or unmarked meaning of a lexical unit should be assumed correct unless the context points to some other meaning… Signs (verbal and nonverbal) are always defined by other Signs… in all language there are a strictly limited number of verbal Signs to cover an infinite variety of objects, events, and abstracts. This means that, except for proper names, the meaning of a verbal sign cannot be a point but an area of meaning.\(^{131}\)

Nida has extended his understanding of the semantic structure of New Testament Greek into his *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic*
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\(^{127}\) Nida, *Toward a Science*, 153.

\(^{128}\) Nida and de Waard, *Functional Equivalence*, 32.


\(^{130}\) Nida and de Waard, *Functional Equivalence*, 139.

\(^{131}\) Nida and de Waard, *Functional Equivalence*, 140.
Domains.\textsuperscript{132} This reference work is the first of its kind in Greek lexicography and has tremendous value in Bible translation. The challenge remains, however, as to how exactly does the translator compare and contrast semantic domains of the SL and RL, and then determine the closest natural equivalents in the RL.

2.2.2.3. Translating Figurative Expressions

Functional equivalence theory has received criticism from translation specialists as well as biblical scholars, especially in its handling of figurative speech of the SL.\textsuperscript{133} According to Nida, figurative expressions are semantic extensions that are purely conventional and arbitrary, and “almost always specific to the particular culture and language.”\textsuperscript{134} Others disagree. Ernst-August Gutt, for example, uses relevance theory, a cognitive approach to human communication, to explain that these extended meanings actually come from information stored in the encyclopedic entry in the human mind.\textsuperscript{135} So, in Nida’s example “He is a fox,” our understanding of the concept of a fox in English is not derived from its linguistic component meaning “deceptively clever,” but rather people come to associate the word “fox” with this particular characteristic due to a

\textsuperscript{132} Nida and Louw, \textit{Greek-English Lexicon}.

\textsuperscript{133} Leading representatives of Nida’s critics include Carson, Nichols, Gutt, Van Leeuwen, and Ryken. See Carson, “Limits,” (1985) 200–13; Carson, “Limits,” (2003) 65–113; Nichols, “Translating.” Nichols has criticized Nida for imposing modern western preoccupation with the reader’s response on non-western readers (e.g. Indonesians), who may not have recourse to formal correspondence translation in order to evaluate the received tradition. For Gutt and Ryken’s responses, see below. See also Van Leeuwen, “We Really Do Need,” 28–35. For other reactions to Nida’s approach, see Venuti, who sees Bible translation as a vehicle to “strengthen the ideological consistency and institutional stability of the church.” Pushing the theory of functional equivalence to extreme practice will ultimately result in what he calls “domesticating” effects of the translated text. Venuti, \textit{Scandals}, 78–79; 182. Van Leeuwen shares similar concerns. See Van Leeuwen, “We Really Do Need,” 30.

\textsuperscript{134} Nida and Taber, \textit{Theory and Practice}, 87–88. See also Nida, Toward a Science, 95–96.

\textsuperscript{135} Gutt, \textit{Translation and Relevance}, 83, 141–42. Gutt’s approach to translation is based on relevance theory developed by Wilson and Sperber in 1986. See Sperber and Wilson, \textit{Relevance}. 
popular belief among English speakers. In relevance theoretic terms, this “popular belief” is understood as the contextual information.

Leland Ryken has joined many others to criticize the theory of functional equivalence. In his recent book, *The Word of God in English: Criteria for Excellence in Bible Translation*, Ryken argues that Bible versions that utilize Nida’s principles emphasize the readability or communicability of the translated text to the reader as their ultimate goal, and as a result they tend to destabilize the Bible as well as obscure the world of the original text. Not only so, in translating figurative speech into plain language, versions such as the TEV destroy the beauty and possible multiple meanings of the biblical text. Carson shares Ryken’s concerns with the limitations of Nida’s theory. Besides ignoring the literary qualities of the Bible, Carson adds that potential abuse of the functional equivalence translation principle may lead to “overriding the Bible’s historical particularity as well as ignoring salvation-historical changes within the Bible.”

Although most Chinese translations tend to render figurative expressions literally, only a few would go as far to use, for example, the phrase “bowels of mercy” for the Greek word σπλάγχνα as illustrated in Phil 1:8 “...I long after you all in the bowels of Jesus Christ” (KJV). Σπλάγχνα means the inward parts of a body or entails, but the figurative expression ἐν σπλάγχνοις is associated with feeling itself and, thus, can also denote love or affection, the meaning most Chinese versions have adopted (e.g. GÜ, DV, SB, SJ, NCV, CLB). The UV, however, follows the example of the KJV and reads ὡδε

136 Gutt, *Translation and Relevance*, 83.
140 BDAG, s.v.
tīhuì Jīdū Yēsū de xīncháng 我體會基督耶穌的心腸（“I appreciate Christ Jesus’ xīncháng）。Two Chinese versions in wenli, BCV and MAR, also employ xīncháng, as does the other Mandarin version LÜ (rè xīncháng 熱心腸, “warm xīncháng”). The KJV’s literal translation of ἐν σπλάγχνοις makes no sense in English in such a context because the word “intestines” or “bowels” is not normally associated with love or compassion in current usage. In Chinese, however, the UV and the three other versions’ literal translation of ἐν σπλάγχνοις is not unjustified. Xīncháng is made up of two characters, xīn (“heart”) and cháng (“intestines”). Together xīncháng generally means heart. In Chinese one can say tā xīncháng hǎo, meaning “he has a good heart” or “he is merciful and kind.” Therefore in this case, a literal translation of the Greek word into Chinese is actually consistent with Nida’s principles of functional equivalence, thereby creating the closest approximation both in form and in response as intended by the original author. The TCV on the other hand uses àixīn 愛心 (“loving heart”) and, therefore, should be deemed merely partially compliant with the theory.

Here is an example that illustrates the difference between translation theory and practice. The TEV’s translation of Phil 1:8 “...I tell you the truth when I say that my deep feeling for you all comes from the heart of Christ Jesus himself” clearly presents the “message” of the figurative expression ἐν σπλάγχνοις, and renders it in its English figurative equivalent, namely, “heart.” Unfortunately, the Chinese edition of the TEV (i.e. TCV) merely literally translates the English word “heart” without considering the figurative expression in the original Greek. This is a serious problem that translators of the TEV do not translate the Bible in accordance with functional equivalence theory.
They acknowledge the theory’s merits in getting the message from the originals, but do not apply it to actual practice.

2.2.2.4. Conclusion

The crux of the problem with functional equivalence, however, is not limited to the difficulty in reckoning the difference between theory and practice. The real issue is that Nida introduces mutually exclusive categories of formal and functional equivalence and by so doing exaggerates the traditional dichotomy between literal versus free translation, a problem that is most conspicuous in his handling of figurative speech as illustrated above. This is not to say that Nida’s theory offers no assistance in Chinese Bible translation. Functional equivalence can in many ways guide translators to make crucial decisions in rendering the Bible into Chinese more accurately and meaningfully while at the same time preserving the unique character of the biblical text. The challenge remains to be the realization of the theory’s full potential in the actual practice of translation. Ironically, one simply cannot do justice to the theory itself by implementing the guidelines of functional equivalence that Nida offers, since translating figurative expressions literally can in fact fulfill the rules required by the theory, as seen in the example of Phil 1:8 above. Having brought these limitations to the forefront, the translation principles adopted for the current study (2.2.4) will be based on an attempt to ease the existing tension between theory and practice in Chinese Bible translation in light of Nida’s contributions.
2.2.3. Other Modern Translation Theories

2.2.3.1. J.C. Catford

Catford, Nida’s contemporary, offers a brief but impressive treatment of translation from a linguistic perspective. Many of his approaches have been influenced by functionalist linguists such as Halliday and Firth.\(^{141}\) Catford classifies three general types of translation in terms of its extent, levels, and ranks.\(^{142}\) The second and the third types deserve our attention. Translation can be either “total” or “restricted” depending on the levels of language involved. In total translation, all levels of the SL text are replaced by RL material. These levels include grammar, lexis, phonology, and graphology. If only one level is replaced, it would be considered a “restricted” translation. Also, translation can be either “rank-bound” or “unbounded,” in terms of the rank in a grammatical or phonological hierarchy. In English, for example, these ranks include sentence, clause, group, word, and morpheme.

2.2.3.2. Shízijìà for σταυρός

Since the arrival of Nestorian missionaries in China as early as the eighth century, almost all Bible translators have consistently used the Chinese word shízijìà 十字架 to translate the New Testament word σταυρός.\(^{143}\) The only exception is found among the Christian titles listed in the early tenth-century document named the Diptychs (see 2.1.2.). The Doctrine of the Cross or, literally, Cîlîpî Sūtra, contains in its title a different way of rendering the cross in a Christian context.\(^{144}\) According to Catford, both cîlîpî and

\(^{141}\) For related works, see Halliday, et al. *Linguistic Sciences*; Firth, *Selected Papers*.


\(^{143}\) The word shízì has appeared on the Nestorian Stele to refer to the Christian cross. On the subject of the Christian cross used by the Nestorians, see Moule, “Use of the cross,” 78–86; Moule, *Nestorians in China*, 21–43.

\(^{144}\) In the Pinyin, “c” is pronounced as a “tsu” sound.
shizijìà are examples of restricted translation. Shizijìà is a translation of the object cross only at the lexical level because its three characters, shì ("ten"), zi ("word"), and jià ("stand" or "frame"), form the equivalent lexis, meaning "ten-shaped stand" in Chinese. Cilipō on the other hand renders the object into Chinese at the phonological level, since it merely transliterates in this case not the Greek word but the Syriac  tarafān ("cross").

2.2.3.3. Beekman and Callow

a. Introduction

In their *Translating the Word of God*, John Beekman and John Callow state their goal of translation as "so rich in vocabulary, so idiomatic in phrase, so correct in construction, so smooth in flow of thought, so clear in meaning, so elegant in style, that it does not appear to be a translation at all." Following Nida, they stress that in translating the Bible, the linguistic form should be natural, and the message meaningful. They have added an analysis of the components of meaning of a word, which is lacking in Nida and Tabor, and an extended treatment of figurative expressions. Unlike Catford, who largely deals with translation by comparing and contrasting language systems, Beekman and Callow consider especially pertinent issues involving intercultural communication. They argue that the translator needs not only analytical skill but also flexibility and sensitivity in order to handle semantic features of the biblical text. Such features include multiple senses (e.g. figurative senses found in metonymy, synecdoche, hyperbole,

---

145 tarafān is used in the Peshitta to which the Nestorians would have access. See Smith, *Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, s.v.; Thackston, *Introduction to Syriac*, 201.
146 Beekman and Callow, *Translating*, 32.
metaphor and simile, idioms, symbolic actions, etc.) that could be preserved by substituting equivalents in the RL. This optimism sounds quite simple and straightforward, but the actual tasks are often enormous and difficult. Naturally, Beekman and Callow do not utilize Ryken’s “essentially literal” methods to accomplish their goal. They offer the following guidelines:

1) The sense of the word may be translated directly
2) The word used in the original can be retained along with a direct translation of its sense
3) The original figure can be replaced by a figure of the RL with the same meaning.

Beekman and Callow’s suggested guidelines in translating figurative speech may assist Chinese Bible translators. In the example of rendering ἐν στάχτη (Phil 1:8) into the equivalent Chinese expression, at least some of these guidelines obviously would work. Point three, however, needs further attention. It is highly doubtful that the original figure can be easily replaced by a figure of the RL with the absolute same meaning. A close approximation of such replacement might be possible, but realistically it rarely occurs, if at all, since two different language systems operate on two entirely different sets of semantic structures.

b. Lexical Equivalence

Beekman and Callow’s treatment of lexical equivalence deserves some notice. Let us take the example of Paul’s speech to the Athenians in front of the Areopagus in Acts 17:22–31. According to Beekman and Callow, semantically complex words of the SL such as “praise” or “confess” can be substituted with “A says: B is good” or “A says: I did something bad” respectively. When Paul uses the word δείκτη (δείκτημον), he seems to

---

150 Beekman and Callow, *Translating*, 104.
recognize that the Athenians are religious people. The form δεισιδαιμονεστέρους is a comparative adjective, meaning extremely religious. In Chinese one can use the modifier tài (“too”) or tài guó (“excessively”) as several early versions have done (e.g. MOR, MAR, GÜ, PK, JOHNM). The inherent meaning of the Greek word δεισιδαιμόνιον involves a deity or an object of worship. In Beekman and Callow’s theory, it could be rephrased as “fearing the gods.”

Morrison has rendered the verse as Cóng qiánchóng Púsà tài guó, literally “revering the Púsà (Bodhisattva) too much.” The Buddhist term Púsà also appears in GÜ but is used to translate τά σεβάσματα (“objects of worship”) in the following verse. The choice of using Púsà in this context is problematic, since it is used in Chinese Buddhism to specifically refer to Bodhisattva, a saintly figure who provides guidance to the path of enlightenment. Bodhisattva is never worshipped as a god in a way that a god or deity is worshipped in the western concept. In this passage Paul clearly refers to the practice of worshipping pagan gods involving religious objects. Also, Paul never identifies the names of the gods. Morrison and Medhurst put words in Paul’s mouth by their explicit reference to Bodhisattva, thereby violating the principle of historical fidelity. Therefore, the two Chinese versions MOR and GÜ are to be deemed inappropriate and misleading.

Several other Chinese versions (Table 2.1) prefer the word guíshén (gui, “ghost” and shén, “god”). Unlike Púsà, which is used exclusively in Buddhism, guíshén has profound religious meanings widely used in Taoism and Confucianism. In other words, guíshén is

---

152 Bodhisattvas belong to the third class of saints who have to pass only once more through human life before becoming Buddhas, including also those who have not yet entered Nirvana. See Eitel and Takakuwa, Handbook, 32.

153 See, for example, Beekman and Callow’s discussion on cultural substitution. Beekman and Callow, Translating, 201–11.
a relatively neutral term that denotes “supernatural beings” or “spirits” in indigenous Chinese religions, including dozens of folk traditions. Also, because the inclusiveness of the term does not identify specific names of spirits, guīshén maintains historical fidelity to the original text. In line with Beekman and Callow’s theory, guīshén seems to be a good fit in this context.

Table 2.1 provides a comparative survey of different translations of the verse in Acts 17:22b found in several major Chinese versions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOR</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>GÜ</th>
<th>WV</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>UV</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>NCV</th>
<th>CLB</th>
<th>CRV</th>
<th>PK, JOHNNM</th>
<th>WANG</th>
<th>TCV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>我觀凡事爾等從事崇信太過</td>
<td>我觀凡事爾等從事崇信太過</td>
<td>我看你們凡事從事鬼神太過 (v. 23 我看你們拜菩萨... )</td>
<td>予觀爾等頗具宗教精神</td>
<td>我觀爾曹、畏鬼神甚哉</td>
<td>我看你們凡事很敬畏鬼神</td>
<td>我看你們在各方面都更敬畏神明</td>
<td>我看你們在各方面都非常敬畏鬼神</td>
<td>我看得出你們是敬畏鬼神的人，十分誠心</td>
<td>我看你們凡事都很敬畏鬼神</td>
<td>你們凡事敬重宗教</td>
<td>我知道你們在各方面都表現出濃厚的宗教熱情</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I see that in everything you revere the Bodhisattva too much.</td>
<td>I see that in everything you revere the gods too much.</td>
<td>I see you all, revere the gods too much (v. 23 I see you worship the Bodhisattva...)</td>
<td>I see you are rather religious.</td>
<td>I see you all, fear the gods very much.</td>
<td>I see you in everything revere the gods very much.</td>
<td>I see that you in every aspect revere the gods even more.</td>
<td>I see that you in every aspect revere the gods very much.</td>
<td>I can see that you are people who revere the gods, with much sincerity.</td>
<td>I see that you in every aspect revere the gods very much.</td>
<td>I see that you in everything revere the gods too much.</td>
<td>You revere religion in everything.</td>
<td>I know that you in every aspect demonstrate strong religious fervor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. Acts 17:22b
c. Discourse Considerations

Kathleen Callow, who has worked with the Wycliffe Bible Translators in Brazil and Ghana with her husband John, has contributed a short but valuable companion work to Beekman and Callow on discourse considerations in translation. Callow’s work was groundbreaking at the time of its publication more than three decades ago, and is still highly applicable to Chinese Bible translation despite the limitations of its main focus on the RL. Four categories are discussed here: grouping, cohesion, information structure, and prominence.

Callow’s work has built on preliminary discussions of discourse analysis in Beekman and Callow. Some of these comments are rather brief and introductory, but they offer potential insight to the practice of translating the Bible into Chinese. Criteria for delineating discourse units, boundaries, and types, for example, are especially helpful. Early Chinese versions divide the New Testament books into different groups according to their discourse genre. Medhurst divides his 1837 edition of the New Testament into two bēn 本 or “volumes”: vol. 1 contains the Gospels and vol. 2 the rest of the New Testament. In its 1840s revision by Gützlaff there is no such division, but the first five books of the New Testament are bound in one juàn 卷 or “scroll.” The titles of the Gospels are referred to as Chuán fúyīn shū 傳福音書 or “Book of the Evangelists” and the Epistles simply as shū, the same word used for Gospels, which can also mean letters in Chinese. In modern versions, however, shū is reserved for epistolary or Old Testament prophetic books. For Old Testament historical narratives, jí 記 (lit. “records” or

154 Callow, Discourse Considerations.
155 Beekman and Callow, Translating, 178-79; Callow, Discourse Considerations, 13.
"recollections") is preferred by most translators. Zhuan 傳 (lit. "accounts") is often used in historical or biographical titles, for example, the Acts of the Apostles, and in some versions, the Gospels (DV) or Revelation (GÜ). The lack of consensus among early translators makes these Chinese words very confusing and misleading. Today, however, the Chinese words used to divide biblical titles according to their discourse types are relatively uniformly fixed, with only slight variations in the Catholic Bible.

There are different ways to delineate discourse units in the Chinese Bible. Early versions such as GÜ, MAR, and MOR use the word zhōng to indicate the end of each book. For example, Gützlaflf includes Mátài Chuánfúyín shū zhōng 马太福音書終 ("the ending of Matthew's Gospel") in a separate line at the left margin of the text, just as ancient scribes of the Greek manuscripts have often done. Early versions contain several other editorial features with respect to discourse features of the Bible. In traditional Chinese printed books, text runs from top to bottom, right to left. There are no word divisions, as in the ancient Greek MSS. Punctuation is added on the right margin between columns, and therefore is not considered part of the text. As with the Chinese words used in biblical titles, there was no general consensus among translators with respect to the use of punctuation marks or discourse markers. GÜ uses an ordinary Chinese stroke for comma [、], a dot [·] for semicolon or a short break, and a small circle [。] for period. The first editions of the Union Versions employ three different punctuation marks: a dot [•] for comma and semicolon, a small circle [。] for period, and a large circle [○] to divide paragraphs. The practice of punctuation and discourse markers in the Chinese Bible has been a matter of convention and hence subject to confusion and frustration to its readers, for even today there is no uniformity in the system.
In her treatment of cohesion in translation, Callow considers various levels or kinds of cohesiveness relating to lexis, participants, and events in a discourse. The section on cohesion of participants offers some insights into the current discussion of Chinese pronouns. When tracing a participant through a discourse, she suggests that

In many languages a useful rule-of-thumb is to use a pronoun, after the first introduction is completed, unless at some point confusion would result...is this [confusion] resolved by the use of a proper name, a demonstrative, a generic term, or possibly a descriptive noun phrase? There is no way to discover the natural usage except by careful analysis of spontaneous text in the RL. By tracing different participants through the narrative in turn it is possible to discover the normal method of referring to a previously-mentioned participant. Then the less usual forms of reference may be studied to see in what contexts they are found, whether to resolve ambiguity, to start a new paragraph, to provide contrast, or whatever.156

2.2.3.4. Relevance Theory

Relevance theory, a cognitive approach to human communication designed by Sperber and Wilson in 1986, has lent itself to translation studies since 1991, when Ernst-August Gutt published his Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context. Gutt’s work, while ground-breaking in its perspective and promising in its potential, has received mixed responses from scholars of many different interests. The full extent of Gutt’s attempt to utilize relevance theory to account for translation does not need to be repeated here, but some of his insights could be used to increase the translator’s competence and chance for success in Chinese Bible translation.

Gutt’s application of relevance theory to translation studies, as noted by Timothy Wilt, “marks the transition from an era in which it was assumed that the psychological processes involved in translation would ‘simply have to [be taken] for granted.’”157

Principles of relevance suggest that human beings are naturally “wired” to achieve the

156 Callow, Discourse Considerations, 33–34.
157 Nida, Toward a Science, 146; Wilt, Bible Translation, 44, n. 21.
most contextual effects possible for the least processing effort.\textsuperscript{158} In other words, all human beings, without exception, aim at an “optimal relevance” in every verbal utterance and non-verbal communication (including pointing and winking).

Based on this framework, Gutt has argued for some significant implications in translation, which he understands as an “interpretive” use of language. These implications are gathered primarily from pragmatics. Gutt’s contribution is limited, however, to the extent that relevance theory can assist Bible translators only at the macro level. It is ill-equipped, for example, to be utilized as an exegetical tool of the SL.

Conceivable benefits of relevance theory are probably related to quality control, which includes checking the final stages of translation. One could argue that in accordance with relevance theory, Mandarin is currently preferable to the wenli style of Chinese writing or to other regional dialects of China, since it requires the least effort from the great majority of Chinese readers. For the same reason, Bible versions printed in simplified rather than traditional characters are far more likely to enjoy wider circulation in Mainland China. Retaining the conventional Chinese renderings of Christian concepts or transliterations of proper names of the Bible in a new version, again in compliance with relevance theory, produces better contextual effects with minimum costs (both for the translator and the reader) than creating an entirely different system of translation.

2.2.4. Translation Methodology

2.2.4.1. Introduction

This section provides an outline of the proposed translation methodology for the current study. Its scope is largely limited to a linguistic investigation of major Bible

\textsuperscript{158} Sperber and Wilson, \textit{Relevance}, 260.
translation issues, with special reference to grammatical representation of Greek verbal aspect into Mandarin verbal aspect. The outline divides into five areas: grammatical, lexical, phonological, formal, and functional translation. It also includes a discussion of the proper handling of disputed texts. It concludes with the role and responsibilities of the Bible translator.

2.2.4.2. Grammatical Translation

Grammatical translation is of critical importance for Chinese Bible translation. The primary focus of this dissertation, namely translating Greek aspect into Mandarin aspect, deals directly with grammatical translation. Existing versions of the New Testament in Mandarin fail to render Greek aspect correctly because of the translators’ serious misconceptions of both Greek and Mandarin aspect. As a result, many translators rely heavily on lexical means for the translation of Greek aspect into Mandarin. It is argued here that Greek aspect can be translated into Mandarin solely by grammatical means.

Greek and Mandarin both grammaticalize three aspects: perfective, imperfect, and stative aspects. Aspect in the two languages will be discussed in detail in the following chapters. Generally, Greek tense-forms that realize the three aspects may be consistently rendered by the corresponding Mandarin aspect morphemes. (1) illustrates: 159

(1) Ἰησοῦς οὖν εἶδος πάντα τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἐπὶ αὐτὸν ἐξῆλθεν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς τίνα ζητεῖτε; (John 18:4)

此刻耶穌洞察異乎所面臨著的一切，就走了出去告訴他們說：「你們在我那一位？」 (FOLEY) 160

---

159 Note the English translation is from the Chinese. See also the commentary on John 18:4 in my chapter 6.
160 FOLEY refers to the author’s translation done according to the proposed translation theory.
Then Jesus, having understood everything that he was soon facing, went out to tell them, “For whom are you looking?”

Here, the stative aspect, which is realized by the perfect tense-form (εἰδός) in Greek, may be translated by a four-character set phrase (dong-chá-qí-jíān, “know well”) with the ø morpheme (formally unmarked), which signals the corresponding stative aspect in Mandarin. The imperfective aspect, which is signaled by the present tense-forms (ἐρχόμενος, λέγει, ζητεῖτε), may be conveyed in one of the following three ways (see Table 4.2 below): a disyllabic verb with the ø morpheme, a single imperfective aspect morpheme, or an imperfective aspect compound. The perfective aspect, which is signaled by the aorist tense-form (ἐξήλθεν), may be conveyed in Mandarin by either the ø morpheme or by a morphologically expressed perfective morpheme (see Table 4.1).

Here, Catford’s theory, especially his commentary on translation shifts and grammatical and lexical translation, may be extended to the level of discourse. In (1), the four-character set phrase with the ø morpheme not only closely represents the stative aspect in Greek, but its heavily marked feature in Mandarin discourse also adequately translates the frontgrounding device in Greek discourse. Likewise, the more heavily marked disyllabic verb with -zhe not only translates the Greek imperfective aspect, but also translates the discourse function of the present tense-form as a foregrounding device.

The perfective aspect in Greek deserves special notice. Consider the following example:

(2) Ἐγώ γὰρ εἰμὶ ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων ὡς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανός καλεῖσθαι

---

For I am the least among the apostles, not even worthy of being an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God.

Here, the aorist (ἐδίωξα) is translated by the perfective aspect marker -guò. However, other perfective morphemes, including -le and the ø morpheme, are also an option. It should be emphasized that, unlike Greek, Mandarin aspect morphemes are not obligatory, thus explaining the dominance of the unmarked or ø morpheme in Mandarin discourse. Hence, when pòhài-guò-le (“persecuted”) is used instead of pòhài-guò (“persecuted”) in (2), it results in a shift in discourse function. The two-morpheme aspect compound -guò -le is considered inappropriate here because it marks foregrounded prominence in Mandarin, which clearly misrepresents the aorist as the backgrounding tense-form in Greek discourse. Generally, discourse considerations exclude the use of two-morpheme aspect compounds for translating the aorist, unless emphasis is added syntactically (e.g. the repetition of the exact verb form).¹⁶² In addition to the three tense-forms already mentioned, the imperfect and pluperfect tense-forms, which realize the imperfective and stative aspects in Greek respectively, are translated into Mandarin through grammatical rather than lexical means.

¹⁶² See the commentary on ὁσαύρωσον ὁσαύρωσον (John 19:6) in chapter 6 below.
2.2.4.3. Lexical Translation

There are certain syntactical nuances in Greek that are expressed lexically in Mandarin. For example, different types of conditional statements in Greek cannot be expressed grammatically in Mandarin, instead they must be expressed lexically (e.g. using carefully chosen words such as \textit{wànyì} 萬一 ("if by any chance") or \textit{bāhùde} 巴不得 ("earnestly wish") to reflect the nuances of contingency in the fourth conditional).\footnote{163} Also, adverbial or circumstantial uses of the Greek participle, including those of concession, cause, purpose/result, instrument, condition, and command, can only be expressed lexically in Mandarin.\footnote{164}

Another criterion of lexical translation pertains to the issue of consistency in the use of lexis. Generally, the same word/phrase in Greek may consistently be translated by the same word/phrase or expression in Mandarin. For example, the perfect form \textit{γέγραπτα}, which is used as a formulaic phrase to introduce a direct quotation from the Old Testament, should be consistently translated as \textit{jīng shàng jí-zhe shuō} 经上记录说 ("it stands written in the scriptures"), with the stative aspect marker \textit{-zhe}. Furthermore, in the case of two or more synonyms or closely-related words in the Greek New Testament, such as \textit{ἐγείρω} and \textit{ἀνίστημι}/\textit{ἀνάστασις}, both may be translated as \textit{fūhuó} 复活 ("come back to life").\footnote{165} More frequently, however, largely due to complex semantic, pragmatic,
or stylistic considerations in discourse, the same Greek word/phrase may not be translated by the same Mandarin word/phrase occurring in different contexts. For example, λέγω may be translated by various words in Mandarin, including shuō 說 ("say"), wèn 問 ("ask"), gāosù 告訴 ("speak"), or huìfù/huídá 回覆/回答 ("respond"), depending on the given context.

2.2.4.4. Phonological Translation

Phonological translation, according to Catford, is "restricted translation in which the SL phonology of a text is replaced by equivalent TL phonology." Phonological translation in the Greek New Testament is often done at the phrase or word level (e.g. ἀκελόδομος Acts 1:19), and to a lesser extent at the sentence level (e.g. ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῶν ναών σαβαὼν; Matt 27:46). Around the eighth and ninth centuries, three hymns written in Middle Iranian dialects were transliterated into Chinese and later collected into a document that became known as the Manichaean Hymnscroll. In the Chinese Bible, however, phonological translation is mostly confined to the transliteration of proper names. Among early translators, Gury is especially noted for his creativity in devising a unique and elaborate system of transliteration for the New Testament in Chinese. For example, Jesus is transcribed as Yīyīsū从伊稣 from the Russian Иисус, which of

---

Greek. In his collocational analysis of these two Greek verbs, O'Donnell notes that ἐγείρω is used more frequently in the New Testament to refer to resurrection than ἀνάστησις. He also calls for a re-evaluation of the voice system in Greek, suggesting that it should be studied in terms of ergativity as opposed to deponency and transitivity. See O'Donnell, "Resurrection," 136–63. For further comments, see my chapter 7 below.

166 Catford, Linguistic Theory, 56.
course is a transliteration itself from the Greek Ἰησοῦς. Apart from the first three characters used for phonetic transcription, Gury adds a fourth, σ̣, which he renders slightly smaller than normal size so as to represent the aspiration [s] at the ending. Furthermore, he adds a small circle to the top of the character σ̣ to mark the accent of the Greek original. While his attempt to accurately transcribe every nuance of a biblical name into Chinese is commendable, the awkwardness of its appearance and the foreignness of the Greek accent have perhaps hindered Gury's system from being adopted by another translator or being accepted by the Chinese public. Therefore, Gury's system is not suitable for the modern practice of phonological translation of the Bible.

Another issue of phonological translation involves the marking of proper names that have been transliterated into Chinese discourse. Since editorial marks are nonexistent in conventional Chinese writing (e.g. capitalization or italics as in English) to distinguish proper names from other nouns, many translators have experimented to compensate for this void. Morrison and Marshman, for example, found a solution to distinguish place names from personal names by enclosing the characters for the former, for example, 耶路撒冷 (Jerusalem), and by underlining the characters for the latter, for example, 猶大 (Judas). Others use double underlining to mark place names, for example, 耶路撒冷 (Jerusalem, GÜ, followed by DV, GO, GURY, BCV, PK, JOHN, JOHN M, SJ, BB, UVW, UVE, YAN, SYD, WANG, ZHU, CSB). In addition to underlining, Graves suggests that phonological translation may be indicated by inserting the radical 甲 to

---

168 As Graves notes, since many words like 耶穌 (Jesus) have already become a part of the accepted Christian nomenclature of China, alternative forms such as the Russian transliteration mentioned here would not be accepted, even though they reflect closer phonetic representations of the Greek. See Graves, "Principles," 582.
the left of the characters (e.g. 法利嗎 for Pharisee, MOR, MAR). These distinctions are unnecessary, since they are not warranted by the original. Therefore, the marking of biblical proper names will follow today’s conventions, that is, simply by single underlining (CNT, WV, IG, HSC, SB, LÜ, UV, TCV, NCV).

2.2.4.5. Formal Translation

Generally, the word order of the Mandarin translation in this dissertation closely follows that of the Greek New Testament. There are contexts where Mandarin syntax does not permit the formal translation of the original. For example, unlike Greek, the protasis of a Mandarin conditional statement must be placed before the apodosis (e.g. Acts 24:19). For the Greek text, including word divisions and punctuation marks (but not paragraph breaks), the Mandarin translation of the current study follows Nestle-Aland’s Novum Testamentum Graece (27th ed.).

Figurative expressions are generally rendered by formal translation. Consider the following example (Prov 5:15–19):

(3) 你要對自己的妻子忠實，專心愛她...所以，你要以自己的妻子為滿足，
要跟你所娶的女子同享快樂。（TCV）

Nǐ yào duì zǐjī de qīzǐ zhōngshí, zhuānxīn ài tā...suǒyǐ, nǐ yào yī zǐjī de qīzǐ wéi
mānzu, yào gēn nǐ suō qū de núzǐ tóngxiāng kuāilè.

You should be faithful to your own wife; love her wholeheartedly...Therefore,
you should be satisfied with your own wife; you should share happiness with
the girl you marry.

---

169 Graves, “Uniform Names,” 122. Unfortunately, however, Graves’ suggestion was not accepted. Graves follows GÜ and others for the markings of proper names in the Chinese Bible.
170 See example (35) in chapter 5 for further discussion.
171 Aland et al., Novum Testamentum Graece.
According to Nida, functional equivalence requires that figurative expressions of the SL be translated into their equivalent in the RL. The TCV, represented in (3), closely follows the wording of the TEV, which is the first English version of the Bible to employ Nida’s theory. Rather than literally translating, “Drink water from your own cistern, flowing water from your own well... Let your fountain be blessed, and rejoice in the wife of your youth,” as in the NRSV, the TEV renders Hebrew poetry in plain English: “Be faithful to your own wife and give your love to her alone... so be happy with your wife and find your joy with the girl you married.”

Most Chinese versions, however, translate the Hebrew figurative expressions literally (e.g. MAR, GÚ, BCV, DV, SJ, UV, LÜ, SB, NCV, CRV). (4) illustrates:

(4) 你要喝你自已池裡的水，飲你自已井中的活水...要使你的水源蒙祝福；要喜悅你少年所娶的妻。 (LÜ)

Nǐ yào hē nǐ zìjǐ chí lǐ de shuǐ, yǐn nǐ zìjǐ jīng zhòngdǐ huóshuǐ...yào shǐ nǐ de shuǐyuán méng zhùfú; yào xǐyuè nǐ shàonián suǒ qǔ de qī.

You should drink the water from your own pool [and] drink the running water from your own well... let your fountain be blessed; rejoice with the wife of your youth.

Even paraphrased versions, such as the CLB, preserve the original figurative form:

(5) 孩子啊，你當喝自己池裡的水，飲用自己井裡的活泉...你要使家庭蒙福，就要忠於你的髮妻。

Háizì a, nǐ dāng hē zìjǐ chí zhòngdì shuǐ, yǐnyòng zìjǐ jīng lǐ de huóquán...nǐ yào shǐ jiātíng méng fú, jiùyào zhōnggǔ mí de fāqī.

Children, you should drink the water from your own pool; drink the living
spring from your well...if you would like your family to be blessed, be faithful to your first wife.

In modern Chinese, figurative speech such as this is quite common in everyday speech. Besides, even if the objects mentioned here were uncommon or unheard of in Chinese culture, there is no reason why the passage in Prov 5:15–19 could not be represented in the equivalent figurative speech in Chinese. Hence, formal translation is adopted here as the general approach in translating biblical figurative expressions into Chinese.

2.2.4.6. Functional Translation

Functional translation is necessary in contexts where grammatical forms in Greek cannot possibly be represented formally in Mandarin. For example, periphrasis does not exist as a grammatical construction in Mandarin, therefore, it can only be translated by lexical means, or more precisely, only its function can be translated. (6) illustrates: 172

(6) εἰ εἰν τῇ ἤμη ἀμη ἐν Χριστῷ ἡλπικότες ἐσμὲν μόνον, ἠλεεινότεροι πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐσμὲν. (1 Cor 15:19)

如果我們僅僅在此生對基督是眾人所歸的，我們豈不就比眾人更加可悲了。

Rúguó wǒmen jìnjīn zài cǐ shēng duì Jīdū shì zhòng-wàng-suō-guī de, wǒmen qǐ bù jiù bì zhònggrén gèngjiā kēbēi le.

If we only had hope for Christ in this life, are we not more pitiful than all people?

Here, the phrase ἡλπικότες ἐσμὲν is a periphrastic construction, formed by the present of εἰμί + perfect participle. It is argued here (see 5.3.2.1b) that although the periphrastic construction in Greek does not differ semantically from the monolectic verb form, it clearly adds emphasis to the participle and its modifiers. It is this function of

172 See discussions on the periphrastic construction in 5.3.2.
denoting emphasis that may be translated into Mandarin. The *shi...de* construction performs the equivalent function as the Greek periphrasis, as seen in (6).

**2.2.4.7. Unclear or Disputed Texts (Isa 7:14)**

As a rule, unclear or disputed texts of the Bible are translated into Mandarin with the intention of preserving the ambiguities of the original. At the same time, such translations should be made intelligible to the reader. Translators frequently encounter such problematic texts. For example, Greek grammarians have great difficulty treating the conditional sentence in Acts 24:19. In this passage, the optative in the protasis clearly belongs to the fourth class conditional, whereas the imperfect in the apodosis seems to belong to either the first or second class conditionals. However, the decision of determining the exact conditional type should be left to the reader. The scale of the challenge to the translator in this passage is relatively small, especially compared to that of the controversial so-called “virgin text” of Isa 7:14.

The translation of the Hebrew כִּילָם in Isa 7:14 has stirred up much controversy among Christian churches around the world. In the Old Testament, כִּילָם is used broadly to refer to a woman who has not yet borne a child (e.g. Song 6:8). In some contexts, such as Gen 24:43, the word is used to refer to Rebecca, who may be described as young, unmarried, marriageable, and a virgin. The problem arises when the Septuagint translators use the Greek word παρθένος to render כִּילָם in Isa 7:14. Unlike the Hebrew word, παρθένος is an exclusive term, meaning “virgin.” In the prophecy of the coming

---

173 See discussions of example (35) in chapter 5.
Messiah, Matthew quotes from the Septuagint, stating that the “virgin shall conceive and bear a son.”

Most Chinese versions have followed the reading “virgin” for Isa 7:14 and used the same word for Matthew 1:23. The most frequently used Chinese terms are tongnu 童女 (GÜ, BCV, JOHN, JOHN, SJM, UV, NCV, CLB, SJ) and chūnū 處女 (e.g. MAR, DV, SJ). Although tongnu is used less than chūnū in secular contexts, they are synonymous. Chūnū is the most widely used term to encompass the exclusive meaning of the English term “virgin.” Like English, it can also be used metaphorically, as in chūnū hāng 處女航 (“virgin voyage”). The term tongnu may be a better translation of קָנָה because it contains the word tóng, meaning “child.” The rarity of the word in colloquial discourse in Mandarin could be an advantage because the emphasis is now on the youthfulness of the woman, not her lack of any sexual experience. Tongnu is therefore a preferable translation for קָנָה.

Other translations use different Chinese words to translate קָנָה and παρθενος. SB uses zhēnnū 真女 (lit. “virtuous woman”) for both passages in Isaiah and Matthew. LÜ uses shàofū 少婦 in Isaiah but tongnu in Matthew. SJ uses tongnu in Isaiah but chūnū in Matthew. The TCV also uses two different words for the two passages: guīnū 閨女 in Isa 7:14 and tongnu in Matthew 1:23. According to relevance theory, referring to both passages with the same Chinese word would have the advantage of demanding less effort from the reader. Also, choosing the most common word, in this case, chūnū, would also promote comprehension. Nonetheless, tongnu is the more meaningful and better choice of translation for both קָנָה and παρθενος. It fulfills Nida’s principles of functional

176 Guīnū denotes “unmarried woman” or “daughter” in colloquial Mandarin.
equivalence while maintaining the standards of formal translation that call for accuracy and preservation of multiple senses, which Ryken advocates.

2.2.4.8. Role and Responsibility of the Bible Translator

The task of Bible translation goes beyond Catford and Nida's definitions of translation in terms of "a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another," or simply matching equivalence in the SL with the equivalence in the RL.\(^1\) The role of the Bible translator resembles that of a spokesperson of ancient authority, whose voice can only be heard through faithful and diligent study of the biblical texts. The Bible translator is responsible for ensuring that biblical texts are accurately translated, with respect to its grammatical structure, and lexical, formal and functional representations in the RL. It is also the Bible translator's job to preserve the characteristics of the Bible, including figurative expressions and textual ambiguities. These challenges continue to face the Chinese Bible translator.

2.2.5. Conclusion

The ultimate goal of this survey of translation theories is to provide the basis of translation approaches adopted for this study. Although the primary focus of the study is concentrated on translating Greek verbal aspect into Mandarin verbal aspect, the daunting challenge of translating the Bible demands the formulation of a translation theory that is solidly based on modern linguistic research and scholarship. The following chapters will integrate the critical insights presented in this section and continue to develop the author's translation theory to its fullest potential for subsequent application.

2.3. Conclusion

This chapter addresses crucial issues involved in translating the Bible into Chinese and offers critical reviews of current translation theories and their applications to the practice of Chinese Bible translation. A historical overview of the Chinese Bible is provided as a way of introducing major issues related to linguistic, conceptual, and logistical challenges. In the following chapters, these surveyed Chinese Bible versions, which number over sixty, along with Nestorian, Manichaean, and Catholic documents, will be critically evaluated with special emphasis on their translation of Greek verbal aspect. Finally, the translation theory proposed in the second half of this chapter will be applied to the translation of two sample passages in John 18–19 and 1 Corinthians 15.
CHAPTER 3 VERBAL ASPECT IN MANDARIN CHINESE AND NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

3.0. Introduction

The current chapter begins with an introduction to general studies of aspect (3.1). The chapter then divides into two main parts, focusing on Mandarin Chinese aspect (3.2) and New Testament Greek aspect (3.3). The purpose of the chapter is two-fold: to provide critical reviews of previous studies on the subjects in discussion, and to supply outlines of methodology needed for translating the Bible from Greek into Mandarin.

3.1. General Theories of Aspect

3.1.1. Introduction

Over the last sixty years, general studies of aspect have received much scholarly attention. The term “aspect” was first used by the French linguist C.P. Reiff in the early nineteenth century to translate the Russian word вид, which refers to the perfective and imperfective aspects (совершенности и несовершенности), as well as to Aktionsarten (способ действия or “modes of action”). It was not until the 1930s that it became the accepted term for the study of aspect. Jens Holt coined the classic definition of aspect as “les manières diverses de concevoir l’écoulement du process même.”

1 “Les verbes russes, qui n’ont que ces trois temps, ont d’autres inflexions pour designer diverses circonstances qui accompagnent l’action, comme la durée, l’accomplissement, la réitération. Ces diverses nuances, auxquelles des grammairiens russes donnent le nom d’aspects ou de degrés, s’expriment par des désinences ou par des prépositions.” See Reiff, Grammaire français-russe, 86. For discussions of Russian aspect and Aktionsart, see, for example, Maslov, “Глагольный вид,” 158–59; Maslov, “Outline,” 1 n. 1. Aktionsart is recognized as a distinct category from aspect by some aspectologists (e.g. Bache) but not by others (e.g. Comrie). See discussions below.

2 Holt, Études d’aspect, 6. Comrie translates it “different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation.” Comrie, Aspect, 3 n. 1. A similar definition, “different ways of viewing a situation,” is also found in Li and Thompson, Grammar, 184.
of the twentieth century, many aspectologists, such as Bernard Comrie, followed Holt to define aspect as “different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation.”

3.1.2. Aspect and Aktionsart

Aspect is often confused with Aktionsart (German for “kind of action”). The confusion, unfortunately, is not merely terminological but conceptual. Comrie describes their differences in two ways:

The first distinction is between aspect as grammaticalisation of the relevant semantic distinctions, while aktionsart [sic] represents lexicalisation of the distinctions, irrespective of how these distinctions are lexicalized; this use of aktionsart [sic] is similar to the notion of inherent meaning… The second distinction… is between aspect as grammaticalisation of the semantic distinction, and aktionsart [sic] as lexicalisation of the distinction provided that the lexicalisation is by means of derivational morphology.

Since derivative morphological studies (e.g. prefixed verbs) done mostly by aspectologists of Slavic languages are no longer prevalent, the second distinction that Comrie highlights does not apply here. Comrie’s first distinction remains important because it is the most common view of the fundamental differences between aspect and Aktionsart. For this reason, aspect is often referred to as grammatical aspect, whereas Aktionsart is referred to as lexical aspect. Comrie is mistaken, however, when he replaces Aktionsart with “inherent meaning” and groups it together with grammaticalized aspect to form one general category of aspect in order to avoid possible “confusion” caused by

---

3 Comrie, Aspect, 3, n. 1. Throughout the current study the term “aspectology” is used as an umbrella term to refer to general studies of aspect, whereas “aspectuality” refers to the specific aspeckual system of a language.
4 Comrie, Aspect, 6–7, n. 4.
5 See, for example, Maslov, “Outline,” 40.
the two senses of Aktionsart he identified. Comrie’s conflation of aspect and Aktionsart is built upon by John Lyons, who substitutes “aspectual character” for Aktionsart.

Aspect belongs to subjective categories involving the locutionary agent’s (i.e. speaker’s, writer’s, or utterer’s) particular viewpoint (perfective, imperfective, or stative) expressed morphologically by a verb. Aktionsart, on the other hand, is often described as relating to objective categories concerning the procedural characteristics (i.e. manner in which action proceeds) of the presented situation. In other words, while aspect is manifested at the grammatical level, Aktionsart is manifested at the lexical level. Bache argues that the relationship between the two categories should be regarded as “quasi-objective” rather than “quasi-subjective” because inherent meaning is psychological in nature and the typology of situation is defined only in the projected world, not the real one.

The exact relationship between aspect and Aktionsart continues to be a matter of scholarly contention. While many aspectologists continue to use the term Aktionsart, there are those such as Comrie and Lyons who have introduced alternative terms that they have incorporated into the broad categories of aspect. Others, including Bache, and Bertinotto and Delfitto, have used “action” or “actionality” to designate Aktionsart, and

---

8 See, for example, Forsyth, *Grammar*, 29–31, 356. Forsyth’s mentioning of procedurals is based on Maslov’s discussion (способы действия) in Maslov, “Болгарском,” 160, 165. Bache follows Forsyth and defines Aktionsart in terms of “the procedural characteristics (i.e. the ‘phasisal structure’, ‘time extension’ and ‘manner of development’) ascribed to a given situation referred to by a verb phrase, whereas aspect reflects the situation focus with which a situation is represented.” Bache, “Aspect and Aktionsart,” 70; Bache, *Study*, 218. Bache sees aspect as metalinguistic categories, that is, categories that are operated in universal grammar, and that are used to describe language.
advocate treating it separately from the study of aspect. Those who follow Comrie and Lyons, notably Carlota Smith and her followers (e.g. Michaelis, Xiao and McEnery, Fanning, Olsen), have equated “situation aspect,” or “lexical aspect,” with Aktionsart.

3.1.3. Universal Grammar vs. Language Typology

The study of aspect can be divided into two groups according to their different fundamental assumptions. The first group assumes all languages operate within the framework of universal grammar proposed by Chomsky, Greenberg, and Montague. The second group assumes that languages function according to their typological variations. The former approach is advocated by aspectologists that include Dowty, Comrie, Verkuyl, Bache, and Smith, whereas the latter is represented by Forsyth, Dahl, and Santos. With very few exceptions (e.g. Bache), those who accept universal grammar as their guiding principle almost always include Aktionsart as part of their treatment of aspect.

3.1.4. Aspectual Oppositions

Many aspectologists treat aspect in terms of binary oppositions between the perfective and the imperfective. The notion of binary oppositions, introduced by early writers of the Prague school, is extremely important. Some (e.g. Forsyth, Ruipérez, Olsen) describe the

10 Bache, Basboll, and Lindberg, Aspect, Tense, and Action, 217. See also Bertinetto and Delfitto, “Aspect vs. Actionality.”
11 Key contributions include Chomsky’s early work on generative grammar: Chomsky, Syntactic Structures; Chomsky, Lectures. See also Greenberg, Language Universals. For a helpful introduction to universals and typology, see Croft, Typology and Universals, 1–30.
13 Bache often includes Aktionsart as a separate category (i.e. “action”) in his discussions on tense and aspect. See, for example, Bache, Aspect, Tense, and Action.
oppositions as privative; others (e.g. Gao, Porter) as equipollent. The concept of privative and equipollent oppositions was first introduced by Trubetzkoy in his classification of phonic oppositions. According to Trubetzkoy,

Privative Oppositionen sind solche, bei denen das eine Oppositionsglied durch das Vorhandensein, das andere durch das Nichtvorhandensein eines Merkmals gekennzeichnet sind, z. B. 'stimmhalft' - 'stimmlos', 'nasaliert' - 'unnasaliert', 'gerundet' - 'ungerundet' usw... Äquipollente Oppositionen sind solche, deren beide Glieder logisch gleichberechtigt sind, d. i. Weder als zwei Stufen einer Eigenschaft noch als Verneinung und Bejahung einer Eigenschaft gewertet werden, z. B. deutsch p-t, f-k usw. Die äquipollenten Oppositionen sind in jedem System die allerhäufigsten.

In the nineteenth century, L. Razmusen provided the classic description of aspectual oppositions, defining the perfective aspect as “an action considered as a single whole (одно целое),” while expressing the imperfective as “an action considered only from the point of view of its concrete, denotative features (вещественных [знаменательных] своих признаков) without reference to its totality.” Comrie follows this definition but adds that the perfective does not distinguish between the various separate phases that make up that situation, while the imperfective focuses on the internal structure of the situation. Concerning aspectual meaning, Bache states that the perfective aspect carries the meaning of situational completeness, whereas the imperfective denotes a sense of situational progression.

---

15 Lyons defines the equipollent oppositions in terms of “a relation in which each of the contrasting lexemes denotes a positive property.” Lyons, *Semantics*, vol. 1, 279. Those who describe aspect in terms of equipollent oppositions include, for example, Gao and Porter. See Gao, *Grammar*, 186–99; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*.
18 Comrie, *Aspect*, 16.
In his aspectual hierarchy, Comrie divides the imperfective into habitual and continuous (either nonprogressive or progressive), and the perfective into four subcategories (result, experiential, persistent, and recent past).

It should be noted that Comrie’s subcategories of the perfective are not to be accepted as genuine aspectual oppositions, as Bache has pointed out, because they are merely definable in terms of inherent meanings.

3.1.5. Carlota Smith's Two-Component Theory

3.1.5.1. Introduction

Although clear distinctions have been made between aspect and Aktionsart in this chapter, the plethora of current literature (especially those devoted to the study of Chinese aspect) necessitates the introduction of the role Aktionsart plays in the study of aspect. In The Parameter of Aspect, Carlota Smith develops her two-component theory on the basis of several key linguistic principles defined by universal grammar (Chomsky’s) and by the Prague School (notions of markedness). She also implements Discourse Representation Theory to analyze the aspectual systems of five different languages (English, French, Russian, Chinese, and Navajo). Her two-component theory

---

20 Comrie, Aspect, 25, 58–64.
21 Bache, “Aspect and Aktionsart.” This has also been cited by Porter in Porter, Verbal Aspect, 46.
22 The notion of “markedness” derives from the early works of the Prague School linguists. John Lyons provides a helpful summary of the three key senses of markedness in lexical structure: formal, distributional, and semantic markedness. Lyons, Semantics, vol. 1, 305–11. See discussions in 3.2.5, p. 116 below. For a recent review of Smith’s theory, see Klein, Li, and Hendriks, “Aspect and Assertion,” 735–39. Klein et al. posit an alternative framework of analysis of the four aspect marks (-le, -guo, -zhe, and zai). Their analysis, being largely built upon the works of Smith and Mangione and Li, is concerned with time intervals and temporal relations that these aspect markers situate and assert. It is essentially a model of Aktionsart. See Mangione and Li, “Compositional Analysis,” 65–122.
23 Discourse Representation theory is a kind of semantic algebra useful for analyzing small discourse. It was developed by Kamp and Heim. It should be pointed out that Smith’s application of the theory is limited to analyses at the sentential level. See Kamp, “Theory of Truth,” 277–322; Kamp, “Événements, Représentations Discursives,” 39–64. See also Heim, “Semantics.”
of aspect consists of “viewpoint aspect” (i.e. grammatical aspect) and “situation aspect” (Aktionsart). She claims that the theory also allows integration of aspect with other semantic features of sentences, such as temporal location. The influence of Smith’s two-component theory on the study of aspect is evident in more than a dozen recent publications and doctoral theses on Chinese aspect (e.g. Xiao and McEnery, Kang). Like Comrie, Smith is concerned with providing a universal linguistic account of a theory of aspect. Smith argues that aspectual meanings are grammaticalized through these two types of categories:

The categories of viewpoint aspect are overt, whereas situation aspect is expressed in covert categories...viewpoint is generally indicated morphologically, with affixes or other designated morphemes. Situation type is conveyed more abstractly, by the verb and its arguments, or verb constellation [according to Henk Verkuyl 1972]. The forms that specify each aspectual component co-exist in a sentence.

### 3.1.5.2. Situation Aspect

Situation aspect is often equated with lexical aspect, or Aktionsart, for it focuses on the inherent meaning of the verb at the lexical level. Situation aspect was proposed by Zeno Vendler, a professor of philosophy, in 1967. In addition to the binary oppositions between the perfective and imperfective aspect, three sets of aspectual oppositions can be observed here: [±dynamic], [±durative], and [±telic].

Vendler’s four categories of aspectual situations in English are:

---

24 Smith, *Parameter*, xvi.
26 Smith, *Parameter*, xiv, 5. Xiao and McEnery’s definition, “the study of linguistic devices that enables a speaker to direct the hearer’s attention to the temporality of a situation, either intrinsic [inherent] or viewed from a certain perspective,” is basically derived from Smith’s understanding of aspect. Xiao and McEnery, *Aspect*, 1.
• **Activities** [+dynamic], [+durative], [--telic]
  
e.g. run, walk, swim, push, pull, etc.

• **Accomplishments** [+dynamic], [+durative], [+telic]
  
e.g. run a mile, paint a picture, draw a circle, write a letter, kill, walk to school, attend a class, recover from illness, get ready for something, etc.

• **Achievements** [+dynamic], [--durative], [+telic]
  
e.g. win a race, find the treasure, reach the top, recognize, find, lose, spot, identify, cross the border, start, stop, resume, be born, die, etc.

• **States** [--dynamic], [+durative], [--telic]
  
e.g. have, think, know, believe, love, hate, be tall, own, desire, rule, dominate, etc.

Vendler’s model is most convincing in his own words:

… the concept of activities calls for periods of time that are not unique or definite. Accomplishments, on the other hand, imply the notion of unique and definite time periods. In an analogous way, while achievements involve unique and definite time instants, states involve time instants in an indefinite and nonunique (sic) sense.]

A few years before Vendler put forth his classification, Anthony Kenny had in fact come up with his own version nearly identical to Vendler’s except that he collapsed the accomplishments and achievements into “performances.” Because he has pointed out the similarities between his and Aristotle’s categories, Kenny’s taxonomy of verbs is referred to by some as “Aristotelian aspect.” Vendler and Kenny’s classifications are sometimes called “Vendler-Kenny” categories of verbs.

---


30 See, for example, Binnick, *Time and the Verb*, 139–49, 170–78. Binnick sees aspect, *Aktionsart*, and Aristotelian aspect as three distinct categories. To avoid confusion, this distinction is not maintained here.
Later aspectologists (e.g. Comrie and Smith) have added a fifth situation, semelfactive, to establish atelic punctiliar dynamic verbs (e.g. knock, tap, cough).\textsuperscript{31} Chart 3.1 below illustrates the five aspectual situations according to Smith.\textsuperscript{32} Aspectual meanings found in these situations are discussed differently by others (e.g. Maslov has different terms for each set of aspectual situations).\textsuperscript{33}

![Chart 3.1. Smith's situation types](image)

Recently, Xiao and McEnery have extended Smith's two-component theory to develop a two-level model of situation aspect.\textsuperscript{34} They use the labels [+telic] and [+bounded] to distinguish between temporal and spatial endpoints. They also add [+results] for each situation type (e.g. accomplishments are the only situation type labeled with a plus).\textsuperscript{35} Furthermore, statives are divided into "individual-level" and "stage-level" states. The strength of their argument undoubtedly is that the study is corpus-based, as

---

\textsuperscript{31} Semelfactive derives from the Russian \textit{мгновенный}, meaning "momentary." Comrie defines it as "a situation that takes place once and once only (e.g. one single cough)." Comrie, \textit{Aspect}, 43, n. 2.

\textsuperscript{32} Chart 3.1 is based on Carlota Smith's temporal features of the situation types summarized in Smith, \textit{Parameter}, 20. Here Smith, however, uses [+Static] instead of [+dynamic].

\textsuperscript{33} Maslov prefers \textit{предельный} or "limited" (or "terminative") as opposed to telic situation types. Maslov, "Outline," 7 n. 19; 6–13.

\textsuperscript{34} Xiao and McEnery, "Corpus-Based," 325–63. This same article is reprinted in a summary form in Xiao and McEnery, "Situation Aspect," 185–200.

\textsuperscript{35} See Xiao and McEnery, "Situation Aspect," 339.
opposed to that of Smith, whom they claim, “focuses her aspectual classification directly on idealized situations at the sentential level.”

The Chinese corpus that Xiao and McEnery have used, however, is a rather small journalistic one that does not include the Bible. It does not represent writings of mixed genres, which may include religious, philosophical, or historical content. Xiao and McEnery’s two-level model of situation aspect (basic and derived categories) may be considered superfluous, since Smith has already discussed some of the observations it presents.

3.1.5.3. Smith’s Viewpoint Types

Since the purpose of the current study is translating New Testament Greek aspect into Chinese aspect, a full review of Smith’s two-component theory is not needed. It is necessary, however, to evaluate in more detail her treatment of what she calls the “viewpoint types” of aspect. Smith compares aspectual viewpoints with the focus of a camera lens, which presents situations from a particular perspective. She identifies not two but three viewpoint types:

- **Perfective**: a situation in its entirety, including both initial (I) and final (F) endpoints [I F]

  ／／／／／／／

- **Imperfective**: part of a situation, including neither initial nor final endpoints

  [I.／／／／／／／F]

---

36 Xiao and McEnery, “Situation Aspect,” 330. The same accusation is repeated on the next page. Smith is aware of this limitation as she herself has noted in Smith, *Parameter*, 86.


38 Smith, *Parameter*, 2. Similar analogy is also found in Hewson and Bubenik, *Tense and Aspect*, 3–4.

• **Neutral**: flexible, including the initial endpoint of a situation and at least one internal state [I.]\(^{40}\)

Smith does not follow Comrie’s subcategories of perfective and imperfective aspects, rather, she emphasizes the contrastive viewpoints between a closed (i.e. perfective) and an open (i.e. imperfective) situation in conceptual or narrative time. In Smith’s two-component theory, the perfective aspect generally presents situations as punctual and does not apply to stative situations, which have no endpoints in the temporal schema. They have no duration semantically unless they are specifically marked with duration, as in (1).\(^{41}\)

(1) The king reigned for thirty years.

Smith argues that viewpoint types are realized in many languages by means of verb inflection. For example, the English perfective viewpoint is signaled by the simple form of the main verb. In Japanese, it is signaled by attaching the auxiliary verb *ta te* to the main verb.\(^{42}\) In Mandarin, where there is no verb inflection, the perfective viewpoint is expressed by the morphemes *-le T* and experiential *-guo 過*, and by resultative verb complements (RVCs). The imperfective viewpoint, on the other hand, is signaled by the auxiliary *be + ing* in English and by attaching the auxiliary verb *te iru でいる* to the main verb in Japanese.

---

\(^{40}\) General temporal schemas and explanations are from Smith, *Parameter*, 66, 73, 81.

\(^{41}\) Smith, *Parameter*, 72.

\(^{42}\) The example of Japanese is mine. For discussions on Japanese verbal aspect, see, for example, Yoshimoto, *Tense and Aspect*; Suzuki 鈴木 奎, *Kodai Nihongo doshi*; Suzuki 鈴木 康之, “Fifty Years,” 1–13.
3.1.5.4. Smith’s Neutral Viewpoint Type

While traditional aspectologists deal with only the perfective and imperfective viewpoint types, Smith includes a third type, the neutral viewpoint, which was initially proposed by Carr and Halliday.\(^{43}\) The neutral viewpoint presents a situation that is aspectually vague because it lacks a viewpoint morpheme.\(^{44}\) She describes it as “a default with a positive semantic value” that allows both closed and open readings.\(^{45}\) She claims that the neutral viewpoint is realized in some languages (e.g. French and Mandarin) but not in others (e.g. English).

Smith’s third viewpoint type has not been accepted by most of her peers. Among those who have rejected it are Xiao and McEnery, who follow Smith’s two-component theory in their recent corpus-based treatment of Mandarin aspect.\(^{46}\) The problem with Smith’s proposal is that it is not a global theory of aspect. The neutral viewpoint is only realized in those few selected languages that Smith analyzes. In the case of Mandarin, the neutral aspect may appear to offer insights into the semantics of Chinese verbs; however, upon closer examination it turns out not to be the case. Consider the following example:

\[\text{(2) 若口認耶穌為主、心信上帝復之、則得救 (Rom 10:10)}\]

\[\text{Ruo kou rên Yēsū wéizhǔ, xīn xīn Shàngdì sū zhī, zé déjiù.}\]

If you acknowledge with mouth Jesus as Lord, and believe in the heart that God revived him, you will be saved.

---


\(^{44}\) Smith, *Parameter*, 77–81.

\(^{45}\) Smith, *Parameter*, 77–78.

\(^{46}\) Xiao and McEnery, *Aspect*. 
(2) is the DV's rendering of ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σοῦ ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν ἠγερεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ in wenli style. In Smith's terms, all of the Chinese verbs convey the neutral aspect: ṛĕn ("acknowledge"), xin ("believe"), sū ("revive"), and déjiù ("be saved"). Each verb has both a closed and an open reading. Classical Chinese lacks the aspect morphemes -le, -guo, zài, and -zhe found in Mandarin. Even in Mandarin, aspect morphemes are optional and often omitted in both spoken and written discourse. In (2) the verbs used in Rom 10:10 all lack viewpoint morphemes in most Mandarin versions (e.g. UV, LŪ, TCV, NCV, CLB). Although Mandarin is equipped with clearly identifiable aspect markers, diachronic evidence suggests that it retains linguistic features derived directly from classical Chinese. Therefore, it is a serious mistake to assume that any Mandarin verb with no aspect morpheme belongs to the neutral aspect.

Smith is correct, however, when she points out that aspect morphemes are optional in Mandarin. She observes:

Viewpoint morphemes are syntactically optional, making the neutral viewpoint always available in principle. The presence of an explicit viewpoint morpheme therefore carries a certain emphasis not available in languages for which viewpoint is syntactically obligatory.

---

47 Robert Morrison, however, has used -guo (e.g. Mark 2:12, Luke 14:18–20) and -le (e.g. John 18:30, 33) to translate the Greek aorist tense-form in his wenli New Testament. These must be ruled out as exceptions. It needs to be noted that particles such as qi 其, jūé 貝, yē 也, yi 矣 used in Early and Late Archaic Chinese are not genuine aspect morphemes as Egerod has claimed. See Egerod, "Aspect," 278–86.

48 Classical Chinese employs verb complements to express aspect. For example, the RVC jùn ("complete") is used to convey the perfective aspect in Shàngdì gōng jùn 上帝 工 ("God finished working," Gen 2:2, DV). For this reason, wenli versions of the Chinese Bible are considered in this dissertation. Some argue that RVCs (as well as IDVCs) are frequently attested in historical and literary writings of classical Chinese (e.g. 《史記》, 《漢書》, 四書五經) as early as in the Han Dynasty (206 B.C.E.–220 C.E.). See Yu 余健萍, "On the Origin and Development," 114–26; Wang 王 力, History, vol. 2, 301–04; Yang 杨建園, "Notes," 29–48; Xu 徐 丹, Typological Change, 161, 146–88. It is worth noting that the classical texts throughout Xu’s monograph are cited erroneously in a mixture of simplified and traditional characters. This is an unacceptable practice for any scholarly writing on classical Chinese. Others opinions vary, but most agree that RVCs were fully developed no later than the Tang Dynasty (618–906 C.E). See Ota, Historical Grammar, 204–22; Ota, Historical Study, 173–76; Jiang, "Genesis," 367–81; Antonian, "Diachronic Analysis," 383–403; Wang 王錦慧, Diachronic Analysis, 57–104.

49 Smith, Parameter, 263.
Unfortunately, Smith does not elaborate on the sort of emphasis there is in situations marked with aspect morphemes. She is correct, though, as far as seeing the problem in terms of conventions of use that are “pragmatic in nature and therefore cannot be stated at the level of syntactic or semantic structure.” In addition to pragmatics, discourse factors also play a crucial role. Chang has observed that the perfective morpheme -le, for example, is often omitted and reserved for the peak event in narrative discourse. In Bible translation, these considerations must be included and taken seriously. The problem of Smith’s neutral viewpoint will receive further examination in 3.2.5.

3.1.5.5. Contrastive Aspectual Studies

a. Yuriy Maslov

Recent works on contrasting aspectual systems between languages are numerous. The languages that enjoy well-received attention are Slavic, Germanic, Romance, Nordic, Sanskrit, and Baltic languages (including ancient Greek). Several contrastive aspectual studies of non Indo-European languages such as Japanese and Mandarin have also appeared in recent decades. Maslov’s 1985 essay on contrastive aspectology has become a classic and some of his insights will serve as guidelines for the current study in working with both Greek and Mandarin aspectual systems.

---

50 Smith, Parameter, 280.
52 See, for example, Maslov’s article on aspect in the contemporary Bulgarian literary language, Maslov, “Българском,” 157–312. See also Maslov, Forsyth, and Forsyth, Contrastive Studies. For contrastive studies of Russian (including Old Slavonic) and ancient Greek aspect, see, for example, Navratil, Beirag; Shafranov, “Исследование,” 25–30, 107–36. For Sanskrit and ancient Greek, see, for example, Gonda, Character; Banerjee, Indo-European Tense and Aspect. For Modern Greek and ancient Greek, see, for example, Humbert, “Verbal Aspect,” 21–28; Bubenik, “From Ancient to Modern Greek,” 249–64; Lallot, “Aspects contrastés,” 247–65.
53 For a contrastive aspectual study of Japanese and English, see, for example, Yoshimoto, Tense and Aspect. See reviews on Mandarin below.
Two of Maslov’s ideas are particularly pertinent. One concerns his emphasis on giving priority to functional-semantic similarities and differences between languages before considering external structure. The other relates to his comment that “the distribution of particular aspectual meanings in one language is not isomorphic with their distribution in another.” This is an especially welcome confirmation of the observations made above concerning the neutral viewpoint type in Mandarin. Quite obviously, the Greek perfective aspect would not necessarily correspond exactly to the Mandarin perfective in every detail of semantic and syntactic significance.

Some additional comments Maslov makes on the analysis of translation in contrastive studies deserve further notice. He suggests taking several translations of the same work made by different translators in order to achieve greater objectivity. This supports the use of more than sixty Chinese Bible versions with different writing styles in the current study to assist in analysis. Maslov’s advice on carrying out bidirectional analysis of translated texts, however, is not applicable here, since the aim of Bible translation is limited to only one direction (i.e. from Greek to Mandarin).

This realization with respect to Maslov’s advocacy of bidirectional analysis also underlines the purpose of the current study, of which the scope is not limited to merely contrasting aspectual systems of Greek and Mandarin. The primary concern is Bible translation, and discovering how Greek and Mandarin aspectuality can assist the translator to achieve the goal of rendering the Bible more accurately, elegantly, and meaningfully.

---

b. Zhang Lihua

Previous studies on contrastive aspectology of Mandarin and other languages are few and unsatisfactory. Apart from Xiao and McEnery’s work on Mandarin and English, recent works include Lihua Zhang’s *A Contrastive Study of Aspectuality in German, English, and Chinese.* Zhang’s work is defective and flawed in many fundamental areas, and thus is not reviewed here in full. The most serious mistakes in this study undermine her understanding of aspect. For example, she disregards Maslov’s warning not to confuse prefixed verbs with aspect. Along with prefixed verbs, she also treats postverbal particles, both of which should be categorized under Aktionsart. Furthermore, her work is filled with confused terminology and awkward English expressions. Although Zhang has followed the bidirectional analysis of translated texts between languages suggested by Maslov, it is unclear whether or not the Chinese translation is based on the English translation or the German original.

3.1.5.6. Conclusion

This section covers major discussions of general theories of aspect. Aspect is treated here as the locutionary’s choice of viewing a situation, either as perfective or imperfective, expressed by means of verbal morphology. Perfective aspect views the situation as a whole, whereas imperfective aspect views it as an ongoing process. It should be emphasized that aspect and Aktionsart are two separate categories, and that

---

57 Zhang, *Contrastive Study.*


only aspect will be the focus here. The next two sections deal with two typologically
different aspectual systems, Mandarin Chinese (3.2) and New Testament Greek (3.3).

3.2. Verbal Aspect in Mandarin Chinese

3.2.1. Introduction

Since the early studies on aspect began more than sixty years ago, considerable
attention has been focused on verbal aspect in the Chinese language. Many western
scholars (including those from the Russian school, such as Jaxontov and Maslov)
frequently refer to the Chinese verbal system in their studies of aspect. Notable western
scholars include Maspero, Dragunov, Jaxontov, Smith, J. Charles Thompson, and Sandra
Thompson. Since the late 1960s, some native Chinese speakers have also begun to work
on Mandarin aspect. Most of these are western-trained linguists (e.g. Li, Tai, Xiao),
however, a few others are native scholars from Mainland China (e.g. Lü, Wang, Gao).
Sections 3.2.2–3.2.4 include critical reviews of major theoretical approaches and
discussions of Chinese aspect. These previous studies share a common deficiency in
that they lack a powerful linguistic model needed to satisfactorily treat the ø morpheme.
Section 3.2 concludes with an outline of methodology for treating Chinese aspect
applicable for the purpose of Bible translation (3.2.5).

---

60 For a summary in tabular form of major proposed models of Mandarin aspect, see the Japanese
translator’s Preface in Jaxontov, Chugokugo doshi, 6–7. For outlines of the history of the study of Chinese
grammar, see, for example, Wang, History; Gong, History. Wang covers from pre-Qin (先秦, before 221
B.C.E.) to 1949, with emphasis on phonetics, whereas Gong primarily surveys publications of the modern
period. Gong only includes publications by native speakers in Chinese, and, unfortunately, offers no critical
review regarding verbal aspect in Chinese. See also Fang 方光熹, Collected Essays, 225–51. Fang
mentions a few names of publications in the 1950s by Russian sinologists. For a survey of early Chinese
grammatical treatises by western authors, see Summers, Handbook, v–xv.
3.2.2. Early Approaches

3.2.2.1. Francisco Varo’s Arte de la Lengua Mandarina compuesto

The feat of first publishing a Chinese grammar is credited to the Spanish Dominican missionary Francisco Varo (1627–87). His Arte de la Lengua Mandarina compuesto appeared in Canton in 1703. Several subsequent Chinese grammars, such as T.S. Bayer’s Museum Sinicum, and Étienne Fourmont’s Linguae Sinarum Mandarinicae, also began circulating in the eighteenth century, however, Varo’s grammar deserves special notice not only because it was the first of its kind, but also because it was the first attempt to systematically treat a spoken language of China, in this case, southern (Nanking) Mandarin.

Varo divides his discussion of verbs into indicative and non-indicative moods. The indicative further divides into six subcategories: present indicative (Ø morpheme), imperfect preterit (marked by shì 是), preterit perfect (liǎo 了, yǐ 已), pluperfect preterit (-guòle 过了, -wánle 完了), future imperfect (jiāng 将, huì 会), and future perfect (-liǎo 了, -wán 完, -chéng 成). The non-indicative moods include the imperative, optative and subjunctive (bàbùde 巴不得, yuan 願), infinitive (qù 去, gāi 改, lái 来, etc.), and even participles (...de(rén) 的人, ...zhē 者). In addition to these two categories, Varo also introduces the category of passive voice, which he observes as grammatically marked by particles, such as shì 是, suǒ 所, wéi 为 and bèi 被. Interestingly, these grammatical

---

61 Varo, Arte. Varo’s biography with an introduction to his grammar can be found in Varo, Francisco Varo’s Grammar, ix–liii.
62 Other eighteenth century Chinese grammatical treatises include Bayer et al., Museum Sinicum; Fourmont, Linguae Sinarum Mandarinicae. Southern or Nanking Mandarin was distinguished from Northern or Peking Mandarin, upon which today’s standard Mandarin is based. For introductory comments by nineteenth century Chinese grammarians, see, for example, Bazin, Mémoire, 6–7. The first Mandarin version of the New Testament (1856) was translated into Nanking Mandarin. See 2.1.5, p. 30 above.
63 Varo, Arte, 49–58.
markers remain virtually unchanged even today, and, despite the apparent problems related to his dependence on the tense-based system of Latin, Varo’s basic approach to the treatment of Mandarin verbs has been deeply imprinted upon future generations of grammarians.

3.2.2.2. Morrison, Marshman, Gützlaff, Edkins, and Mateer

In the century following the first publication of Varo’s Mandarin grammar, more than a dozen Chinese grammars sprang up in different European languages. Among them were Robert Morrison’s *A Grammar of the Chinese Language*, Joshua Marshman’s *Clavis Sinica*, Karl Friedrich August Gützlaff’s *Notices on Chinese Grammar*, Joseph Edkins’ *A Grammar of the Chinese Colloquial Language*, and Calvin Mateer’s *A Course of Mandarin Lessons*. These five grammars deserve special treatment here because they were written by those who had been actively involved with translating the Bible from the original languages into Chinese.

a. Robert Morrison

It is now certain that, as Morrison himself claims, his *Grammar* of 1816 was the first of its kind in English, although it was published a year after Marshman’s grammar. It is

---


65 Morrison, *Grammar*, iii. Key evidence strongly suggests that Morrsion had finished his grammar in the spring of 1811. First, the date in the Preface reads April 2, 1811. Second, by 1815 he took on new projects compiling a Chinese-English/English-Chinese dictionary and translating the Bible into wenli Chinese. See Morrison, *Dictionary*. Third, Morrison’s widow and Townsend both report that “for some unknown cause,”
quite possible that the two English missionaries knew each other’s work. Although Morrison’s treatment of Mandarin verbs was rudimentary, it was a revolutionary undertaking, not only because it was the first of its kind in English, but also because Mandarin had never been used officially in writing and would remain strictly in colloquial use for at least another century.

Morrison clearly anticipated that his work would satisfy the need of (Protestant) missionaries working in China for a Mandarin primer. Following Varo, Morrison treats Mandarin verbs within the traditional western tense and mood categories, however, he illustrates the verb system through paradigms, such as “to have” (ǒu 有), “to be” (shi 是), “to advise” (quàn 勸), and auxiliary verbs that are “conjugated” in the present, imperfect, perfect, pluperfect, and future tenses. Again, Morrison follows Varo closely by listing five kinds of moods: the indicative, potential, subjunctive, infinitive, and participle. The perfect and pluperfect tenses are denoted by the suffix -guó, and are differentiated by the adverbs yìjīng 已經 (“already”) and cèngjīng 曾經 (“once,” “ever”). Unlike Varo, -le is treated as a post-sentential modal particle, not as an aspect marker.

Morrison had finished his grammar for nearly three years before it was finally printed at the Serampore Press in 1815 at the expense of the East India Company for which Morrison worked as the official translator of Chinese. See Morrison, Memoirs of the Life and Labours of Robert Morrison, 298–99; Townsend, Robert Morrison, 53, 58. Fourth, Zetzsche has noted an incident in which Morrison accused Marshman of plagiarizing his grammar. Marshman responded with the accusation that Morrison was guilty of plagiarizing Basset’s MSS in his translation of the New Testament. See Zetzsche, Bible in China, 51. Finally, Samuel Kidd, professor of Chinese in University College in Malacca, Malaysia, notes that Morrison’s grammar is “not only the first production of the author, but the first in the English language, on Chinese philology.” Morrison, Memoirs of the Life and Labours of Robert Morrison, vol. 2, 75.

66 Varo also had the same goal in mind.

67 Morrison, Grammar, 113–200. The same word was used by Varo. See Varo, Arte, 51.
expressing perfectivity. Following Varo, Morrison excludes imperfective markers, such as zuì and -zhe.

b. Joshua Marshman

Joshua Marshman’s grammar shares some similarities with Morrison’s as both follow Varo’s basic framework of treating Chinese verbs. For the classifications of moods, Marshman follows Morrison closely but adds a brief discussion on the imperative and optative moods. In reality, however, the two have significantly different approaches to treating the Chinese verbal system. For example, Marshman argues that verb inflection is irrelevant in Chinese because Chinese verbs do not conjugate in the same way as Indo-European languages. Hence, unlike Morrison, who uses conjugations of paradigm verbs, Marshman discusses verbal syntax with illustrations of wenli Chinese from the classics (e.g. Confucian texts) and illustrations of Mandarin from informal discourse and conversation. Oddly, even though both had already published at least parts of the New Testament by the time their grammars appeared, neither Marshman nor Morrison includes illustrations from the Bible. Most importantly, Marshman treats the Chinese verbal system in the context of its relation to other languages, such as English, Sanskrit, Hebrew, and Greek. For this reason, Marshman’s Chinese grammar is perhaps more useful for Bible translation than that of Morrison.

Marshman posits five tenses in Chinese: indefinite/aorist, present, perfect, “past connected with time” (or “past time”), and future. According to Marshman, the Chinese

---

68 For the term “modal particle,” I follow Li and Takahashi. See Li 李, Beiträge, 278; Takahashi, “On the Use,” 220.
70 Marshman, Clavis Sinica, 390.
aorist corresponds to the Greek aorist tense-form, which expresses the present, past, and future time. In contrast to Varo, Marshman asserts that the “simple verb” (i.e. verb marked with the 0 morpheme) realizes not the present indicative but the “aorist tense” in Chinese, which can be used to render the Greek aorist.\textsuperscript{72} The other four tenses are signaled by temporal deictic indicators, verbal suffixes, and auxiliary verbs. For example, the adverb 今 今 (“now”) expresses the present, 始 始 (“begin”) expresses the “past time,” and the auxiliary verb 將 將 conveys the future.\textsuperscript{73} The perfect tense, Marshman argues, is signaled by several different morphemes, which include the adverbs 已 已 ("already"), 完 完 ("done"), and 尝 尝 ("taste," "try"), and aspect perfective morphemes -guò, wán ("finish"), and -le.\textsuperscript{74} Unlike Morrison, Marshman treats the post-sentential le not as a modal particle but as a marker of the perfect tense.

c. Karl Friedrich August Gützlaff

Gützlaff's Notices on Chinese Grammar was published in Batavia in 1842 under the pseudonym Philo-Sinensis. Although this volume has been criticized by the contemporary grammarian James Summers for its limited contributions,\textsuperscript{75} it is worth noting here because it is technically a collaboration between Gützlaff and Walter H.

\textsuperscript{72} Marshman, Clavis Sinica, 433.
\textsuperscript{73} For examples of the temporal deixes used in the Analect, see von der Gabelentz, Chinesische Grammatik, 462–68, 496–97; Ota, Descriptive Grammar, 79–85.
\textsuperscript{74} Marshman, Clavis Sinica, 435–42; Marshman correctly notes that -guò, wán, and -le, are frequently found in conversation and vernacular discourse, but scarcely or never used in Chinese classical literature. Compare Brandt, who categorizes several other particles as the "particles of completed action": 將 將, 將 將, 方 方, 令 令, 始 始, 成 成, 應 應, 許 許, 業 業. See Brandt, "Wenli Particles," 8–9.
\textsuperscript{75} Summers notes that "this work was prepared in haste, and consequently neither the author nor the editor did justice to his abilities and acquirements." See Summers, Handbook, ix.
Medhurst, both of whom were translators of the Medhurst/Gütlaff/Bridgman’s Version of the Chinese Bible (GÜ).\textsuperscript{76}

Although Gütlaff treats Chinese verbs according to western tense-based categories, his remarks on the ə morpheme are significant. He argues that grammatical particles or auxiliaries such as wán 完, jìn 竅, chéng 成, -guò, and bi 毕, which are "words descriptive of the past tense; as-done, finished" are optional in Chinese (including Mandarin).\textsuperscript{77} He states,

As the Chinese verb has not yet been exhibited in all its bearings, we shall be the more particular upon this subject. Thus it will be our object to show, how, though devoid of moods and tenses, it is made to answer all the purposes of our conjugations and infections; while we must always bear in mind, that unless the distinction become necessary, none of the grammatical particles or auxiliaries are employed.\textsuperscript{78}

Unfortunately, Gütlaff does not elaborate on the conditions in which such distinction becomes necessary. Also, lacking the modern linguistic concept of aspect, Gütlaff adopts Morrison’s system of tense and mood in Chinese to discuss the ə morpheme and common verbal suffixes. It is these considerations that have limited Gütlaff's contribution to the study of Chinese verbs. Gütlaff does, however, include a few important grammatical particles that had not been treated previously. For example, he was the first author to recognize the particle zhèngzài 正在 as a marker of imperfect tense.\textsuperscript{79}

\textsuperscript{76} The title page of this volume identifies Medhurst as the translator. While Gütlaff presumably wrote this grammar in German, there is no evidence that he ever published it in a language other than English. As mentioned above, Summers refers to Medhurst as Gütlaff's editor. See Summers, \textit{Handbook}, ix. For the discussions of GÜ, see 2.1.4.2, p. 22 above. In addition to GÜ, Medhurst also took part in the translation of the DV. See 2.1.4.4, p. 24 above.

\textsuperscript{77} Gütlaff, \textit{Notices}, 86–87.

\textsuperscript{78} Gütlaff, \textit{Notices}, 77–78; 97.

\textsuperscript{79} Gütlaff, \textit{Notices}, 98.
d. Joseph Edkins

In the year that the Taiping Rebellion ended in China (1864), Joseph Edkins published his second edition of *A Grammar of the Chinese Colloquial Language*. Edkins, who was also a prominent English missionary (LMS) actively involved in Bible translation, was one of the five original members of the Peking Committee, which published a Mandarin version of the New Testament (PK) in 1872. Until his death in 1907, Edkins served on the committee translating the high wenli Union Version (UVW).

Edkins’ approach to analyzing Chinese diverges sharply from that of Morrison, Marshman, and other grammarians before him. He was aware of the dominant influence of the comparative philology of his time in Europe, and quick to point out the shortcomings of its application to the study of Chinese. He states,

> Comparative philology has hitherto directed its efforts too exclusively, to languages whose words consist of a root and some addition to or modification of the root. The Chinese must be regarded as the best type of those languages, which do not admit any modifications of the root, but allow the appendage of auxiliary words under a strict law of limitation.

Hence, according to Edkins, one should not be preoccupied with analyzing particles, which other grammarians believed could correspond to the verb inflections of Indo-European languages. Rather, one should focus on the syntax and semantics of compounds and auxiliary words. One other distinction in Edkins’ approach is that he follows Varo in focusing on the spoken language. Rather than the Confucian classics many of his

---

80 First edition was published in 1857.
81 See 2.1.5, p. 30 above.
82 Edkins was responsible for translating Rev, Jude, and Acts. See Zetzsche, *Bible in China*, 241. The New Testament portion of the UVW was published two years after his death.
83 Edkins specifically mentions de Prémare’s work for the heavy influence of the comparative philology movement in Europe. He also notes that the grammars by Morrison and Marshman, “fail to convey the mind of the student, the richness of its idioms, and the extended development of its peculiar principles.” See “Preface to the First Edition, 1857” in Edkins, *Grammar*, ii.
predecessors use as the basis for illustrations, Edkins chooses the *Dream of the Red Chamber* (mid to late eighteenth century) and the *Sacred Edict Colloquialized* (ca. 1849), both of which were written in the contemporary Mandarin colloquial and were unavailable during Varo or de Prémare’s time.

Although Edkins does not appear to have the modern concept of *Aktionsart* or aspect, his analysis of Mandarin compounds and auxiliary words suggests an affinity towards a primitive idea of aspect. For example, *-zhe* is treated as an auxiliary verb that expresses “single action generally.”\(^{85}\) He also notes that the “completion” or “non-completion” of action is expressed in the negative and affirmative forms by what later grammarians would call RVCs, *chéng*, *wán*, *liáo*, *bi*, and *jin*.\(^{86}\) However, Edkins does not have a clear understanding of aspect conveyed by other morphemes, such as *lái*, *qù*, and *qīlái*, which he describes in terms of giving direction to the action, or verb reduplication, which he defines as giving the “tentative sense.”\(^{87}\) As for other aspect morphemes, such as *-guò*, *-le*, and the *∅* morpheme, Edkins follows his predecessors in construing them within the western tense-based categories.

e. **Calvin Mateer**

Around the turn of the twentieth century, the study of Chinese had assumed a more practical and pedagogical approach (i.e. grammatical lessons with exercises and readings) to the spoken language in order to serve a wider public interest. Representatives of

---

\(^{85}\) Edkins, *Grammar*, 175.

\(^{86}\) Edkins, *Grammar*, 183–84. This is also noted by James Summers (1829–91), Edkin’s contemporary who also happened to be British. See Summers, *Handbook*, 69–75. Summer adds that RVCs are used as auxiliary verbs "to limit or perfect the notion of the primitive." Summers, *Handbook*, 70. For a list of common Mandarin RVCs, see Table 3.2, p. 123 below.

Mandarin primers from this period include Camille Imbault-Huart’s *Manuel pratique de la langue chinoise parlée*, Calvin Mateer’s *A Course of Mandarin Lessons*, Baller’s *A Mandarin Primer*, and Jozef Mullie’s *The Structural Principles of the Chinese Language*. For the purpose of the current study, only Mateer’s work will be reviewed here.

Mateer was the first American to publish a Mandarin primer. Similar to the three aforementioned missionaries, Mateer (ABCFM) had the distinguished role of chairing the translation committee of the Mandarin Union Version. The second edition of his *Course* appeared in 1906, a year before the UV New Testament was published. Overall, Mateer follows previous grammatical treatises in his treatment of verbs, especially that of Edkins. For example, he recognizes -le as a past tense-marker and lài and qù as auxiliary verbs that give direction to the verb. There are several points, however, where Mateer departs from Edkins. Mateer identifies qi as an auxiliary verb that expresses a progressive action, whereas -zhe “gives the force of the present participle.” He also adds that verb reduplication is used “partly for emphasis, partly to specialize the action expressed.”

Following de Prémare, Mateer also includes a discussion on Chinese four-character set phrases, which he calls “quadruplet phrases.” Unfortunately, both Mateer and de

---


90 Mateer, *Course*, vol. 1, 70–72; 55–53.


Prémare fail to provide any explanation whatsoever on the meaning or discourse function of the set phrases.

3.2.2.3. Carr, Maspero, Frei, and Průšek

a. Denzel Carr

The first person to discuss Mandarin aspect as a modern linguistic category is Denzel Carr. With only slight modification, Carr applies Jespersen’s scheme directly to Mandarin. 93 Eleven aspects are categorized: aorist (-le), imperfect (ø, -zhe), durative (-zhe, -zhù), punctual/momentary (ø, -de), finished (verbal-le…la, -guò(le), -wán, -lái, -qù), unfinished (ø, -zhe, -láizhe), unifactual (…yī…), frequentative/iterative (-láizhe, -guò), stability (ø, -zhe), change/inchoative/inceptive (sentence-le, -qílái, -shàngláí), and implication of result/definite (-guò, -dào). Carr is aware that the privative opposition between the perfective and imperfective in the Slavic languages cannot be applied to Mandarin aspect. He does note, however, that the opposition between stability and change closely resembles that opposition. Although his scheme has more to do with Aktionsart than to aspect, Carr makes several contributions that are influential, including his introduction of the “neuter” aspect (expressed by the ø morpheme) and his recognition of the two morphemes of le, which he terms the “verbal le” (expresses the perfective aspect) and “sentence le” (denotes “change of state”). 94

b. Henri Maspero

Shortly after Carr in 1939, Henri Maspero published his own original scheme of Mandarin aspect. Maspero identifies two types of aspect based on frequency: the

---

93 Jespersen’s scheme is much closer to Aktionsart than to aspect. Jespersen, Philosophy, 287; Carr, “Characterization,” 78–81.
common and less common aspects. The common aspects include the determinative (-lái, -qù), accomplished (-le), durative (-zhe), and aoristic (-guó), whereas the less common aspects include the continuative (-zhì), ingressive (-qī), resultative (-zháo), and effective (-shàng, -xià, -jìn, -chù). In addition, the less common “pseudo-auxiliaries” (i.e. RVCs such as chéng, zhòng, hǎo) also convey the nuances of the effective aspect. Maspero does not treat the ø morpheme, but his elaborate scheme makes several highly influential contributions, among which is his central claim that Mandarin grammaticalizes aspect, and that aspect in Mandarin is independent of time.

c. Henri Frei

Henri Frei’s scheme differs significantly from those of Carr and Maspero. Frei asserts that Mandarin aspect may be categorized according to the binary oppositions between perfective (achevé, realized by the particle -le) and imperfective (inachevé, realized by -ne, -làizhe). The perfective aspect is also realized by resultative auxiliaries, such as jiàn, dào, and zhào, and by the adverbs kuài 快 (“soon”), and yǐfēng “already”). The imperfective aspect is conveyed by the durative auxiliary -zhe and the continuative adverbs zhì 直, zhèng 正, and hái 還. Frei does not treat the perfective marker -guó, nor does he consider other imperfective morphemes, such as zài, or morphemes that are later classified by linguists as directional verb complements (DVCs; e.g. -qīlái, -xiàqù).

96 Maspero’s view of -guó being aoristic is followed by Jaxontov (see below). Iljic arrives at similar conclusions. See Iljic, “Verbal Suffix -guo,” 301-26.
97 Maspero’s claim is followed by Průšek (see review below) and by some Mainland Chinese authors, for example, Li, who categorizes DVCs and RVCs as zhùn biǎozi zhūcì 半表體助詞 (“quasi-aspect particle”) or bān biǎozi zhūcì 半表體助詞 (“half-aspect particle”). See Li 李, Modern Chinese Verbs, 32-33.
99 For a list of common Mandarin resultative auxiliaries (i.e. RVCs), see Table 3.2, p. 123 below.
d. Jaroslav Průšek

In 1950, Frei’s contemporary, Jaroslav Průšek, published an important article on verbal aspect in Mandarin with several critical remarks drawn chiefly from his analysis of the late Qing novel The Travels of Lao T’san (1907). Průšek criticizes Frei’s overly simplified scheme of Mandarin aspect based on the privative oppositions between the perfect and the imperfect found primarily in Slavic languages, which, according to Průšek, simply do not exist in Mandarin. Building upon the argument of “pseudo-auxiliaries” put forth by Maspero, Průšek asserts that RVCs (and some DVCs) are not fully grammaticalized. RVCs, therefore, are capable of expressing resultative aspect in Mandarin because their lexical content is still meaningful, whereas aspect particles, notably -zhe, no longer retaining their lexical meaning, have become totally grammaticalized as aspect markers. Although Průšek does not utilize the theory of markedness, his comments that aspect particles tend to be used more frequently in “simple verbs” (i.e. verbs with the Ø morpheme) than in “verb compounds” (i.e. verbs marked with RVCs or DVCs) support the argument, as presented later in this chapter, that verb forms marked with two or three aspect morphemes are more heavily marked (i.e. distributionally) than those with single aspect morphemes.

3.2.2.4. Contributions from Native Speakers

a. Ma Jianzhong

The same year Mateer’s Mandarin primer appeared, Ma Jianzhong, a Catholic convert who had received education in France, became the first native speaker to publish a

---

100 Průšek, “Quelques remarques,” 408–30.
101 This is followed by Kalousková in Kalousková, Études sur les aspects des verbes, 145. Kalousková recognizes only three grammatical verbal suffixes in Mandarin: -le, -guó, and -zhe. See Kalousková, Études sur les aspects des verbes, 23–26.
comprehensive grammatical treatise on classical and literary Chinese. Although he writes his grammar in literary style (easy wenli) and mainly addresses the formal written form of Chinese, Ma also includes Mandarin in his discussions (e.g. the modal particle le). Ma adopts the western framework of nineteenth century comparative philology and uses European grammatical categories to treat Chinese. The grammar broadly divides Chinese vocabulary into classes, shizi (lit. “real word”) and xūzi (lit. “void word”). The former further divides into four categories (noun, pronoun, verb, and adjective/adverb), while the latter divides into four (preposition, conjunctives, auxiliary verb, and modal particles). Ma’s treatment of the verb only extends as far as classifying transitive/intransitive verbs, mood (including participles), and voice. Tense and aspect are not discussed, except for some common modal particles (yē, yī, ēr, yē) that are considered optional but capable of expressing perfective aspect. Ma’s legacy to the study of Chinese is very limited, as suggested by the fact that most Chinese grammatical terms coined by Ma are no longer current.

b. Lü Shuxiang and Zhu Dexi

Representatives of the early native Chinese-speaking scholars include Lü Shuxiang, Zhu Dexi, Wang Li, and Gao Mingkai. Their monographs on Mandarin grammar and

---

102 Ma 马建忠, Grammar. For Ma’s biography, see Fang 方 豪, Biographical Accounts, vol. 3, 299–304.
103 Ma 马建忠, Grammar, 341.
104 This has been noted, for example, by Bazin in Bazin, Grammaire mandarin, 56–57. Shryock refers to shizi as “content-words” and xūzi as “particles.” See Shryock, “Use,” 159–160.
105 Ma 马建忠, Grammar, 144–90.
107 Lü 名叔湘, Grammar; Wang 王 力, Grammar, Wang 王 力, Treatise; Wang 王 力, Outline; Zhu 朱德熙, Composition; Gao, Grammar. Li’s grammar, which went through 24 editions since its first publication in 1924, does not include any treatment of aspect at all. Li considers aspect morphemes as particles to specify temporal locations along with temporal deictic indicators. See Li 黎锦熙, Grammar, 109–12, 229–36.
syntax show the influence of structural linguistics and comparative philology.\textsuperscript{108} The four were immensely influential and respected scholars in China, who were instrumental in the modern linguistic development of Chinese, including the implementation of Script Reform in the 1950s and 1960s.

These early modern Chinese grammarians all wrote in Mandarin, with their primary focus being the spoken language. Their approaches, however, differ to various degrees. Lü uses \textit{Aktionsart} categories to treat the semantics of aspect morphemes -zhe, -le, verb reduplication, and DVCs.\textsuperscript{109} Zhu does not recognize aspect as a separate domain and treats aspect morphemes according to western tense-based linguistic categories, with emphasis on their syntactic and pragmatic features.\textsuperscript{110} Wang and Gao's models of Chinese aspect are more complete and original than those of Lü and Zhu, and hence deserve a fuller review here.

c. Wang and Gao

\textbf{a. Wang Li}

According to Wang Li, the Mandarin aspectual situation generally occurs in narrative discourse and concerns the duration of the event, with its initial and final endpoints specified.\textsuperscript{111} Wang identifies seven aspects (or rather, aspectual situations) of Mandarin, which can be divided into four groups: zero or without aspect morpheme (\(\phi\)), with aspect

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{108} Lü and Wang, for example, both utilize Jespersen's theories of Rank and Nexus. See Jespersen and Haislund, \textit{Modern English Grammar}; Jespersen, \textit{Philosophy}.
\item \textsuperscript{109} Lü, \textit{Grammar}, 215–33. Lü contributed greatly to Chinese literary and linguistics scholarship. His treatment of Chinese verbs extends even to classical Chinese, a practice which is seldom equaled among newer generations of Mandarin scholars.
\item \textsuperscript{110} Zhu, \textit{Grammar}, 78–85. See also Goto, \textit{Indochina}, 177–82. Goto posits three tenses in Peking Mandarin: present (-zhe), past (-le), and future (yào 要).
\item \textsuperscript{111} Translation is my own. See Wang, \textit{Grammar}, vol. 1, 311–12.
\end{itemize}
morpheme, with verb complements, and verb reduplication. The o aspect (普通貌, lit. "common aspect") is similar to Carr, Halliday, and Smith's neutral aspect, however, it is unclear how it relates to the other six aspects Wang has proposed. Wang simply states that the o aspect does not specify temporal location for an event, thus it allows the audience or reader the freedom to make the determination themselves. The second group includes the progressive (進行貌 signaled by -zhe), perfective (完成貌 signaled by -le), and perfective of recent past (進過去貌 signaled by -lāizhe). The third group is conveyed by two DVCs: the inchoative or inceptive (開始貌 signaled by -qīlái), and the successive (繼續貌 signaled by -xiàqù). The final group includes the reduplication of verbs, or transitory aspect (短時貌).

Although it is difficult to pinpoint whether Wang equates Aktionsart with aspect, he certainly conflates Aktionsart with aspect categories. The fact that Wang uses qīngmào 情貌 ("situation aspect") for aspect indicates that he makes no distinction between the two different categories. Lü Shuxiang (and many later aspectologists), on the other hand, uses dòngxiàng 動相 ("verbal aspect") to refer to the study of aspect in Mandarin.

---

113 English translations are Wang's own. Wang 王, Treatise, vol. 1, 283–84. Wang's analysis of verb reduplications is followed by Dai in Dai 戴驃, Aspect, 75–79. A modified version of Wang's model is found in Zhang 張, “Tense and Aspect,” 164–74. Zhang's model includes the general/zero (一般體/零形體), progressive (持續體), and bounded (限界體) aspects. The first aspect further divides into three categories of verbs according to their inherent meaning. The second aspect is realized by -zhe whereas the third aspect by RVCs, -xiàqù-qiālái, -guō, -le. The third aspect further divides into five categories (e.g. ingressive, terminative, continutive, etc.). Zhang's model is clearly that of Aktionsart.
Chinese. Unfortunately, Lü is only correct insofar as the terminology. He follows Wang’s seven aspects almost exactly, with only slight variation in selected morphemes and terminology. For example, Lü expanded the number of progressive morphemes to include the particle -ne, not only -zhe. Like Wang, Lü uses Aktionsart categories (i.e. [+durative]) to discuss the reduplication of verbs, and adds the semelfactive (signaled by yì or yìxiàzi 一下子 or verb reduplication). Neither Wang nor Lü has discussed the perfective morpheme -guò or any hierarchy structure in their model of Mandarin aspect. However, Wang and Lü (as well as Zhu) were the first Chinese scholars to follow Carr in differentiating the two usages of le, namely, as a perfective aspect marker (-le) and a sentence-final modal particle (le). This distinction of le is important, and will be examined further below.

β. Gao Mingkai

Gao’s model of Chinese aspect is relatively elaborate, clearly defined, and well supported by illustrations from both Mandarin and classical texts. He defines aspect as that which “focuses on how action is perceived by its intervals of duration, irrespective to whether being present, past, or future.” Although Lü, Zhu, and Wang have all hinted

---


117 The particle -ne is not treated here as an aspectual marker. For those who discuss the aspectual meaning of -ne, see, for example, Zhang 張 秀, “Tense & Aspect,” 157-58; Lin, “Descriptive Semantic Analysis,” 33-79; Chan, “Temporal Reference,” 33-79; Paris, Problèmes, 380-417; King, “Ne-,” 21-46.

118 Translation is my own. See Gao, Grammar (rev. ed.), 188.
that Chinese aspect morphemes do not grammaticalize temporal references, Gao, being a former student of Maspero, was the first native speaking Chinese grammarian to recognize that Chinese does not have tense but aspect. Gao posits six aspects, and groups them into three pairs according to his understanding of aspectual oppositions. The first pair includes “accomplished” (-le, -guò, -hào, -wán, -liǎo) and resultative (-zhù, -dēi, -dào, -zhòng) aspects. The second pair includes progressive/durative (-zhe, zài, zhèngzài, zhèngzài...-zhe) and “momentary” (cài 才, qià 恰, gāngcái 剛才) aspects. The third pair includes iterative (verb reduplication) and “intensive” (verb compound) aspects. Gao clearly recognizes the equipollent contrasts between the first two pairs, however, he disregards the contrasts in binary oppositions between the perfective and imperfective aspects. Nonetheless, Gao was the first Chinese scholar to assert that (following Maspero), in addition to -le and -guò, RVCs can express the perfective aspect. More importantly, his model was the first attempt to exhibit a primitive structure of hierarchy as well as recognize aspectual oppositions in Chinese. Gao’s tripartite model of Chinese aspect appears to be superior to those of Lü and Wang even though he also mixes Aktionsart categories with aspect (e.g. “momentary”) and does not discuss the ø morpheme. Nonetheless, similar to Lü, Wang, and Zhu, the gaps in Gao’s model of Mandarin aspect and its inability to address certain problems make it less convincing. For example, Gao fails to explain the differences in aspectual meaning between the subcategories in each of the three aspects. Also, he makes no attempt to

119 Gao, Grammar (rev. ed.), 186–99. The intensive aspect is realized by the addition of a synonym to a (monosyllabic) verb, for example, guān-kàn 觀看 (“watch”).
examine the factors that affect an individual’s decision to choose one aspect morpheme over the other.

3.2.2.5. Russian School

a. A.A. Dragunov

The Russian school of the study of Mandarin aspect is represented by two prominent grammarians, A.A. Dragunov and Sergej Jaxontov. Dragunov argues that Mandarin aspect is not an absolute grammatical category, and therefore is best treated within the framework of what he calls the modal-temporal system. Based on the previous scholarship done on the two morphemes of le, Dragunov asserts that particles such as -le, -guò and -làižhe, which are used to grammaticalize past tense (прошедшее времена), also perform modal functions (e.g. le is used to mark an emphatic wish). Likewise, modal particles, such as le, -zhene, and -ne, are used to express what he calls “preterit-present-future” (прошедшее-настоящее-будущее) of the temporal system (i.e. le denotes the preterit, -zhene denotes the future, whereas -ne conveys habitual sense of the present). It should be pointed out, however, that as a result of Dragunov’s claim that Mandarin verb forms do not exhibit a definite character with respect to time, genus (залог), and aspect, many of his observations appear to be contradictory. For example, in his analysis of verb reduplication, he notes that it is used both to intensify and diminish the action at the same time.

---

120 Dragunov, Studies, 127–58.
121 Dragunov, Studies, 127.
122 Dragunov, Studies, 115.
b. Sergej Jaxontov

Sergej Jaxontov basically follows Dragunov in his understanding of Mandarin aspect as a mixed category. Verbal suffixes are used to mark both tense and aspect. Jaxontov, however, admits that aspectual meaning may be conveyed by one of three ways: by modifying elements, such as RVCs (and certain DVCs, excluding the inchoative -qîllâi, -kâi, -xiàqì), in order to realize the resultative aspect (результ ativный вид); by verb reduplication, which realizes the momentary aspect (кратковременний вид); and by the ø morpheme, which is used to realize the general aspect (общий вид). On the other hand, Jaxontov posits an elaborate tense-aspect system (видо-временные) consisting of six tenses: preterite perfect (-le), present progressive (-zhe, zài), aoristic preterite (-guó), instantative preterit (…yī…), future perfect (verb reduplication), and present-future (ø morpheme). Following Dragunov, Jaxontov classifies verbs into action and non-action, and discusses the different kinds of action and their respective temporal meaning as expressed lexically. In other words, by asserting that grammatical and lexical categories in Mandarin are inseparably intertwined, Jaxontov not only conflates tense and aspect into one category, he also discusses the syntax and semantics of verbal suffixes and complements in terms of Aktionsart.

---

123 Jaxontov, Verbal Category, 73–163. Gorelov, Jaxontov’s comtempoary, offers similar, but much simpler treatment of the four select morphemes, -le, -guó, -zhe, and zài. See Gorelov, Practical Chinese Grammar, 67–72. Unlike Dragunov and Jaxontov, Gorelov does not have a linguistic model of Mandarin aspect.

3.2.3. Recent Approaches

3.2.3.1. Chao, J.C. Thompson, and Li and S.A. Thompson

a. Chao Yuen Ren

A new generation of linguists from the 1960s and 1970s, represented by Chao Yuen Ren, J. Charles Thompson, and Li and Sandra Thompson, continues the traditional focus on the spoken language in their studies of Mandarin aspect. Chao uses Wang as a starting point, and, like Lü, he follows Wang’s seven aspects closely, including the θ aspect, with slightly more elaborate explanations on its significance. Chao’s approaches differ from the previous works of traditional Chinese grammarians on several points. For example, rather than identifying the number of different aspects in Mandarin, Chao first lists verbal suffixes and then discusses each according to its aspectual meaning. He also adds the perfective marker -guó, which he defines as the “indefinite past aspect” that “happened at least once in the past—ever (sic).” Chao correctly dismisses the perfective aspect of recent past, stating that -lái zhe is not a verbal suffix but rather “a double particle and occurs after an object if there is one.” He also lists an additional morpheme, fā 法.

125 Chao, Grammar, 245–53.
126 Chao, Grammar, 251.
127 Chao, Grammar, 249. Egerod basically follows Wang, Lü, and Zhu and adds that -lái ze is a “semiverbal expression, grammaticalized in the sense of recent progressive.” Egerod, “Aspect,” 301. Lái zhe has been studied by many: in addition to Carr, Dragunov, see Lin, “Aspect-Tense,” 115–18; Zhu 朱德熙, Grammar, 235–37; Li 黎錦熙, Grammar, 110; Gong, Aspect, 56–57; Sun, “On the Origin,” 434–43; He, “Synchronic Account,” 99–114. Recently, Chirkova has argued that in Peking Mandarin (as opposed to Standard Mandarin), -lái zhe, along with its closely related morphemes, -lái de, denotes the “absolute recent past.” Chirkova, In Search of Time, 92–101. While her effort in focusing on spoken discourse with a corpus-linguistic approach to the Peking dialect is commendable, Chirkova’s treatment of aspect morphemes is either too brief (e.g. -guó, -zhe) or non-existent (e.g. verb reduplication, RVCs, DVCs). Therefore, Chirkova’s contribution toward the study of aspect in Chinese is rather limited. Chirkova’s study, however, supports Wang’s comments of the dialectic characteristics of -lái zhe, particular to speakers of Beijing and its surrounding areas. Wang 王 力, Outline, 119–20. See also Zhang 張秀, “Tense & Aspect,” 160.
however, it is unclear whether he considers it an aspect morpheme, since he does not
comment on its aspectual meaning.

b. J. Charles Thompson

In the same year that Chao’s Grammar first appeared, J. Charles Thompson published
a short article in which he analyzes five Mandarin particles, namely, -le, -ne, -guò, -zhe,
and -de, with respect to their aspectual meaning. While many of Thompson’s
comments are too brief to draw any conclusive review, a few are worthy of note.
Thompson points out that the ₀ aspect is used “when the concept of the chain of events is
not considered to apply.” This statement is simply not true, and as the following
sections will show, the ₀ aspect is dictated by discourse factors, and its nature is far more
complicated than Thompson purports. In addition, Thompson recognizes le as a single
morpheme, whereas others before him (e.g. Carr, Jaxontov, Wang, Chao) traditionally
separate it into two morphemes, that is, the aspect suffix -le and the modal particle (post-
sentential) le. According to Thompson, le is used to describe the boundary of the
beginning of an event, whereas the opposite particle -ne denotes that the boundary has
not been defined. Without stating discourse factors, however, it is difficult to see how
boundary can be marked by insisting on the one-morpheme approach of le.

c. Charles Li and Sandra Thompson

Charles Li and Sandra Thompson define aspect simply and broadly as “different ways
of viewing a situation” and identify four types of Mandarin aspect. The first two of the
four types are traditional binary oppositions, namely the perfective (expressed by -le) and

131 Li and Thompson, Grammar, 184.
imperfective or durative (expressed by *zài* and *-zhe*). The other two types include the experiential (expressed by *-guò*) and delimitative (expressed by reduplication of verb). As in previous studies on Mandarin aspect, Li and Thompson incorporate *Aktionsart* categories to account for the usage of aspect morphemes and their aspectual meaning. For example, *-le* is said to be “bounded” (temporally, spatially, or conceptually) according to the following four criteria: qualified event, definite or specific event, inherently bounded, and first event in a sequence. The notions of boundedness and its criteria are in fact discussed by Wang when he argues that the perfective *-le* can express temporal location but occurs only in factual statements (lit. “descriptive sentences”) and subordinate clauses or the protasis of conditional sentences.

In Li and Thompson’s aspect system of Mandarin, there is no zero viewpoint type that constitutes an independent aspect. Instead, in perfective contexts where *-le* could have been used but is not, it is due to the “inherent meaning” of the “perfectivizing expressions.” In other words, Li and Thompson argue for a perfective 0, and not an independent 0 aspect.

They give the following examples:

(3) (a) 我把手錶放在抽屜裡。

*Wō bǎ shǒubiǎo fàng zài chōutì lǐ.*

I put the watch in the drawer.

(b) 他從房子裡走到張三那兒。

---

134 Wang 王, *Grammar*, vol. 1, 335–36; Chang, “Discourse,” 146. Chang adds that “in general, *-le* is not used in cases where factual statements are asserted, specifically when its presence would result in an undesirable ‘change of state’ reading.”
Tā cóng fāngzi lǐ zǒu dào Zhāng Sān nàì.

He walked from his/her house over to Zhangsan’s place.

According to Li and Thompson, the underlined elements in (3a) and (3b) specify spatial limits (bounded) and therefore express perfectivity. It seems that the perfective -le in either sentence would be redundant, although it can still be used. In reality, however, perfectivity is not the only interpretation of (3a) because it is expressed with the ø morpheme that may convey the stative aspect.\(^\text{136}\) Consider the following example:

(4) 我通常把手錶放在抽屜裡。

Wǒ tōngchāng bǎ shǒubiāo fāng zài chōutī lǐ.

I usually put the watch in the drawer.

If “in the drawer” conveyed perfectivity, as Li and Thompson claim, it would contradict the adverb tōngchāng (“usually”) and, as a result, the sentence would not make sense. Therefore, the ø morpheme in (4) conveys the stative aspect, whereas in (3a) it conveys the perfective aspect. On the other hand, (3b) has only the perfective interpretation, not because it specifies the spatial location but because the RVC dào (“arrive”) attached to the verb expresses result and completion.\(^\text{137}\) Therefore (3b) can be translated as “He arrived at Zhangsan’s place from his place.”

3.2.3.2. James Tai’s Application of Vendler’s Categories

In his application of Vendler’s categories to Mandarin verbs, James Tai includes RVCs in the discussion of Mandarin aspect.\(^\text{138}\) Tai’s taxonomy differs significantly from

\(^{136}\) Many consider that the ø morpheme expresses the stative aspect. See, for example, Chan, “On the Theory,” 212–13; Shu, Aspect, 26–28.

\(^{137}\) See, for example, Consuelo Martínez, “El aspecto perfecto resultativo,” 12–13.

\(^{138}\) Vendler’s four categories have been adopted unaltered by many Mainland Chinese authors. See, for example, Hu and Fan, Verbs, 174; Gong, Aspect, 10—11; Liu, “Verb-Copying Construction,” 1–13. Chen’s modified version consists of five situation types: state, activity, accomplishment, complex change (realized...
Smith’s. Tai identifies three categories of Mandarin aspectual situations (Chart 3.2). The first two categories, statives and activities, correspond closely to two of Vendler’s categories. The results category serves double duty by corresponding to the accomplishments and achievements categories of English verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Compound (+RVC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 3.2. Tai’s taxonomy of Mandarin verbs

Tai argues that Vendler’s examples of accomplishment verbs, such as “to paint a picture” and “to write a letter,” do not necessarily imply the attainment of a goal in Mandarin.139 Accomplishment verbs in English are conveyed by RVCs in Mandarin. He observes that unlike an accomplishment verb in English, which has both action and result aspects, a resultative verb compound in Chinese has only the result aspect. He gives the following examples:

(5) (a) 張三幾乎畫完了一張畫。

Zhāngsān jīhū huà-wán-le yī zhāng huà.

Zhangsan almost painted a picture.

(b) 張三幾乎畫了一張畫。

Zhāngsān jīhū huà-le yī zhāng huà.

Zhangsan almost painted a picture.140

by “verbs of change,” DVCs, and verb-adj. compounds), and simple change (realized by RVCs and semelfactive verbs). Chen 陈 平, “Tripartite,” 407–14.


140 Tai, “Verbs,” 293.
As opposed to the English accomplishment verb, huà-wán (lit. “paint-finish”) has only the resultative meaning (5a). In contrast, the simple activity verb, huà (“paint”), refers only to the activity of painting (5b). In other words, Tai argues that Vendler’s accomplishment verbs, such as “learn” and “kill” in English, do not exist in Chinese, but instead are represented by attaching RVCs to simple verbs, as in xué-huí (lit. “learn-know” or “learn-able”) and shā-sī (lit. “kill-die”).141 Here, Tai seems to suggest that simple verbs, xué and shā, refer only to the actions of learning and killing. According to Tai, RVCs are never used to express action but are instead limited to only expressing results. Consider the following examples:

(6) (a) 我在学中文。

Wǒ zài xué Zhōngwén.

I am learning Chinese.

* (b) 我在学会中文。142

Wǒ zài xué-huí Zhōngwén.

I am learning Chinese.

(c) 我在杀张三。

Wǒ zài shā Zhāngsān.

I am killing Zhangsan.

* (d) 我在杀死张三。

Wǒ zài shā-sī Zhāngsān.

I am killing Zhangsan.143

---

142 The asterisks mark the sentences that are ungrammatical or unacceptable in natural Chinese speech.
143 Tai, “Verbs,” 292. In Tai’s examples, Zhangsan in (5) and (6) is rendered “John.”
“Simple verb” here refers to a Chinese verb that is not affixed to a verb complement. It does not mean that the verb contains only one syllable, nor does it mean that the verb lacks the aspect morpheme.

In fact, (6b) and (6d) are both ungrammatical sentences that can be explained not by Aktionsart, but by the aspect morpheme zài. The imperfective zài presents the situation as progressive (6c), therefore it contradicts the perfective aspect marked by the RVCs hui and sf. Unlike Smith and her followers, Tai does not integrate his findings of RVCs with other aspect morphemes, such as perfective or imperfective aspect markers, or reduplication of verbs, etc. After all, Aktionsart deals with the inherent meaning or lexical semantics of verbs, not with the aspectual meaning of verb inflection or morphology. In this case, RVCs should not be considered an Aktionsart category, but rather viewed as belonging to aspect proper.

3.2.3.3. Smith, Her Followers, and Other Approaches

a. Carlota Smith

Smith set the current stage of the study of Mandarin aspect in 1991, when she published the first edition of The Parameter of Aspect. She has proposed a two-component theory of aspect based on the principle of universal grammar and within the framework of Discourse Representation Theory. Her general theoretical approach to aspect was examined in 3.1, and her Mandarin aspectual system (“viewpoint types”) will be reviewed here.

Smith has developed her tripartite aspectual system of Mandarin largely from Li and Thompson and she shares many of their assumptions regarding the functions of aspect

---

144 Smith, Parameter. The second edition was published in 1997.
morphemes and their relationship to Aktionsart. Her system includes the perfective (expressed by -le, -guò), imperfective (zài, -zhe), and neutral viewpoint types ("lacking viewpoint morpheme").\textsuperscript{145} In addition to the aspect markers already mentioned, Smith also treats RVCs and verb reduplication as capable of expressing the perfective aspect. Smith says nothing, however, regarding the aspectual meaning of DVCs.

Smith’s "family of viewpoints" includes an additional aspect, namely, the neutral aspect, which "arises by a compositional default rule" and has no aspect morpheme.\textsuperscript{146} She correctly points out that, in Mandarin, aspect morphemes are syntactically optional and that, in discourse, sentences often appear without them.\textsuperscript{147} The neutral aspect, according to Smith, has both closed and open readings, and "focuses a single endpoint and a single stage of durative events."\textsuperscript{148} She gives the following example:\textsuperscript{149}

(7) 張三到家的時候，馬莉寫工作報告。

\textit{Zhāngsān dào-jīa de shíhou, Mǎlí xiě gōngzuò bāogào.}

Smith claims that (7) has two interpretations:

(a) When Zhangsan arrived at home, Mali began to write the work report.

(b) When Zhangsan arrived at home, Mali was writing the work report.

According to Smith, (7) presents the situation as either "closed, inceptive" (7a) or "open, progressive" (7b).\textsuperscript{150} Because there are two possible readings, Smith categorizes it as

---


\textsuperscript{146} Smith, \textit{Parameter}, 279. See also Smith, "Aspectual Viewpoint," 125.

\textsuperscript{147} Smith, \textit{Parameter}, 277.

\textsuperscript{148} Smith, \textit{Parameter}, 278.

\textsuperscript{149} Smith, \textit{Parameter}, 278. Emphasis is mine.

\textsuperscript{150} Smith, \textit{Parameter}, 278.
belonging to the neutral aspect. The neutral aspect is needed because her two-component theory requires that every sentence have a viewpoint.¹⁵¹

For native speakers, however, (7) may or may not have the choices that Smith has offered. Although the main clause is not marked morphologically with zài, the sentence will sound more natural to native speakers if it is read as imperfective. This is due to the fact that additional temporal adverbs, such as yǐfēng (“already”), or perfective morphemes, such as -le or RVCs (e.g. wán, “complete”), are normally required here. However, this is not to say that (7a) is not a possible reading of (7). Perhaps the imperfective zài is deleted because of the context or discourse, but none of these considerations are specified in Smith’s example. Since the main clause of the sentence expresses imperfectivity, there is no need for the neutral aspect to account for sentences lacking aspect morphemes.

b. Xiao Zhonghua and Antony McEnery

In recent years, Smith’s two-component theory of aspect has been followed by many researchers, including Xiao and McEnery, Dai, Kang, and Chan.¹⁵² Their works generally follow Smith’s definitions of viewpoint types, however, they also add morphemes that Smith has not treated, such as DVCs. In general, the contributions of these new studies can be measured by how adept they handle the Ø morpheme. Xiao and McEnery separate themselves from the pack with their corpus-based analysis and more comprehensive treatment of Mandarin aspect. However, like all the others, Xiao and McEnery reject Smith’s neutral aspect.

According to Xiao and McEnery, Mandarin aspect has two viewpoint types: the
perfective aspect divides into actual (-le), experiential (-guò), delimitative (reduplicant),
and completive (RVCs), and the imperfective divides into durative (-zhe), progressive
(zàì), inceptive (-qǐlái), and continuative (-xiàqù). Classification according to mixed
categories of Aktionsart and aspect is problematic. For example, it is incorrect to describe
-zhe as durative, for the suffix is used to express the progressive as well as continuative
aspect. It can also be used to convey stative aspect. Furthermore, zài is not distinguished
here between aspect use and use of a locative preposition, and complex issues of their
relationship are not discussed. Most importantly, Xiao and McEnery evade giving full
treatment of the ø morpheme. This is a clear indication that their system is deficient. In
short, Xiao and McEnery’s treatment of Mandarin aspect adds very little to what Wang,
Li and Thompson, Smith, and others have already discussed.

3.2.4. Discourse Considerations

3.2.4.1. Introduction

Verbal aspect in discourse has received considerable scholarly attention in recent
decades. Many tend to focus on specific roles aspect plays in the temporal structures of
discourse (e.g. Hopper, Vet, Thelin). Naturally, these linguists include Aktionsart in
their discussions and are proponents of universal grammar. The topic of aspect in Chinese
discourse, on the other hand, has recently been explored by some in order to address the
perplexing problems of the ø morpheme. These problems concerning the ø morpheme of
Mandarin aspect are too often ignored by those such as Yang, who dismisses them as

---

153 Xiao and McEnery, Aspect, 10.
154 Hopper, “Aspect and Foregrounding,” 213–41; Vet and Vetter, Tense and Aspect; Thelin, Verbal
Aspect. For a helpful introduction to the subject, see Thelin, “Verbal Aspect in Discourse: On the State of
the Art,” 3–88.
simply a "topic for another dissertation." There are others, however, who attempt to explain Mandarin aspect through discourse analysis, including Andreasen, Chang, and Hsu. These linguists typically use -le to explain the ø morpheme.

3.2.4.2. Andrew Andreasen

In his analysis of Chinese narrative discourse of the vernacular and modern periods, Andreasen observes that -le typically occurs in foreground (i.e. story line) clauses of the narrative discourse, though it is sometimes deemed unnecessary in the presence of "other perfectivizing devices" such as RVCs. Andreasen uses this argument to account for the occurrence of the ø morpheme. Following Li and Thompson’s analysis of the two morphemes of -le, Andreasen further states that the perfective marker is used as a foregrounding device, whereas the post-sentential or modal particle le is used as a backgrounding device.

3.2.4.3. Vincent Chang

Many agree with Andreasen about the foregrounding function of the perfective -le in written or spoken discourse, however, not as many are convinced by his assertions on the discourse function of post-sentential le. Vincent Chang, for example, has argued that the perfective -le serves as an "overt morpheme for the peak event" in a segment of Chinese narrative discourse. Chang claims that because only one peak is permitted in a discourse that is marked by -le, the "perfective ø morpheme" is used instead.

---

157 Andreasen, "Backgrounding and Foregrounding," 57. See also Smith, Parameter, 278.
158 Chang, "Discourse," 109. Chang’s study is based on a corpus consisting of native speakers and literary samples from novels, short stories, and newspapers.
According to Chang, the post-sentential le functions as a “discourse-final particle,” marking discourse boundaries, especially sub-topical units. In addition to providing the linguistic grounds for the occurrence of the ø morpheme in discourse, Chang observes that an undesirable “choppy” effect will result in narrative discourse in which every verb in the perfective situation is morphologically marked with -le. Chang adds that the morpheme -le (as either aspect marker or modal particle) is not used “in cases where expressions of classical flavor are included.”

3.2.4.4. Kylie Hsu

More recently, Hsu has conducted a corpus-based discourse analysis of the imperfective morpheme zài and two other closely related particles, zhèngzài 正在 and zhèng 正. According to Hsu, zhèng focuses on the external reference time, zài focuses on the internal temporal structure, and zhèngzài emphasizes both. Nevertheless, all three mark the ongoing situations in affirmative constructions and active voice. She further points out that in both spoken and written discourse, zhèng tends to mark ongoing situations involving inanimate subjects, nonvolitional participation on the part of the subject, and stativity, and is less likely to be used to mark internal temporal process than zhèngzài and zài. She argues that this accounts for fewer occurrences of zhèng in ongoing situations in the news, which favors an insider’s vantage point. This observation

161 Chang, “Discourse,” 144. Others like Spanos, for example, utilize Grice’s maxims and speech-act theory to explain the absence of -le and sentence-final particle le. Yi, on the other hand, observes that le rarely occurs in headlines of news reporting. See Spanos, “Contemporary Chinese Use,” 64–73; Yin, “Survey,” 70–80.
164 Hsu, Discourse Analysis. The chosen corpus includes novels, autobiographies, and news.
165 Hsu, Discourse, 84. For its use in classical literature, see Dobson, Dictionary, 379–80.
confirms that zhèng does not convey the imperfective aspect, which focuses on the internal constituents of an ongoing situation.

Regarding the other two markers, Hsu notes that zài functions as a temporal marker as well as a locative preposition, and differs from zhèngzài not simply because it is less formal, as is often thought. She explains:

The so-called formal use is actually a consequence of the need to establish the external reference time in contexts where the reference time is not shared between the language producer and the recipient, as in the case of novel. In a novel, the author and the reader are not interacting in real time as interlocutors do in an oral exchange. Hence, it is important for writer to establish the reference time so that the reader can get a sense of time frame in the narrative...this explains why zhèngzài occurs more frequently in written discourse (i.e. ‘formal use’) than zài.\footnote{Hsu, *Discourse*, 146. For diachronic studies of zhèngzài and zài, see, for example. Ota, *Historical Grammar*, 276; Xiao 蕭, “‘Zài nài’,” 144–56. Ota notes that zài is the abbreviated form of zhèngzài, while Xiao suggests that zhèngzài is of a latter development due to the need to convey more explicitly the progressive aspect. According to Xiao, zhèngzài did not become popular in writing until the 1920s. Both suggestions are possible.}

In other words, Hsu asserts that zhèngzài and zài do not have identical functions in Mandarin discourse because zhèngzài contains the zhèng portion, which focuses on the external reference time. This assertion is unconvincing because it is based on the etymology of zhèngzài as opposed to being based purely on linguistic grounds. Another problem has to do with her assumption that zhèngzài and zài are two separate aspect markers. A more serious concern is the fact that she draws conclusions from isolated examples where the three markers occur, without considering cases where the φ morpheme is used instead. Therefore, while her research of zhèngzài, zhèng, and zài beyond the sentence level is the commendable, Hsu’s conclusions are unconvincing.
3.2.5. Methodology: An Outline of Verbal Aspect in Mandarin Chinese

3.2.5.1. Introduction

In the last sixty years, studies of Chinese aspect have indeed yielded some fruitful results with interesting insights. There remains, however, a pressing need for a powerful, working linguistic model that would provide a more satisfactory account of Mandarin aspect, one that would address some of the most pertinent issues, particularly those regarding the \( \circ \) morpheme. Thus, an outline of a proposed model of Mandarin aspect is developed here with the specific goal of assisting in the practice of Bible translation. The following discussions are supported by examples drawn from Chinese versions of the Bible, including those in wenli and Mandarin.

a. Binary Oppositions

The proposed model of Mandarin aspect adopted for the purpose of translating New Testament Greek verbal aspect into Mandarin is summarized below in Chart 3.3. This proposal assumes that Mandarin does not have tense, but rather operates on a well-developed system of aspect.\(^{167}\) Aspectual oppositions in Mandarin have been recognized by scholars (each with unique variations) such as Carr, Frei, Li and Thompson, Gao, Halliday, Smith, Xiao and McEnery, and many others. Mandarin aspect divides into two sets of equipollent oppositions: the first set is represented by [+perfective] and [−perfective]; the second set divides the [−perfective] into [+imperfective] and [+stative].

b. Markedness and Grounding

The binary oppositions, represented here by the labels [+perfective], [+imperfective], and [+stative], explore the theory of markedness first introduced by the Prague School linguists. The theory of markedness extends to several distinct characteristics, such as those of formal, distributional, semantic, phonological, and syntactical markedness. Among these, the notions of lexical and grammatical markedness are pertinent to Bible translation. Markedness theory, as Battistella puts it, "posits that the terms of polar oppositions at any level of language are not mere opposites, but rather that they show an evaluative nonequivalence that is imposed on all oppositions." The polarities existing in all languages are organized in terms of hierarchy. Markedness theory is language-specific, and its applications to aspect, tense, mood, and voice with special reference to grounding in discourse analysis have been made to English by Wallace, and to Hellenistic Greek by Porter, but not yet to Mandarin.

169 Battistella, Markedness, 1.
Mandarin aspect differs greatly from the aspectual systems of other languages. The most important difference is that, in Mandarin, aspect morphemes may be optional, whereas in the majority of the world’s languages they are obligatory. In other words, all Mandarin aspect morphemes are marked as opposed to unmarked (∅ morpheme) in terms of morphology, distribution, and aspectual meaning.

However, Mandarin aspect morphemes are not used invariantly to mark prominence or peak at the discourse level. In fact, prominence is more often achieved by lexical markedness in Mandarin rather than by grammatical markedness alone. Unlike Indo-European languages, a Mandarin verb allows more than one aspect morpheme to be used at the same time. In contexts where there is an option to add a second (or third) morpheme to a verb that is already marked with a single morpheme, that addition makes the verb more heavily marked. For example, shuō-wàn-le (V-RVC-le) is more heavily marked than simply shuō-wàn (V-RVC), because the former has -le added to the RVC wàn, even though both expressions denote “finish saying.” In other words, it is the bulk of the form, which is posited by the current dissertation as the two-morpheme aspect compound, that makes it more heavily marked, not the grammatical categorization of -le as more heavily marked than other perfective aspect morphemes. The perfective -le, therefore, is used as a foregrounding device in Mandarin discourse only when the verb form is already marked with other aspect morphemes. Similarly, a verb form is considered to be even more heavily marked when three aspect morphemes (e.g. zài, -zhe, verb reduplication) are used to achieve frontgrounded prominence (see example (26a) below).
Foregrounded and frontgrounded prominence are achieved by lexical markedness in Mandarin, especially when use of the ø morpheme is obligatory. For reasons that will become evident below, four-character set phrases (or four-character idioms) are considered the most heavily marked verb form, and are used to mark frontgrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse. As mentioned above, prominence is achieved grammatically by employing two- or three-morpheme aspect compounds. When the ø morpheme is used, monosyllabic and disyllabic verbs are generally used as backgrounding devices, although the latter is more heavily marked.

For example, the verb “to die” may be expressed by three different lexical forms in Mandarin: the monosyllabic sǐ 死, gù 故, wáng 亡, zú 卒, shì 逝; the disyllabic zuògū 作古 (lit. “be-ancient”), ānxī 安息 (lit. “peaceful-rest”), yánhū 奄忽 (lit. “suddenly”); or four-character set phrases, such as zhū-huái-ān-xī 主懷安息 (lit. “Lord-bosom-peaceful-rest”), sì-jiāo-cháo-tiān 四腳朝天 (lit. “four-feet-toward-heaven”), yī-míng-wū-hū 一命嗚呼 (lit. “one-life-alas!”), and kē-rán-cháng-shì 溘然長逝 (lit. “unexpectedly-gone-forever”). Although all these verb forms use the ø morpheme, the disyllabic verbs are generally more heavily marked than the monosyllabic ones. This is due to the fact that, as Li Linding points out, disyllabic verbs are more contoured in meaning and less flexible in use with other grammatical elements, including aspect morphemes and verb-object compounds in Mandarin. There are cases, however, where the option to use either one or two characters does not exist. For example, fǒurèn 否認 (“deny,” e.g. John 18:25) has

---

170 See p. 92 n. 92 above.
171 For a survey of Chinese terms relating to death and burial, see Watters, Essays, 245–327.
172 Li 李錫定, Modern Chinese Verbs, 133–40. Li, however, does not use the notions of markedness to explain the differences between monosyllabic and disyllabic verbs.
no monosyllabic equivalent available in Mandarin. Hence, in such cases, disyllabic verbs are no more heavily marked than monosyllabic ones.

The four examples of four-character set phrases above, on the other hand, are the most heavily marked because of their morphological bulk, animated semantic content, rigid grammatical structure, and unique syntax. Table 3.1 summarizes markedness and aspect morphemes in Mandarin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morpheme Type</th>
<th>Markedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple single aspect morphemes:</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-le, RVCs, -guò, verb reduplication, IDVCs, zài, -zhe</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex single aspect morphemes:</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-láiV-ì, V-shàngV-xìà, V-guóláiV-guòqù, V-kǎiláiV-kāiqù</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple two-morpheme aspect compounds:</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVC-le, -guò-le, RVC-guò, -le-RVC, V-le-V, -le-IDVCs, verb reduplication-zhe, zài...-zhe, zài...IDVCs</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex two-morpheme aspect compounds:</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zài...V-láiV-ì, zài...V-shàngV-xìà, zài...V-guóláiV-guòqù, zài...V-kǎiláiV-kāiqù</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-morpheme aspect compounds:</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zài...verb reduplication-zhe, zài...V-zheV-zhe</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ø morpheme with four-character set phrases</td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. Markedness and aspect morphemes in Mandarin

3.2.5.2. Perfective Aspect

The Mandarin perfective aspect is realized in four morphologically marked morphemes, -guò, RVCs, -le, and verb reduplication, and in one unmarked morpheme, the ø morpheme.

a. The Perfective -guò

The marker -guò has been widely recognized as a perfective aspect morpheme by influential scholars such as Gao, Halliday, Gorelov, Cartier, Smith, Shu, Dai, and many
It is derived from the verb *guò* 過, meaning “to pass” or “experience,” hence it is commonly described as the “experiential *guò*.”\(^{174}\) However, such a description is based on the etymology and the assumption that *-guò* still retains its lexical meaning rather than a grammatical distinction. In fact, such “experience” has nothing to do with the inherent meaning of *-guò*. Rather, it is generally conveyed by *yǒu* (“have”)—or *měi yǒu* (“have not”) in negative sentences—and *céng jīng* (“ever”) either explicitly or implicitly in the context. Hence, like *-le*, *-guò* is best treated simply as a morpheme that is used only grammatically to express the perfective aspect in Mandarin. (8) illustrates:

(8) 我們從來沒有見過這樣的事。 (Mark 2:12, UV)

Wōmen cóng lái měi yǒu jiàn-guò zhèyàng de shì.

We have never seen anything like it.

The aspect marker *-guò* is also used as an RVC, which conveys the completed aspect of “through.” The RVC *guò* is attached only directly at the end of certain verbs to form a compound that expresses the perfective aspect. These verbs include *tōng* 通 (“pass”) and *chuān* (“pierce”), as the following example illustrates.

(9) 要把那兩條撿成的金鐲子，穿過胸牌兩頭的環子。 (Exod 28:24, UV)

Yāo bā nà liǎng tiáo níng chéng de jīn lián zǐ, chuān-guò xiōng pái liǎngtóu de huánzǐ.

You should pierce the two gold cords into the two rings of the breastplate.

---


Since the aspect marker -guò and the RVC guò both express the perfective aspect, they normally do not appear together in the same verb. While one might find the expressions chuāngguò-guò xiōng pài or chuāngguò xiōng pài -guò acceptable, the redundancy makes them sound rather awkward.

b. RVCs

Resultative verb complements (RVCs) have been treated in the discussion of Mandarin aspect morphemes ever since Varo (followed by Gützlaff, Edkins, Summers, Mullie, Carr, Maspero, Průšek, Jaxontov, Tai), and, furthermore, leading scholars such as Gao, Frei, Chao, Cartier, Smith, and others have all recognized RVCs as morphemes that grammaticalize the perfective aspect in Mandarin.\textsuperscript{175} RVCs differ significantly from the perfective aspect marker -guò. As Průšek has pointed out, RVCs retain lexical meanings that specify the result or natural consequence of a complete action.\textsuperscript{176} Also, RVCs are a rare example of recognizable aspect morphemes in classical Chinese, and consequently are also one of the oldest. For this reason, wenli versions of the Bible are consulted in this study. For example, εἰποῦν in John 18:1 (also v. 38) is translated as yán-bi (lit. “speak-end,” MOR, GŪ, GO) or yán-jìng 言竟 (lit. “speak-complete,” DV, SJ, GURY, UVB) in several wenli versions. The following examples of the use of RVCs are from the wenli (10a) and Mandarin versions (10b).

(10) (a) 耶穌言畢，則偕門生渡基得崙之溪。 (John 18:1, GŪ)

Jesus finished saying, he crossed the Kidron valley with his disciples.

\textsuperscript{175} Chao, Grammar, 446–52; Cartier, Verbes r\textsuperscript{e}\textsuperscript{s}ultatifs; Marco Martínez, “Aspecto,” 5–18; Xiao and McEnery, Aspect, 159–71. For the forementioned authors, see discussions in 3.2.2–3.2.3, pp. 84–112 above.

\textsuperscript{176} See discussions in 3.2.2.3.d, p. 95 above.
Wo de Shangdi, wo de Shangdi, ni wei hegu jiang wo diu-qi?

My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?

The compound diu-qi in (10b) is made up of diu, meaning “to throw,” and the RVC qi, meaning “discard,” thus, it effectively conveys the perfectiveness of the action.

An exhaustive list of Mandarin RVCs is not possible. Table 3.2 includes some of the most commonly used Mandarin RVCs.177

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RVC</th>
<th>Pinyin</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>RVC</th>
<th>Pinyin</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>饱</td>
<td>bāo</td>
<td>be full, satisfied</td>
<td>空</td>
<td>kōng</td>
<td>empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>畢</td>
<td>bì</td>
<td>complete, end</td>
<td>累</td>
<td>lèi</td>
<td>be tired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>端</td>
<td>diān</td>
<td>flatten</td>
<td>了</td>
<td>liǎo</td>
<td>finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>遍</td>
<td>biàn</td>
<td>all over</td>
<td>滿</td>
<td>mán</td>
<td>full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>成</td>
<td>chéng</td>
<td>succeed</td>
<td>腑</td>
<td>ní</td>
<td>be bored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>穿</td>
<td>chuān</td>
<td>penetrate</td>
<td>破</td>
<td>pò</td>
<td>break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>倒</td>
<td>dǎo</td>
<td>fall</td>
<td>上</td>
<td>shàng</td>
<td>succeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>到</td>
<td>dào</td>
<td>reach, succeed, arrive</td>
<td>失</td>
<td>shī</td>
<td>lose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>得</td>
<td>dé</td>
<td>reach</td>
<td>熟</td>
<td>shòu</td>
<td>ripen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>掉</td>
<td>diào</td>
<td>fall/throw off, away</td>
<td>死</td>
<td>sǐ</td>
<td>die</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>丢</td>
<td>diū</td>
<td>discard</td>
<td>通</td>
<td>tōng</td>
<td>connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>动</td>
<td>dòng</td>
<td>move</td>
<td>透</td>
<td>tòu</td>
<td>through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>断</td>
<td>duàn</td>
<td>cut off</td>
<td>歪</td>
<td>wāi</td>
<td>crook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>够</td>
<td>gòu</td>
<td>enough</td>
<td>完</td>
<td>wán</td>
<td>complete, end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>過</td>
<td>guò</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>贏</td>
<td>yínɡ</td>
<td>win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>好</td>
<td>hǎo</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>在</td>
<td>zài</td>
<td>exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>坏</td>
<td>huài</td>
<td>ruin</td>
<td>著</td>
<td>zháo</td>
<td>be on target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>見</td>
<td>jiàn</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>住</td>
<td>zhù</td>
<td>hold on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>畫</td>
<td>jìn</td>
<td>exhaust</td>
<td>中</td>
<td>zhònɡ</td>
<td>hit (a target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>開</td>
<td>kāi</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>走</td>
<td>zǒu</td>
<td>leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2. Common Mandarin RVCs

---

177 Cartier lists over a hundred common Mandarin RVCs, which she classifies according to either dissociable (total of 12) or indissociable (93) meanings. She also lists common verbs that can be combined with RVCs. Cartier, *Verbes résultatifs*, 152–233. See also Mullie, *Structural Principles*, vol. 2, 113–72; Marco Martinez, “Aspecto,” 5–18.
c. The Perfective -le

Since Varo, the marker -le has been treated in the discussion of Mandarin aspect morphemes, and is widely recognized as a morpheme that grammaticalizes the perfective aspect in Mandarin by influential scholars such as Carr, Maspero, Frei, Wang Li, Gao, Gorelov, Jaxontov, Ota, Chao, Li and Thompson, Shimura, Smith, and many others.\(^{178}\)

Like -guò and RVCs, -le views the event as a whole and is not concerned with its internal constituents. (11) illustrates:

(11) 如果你們聽過他的道，領了他的教，學了他的真理 (Eph 4:21, UV)

Rúguō nǐmen tīng-guò tā de dào, lǐng-le tā de jiào, xué-le tā de zhēnli….

If you have ever heard him preaching, and received his teaching, and learned his truth….

The marker -guò and -le in (11) both express the perfective aspect. The two perfective morphemes may be used interchangeably. In other words, there is no apparent difference between tīng-guò and tīng-le with respect to aspect, markedness, meaning, or discourse function. However, when -guò and -le are combined to modify the same verb, tīng (“hear”), the two aspect markers grammaticalize the same perfective aspect but become more heavily marked (see example (17) below).

a. -le and the Modal Particle le

The imperfective aspect marker -le is to be distinguished from the modal le and the RVC liǎo. Morphologically, the three are written exactly the same way (了). All three are derived from the verb liǎo, meaning “to finish.” The aspect marker -le and the modal le

are both written and pronounced the same way, but they are found in different positions in the sentence. The aspect marker -le (also called the verbal -le) functions as a suffix that attaches immediately to the end of the verb. The modal particle le (also called the post-sentential or sentence-final le), on the other hand, occurs at the end of the sentence (12).

(12) 原來藉著神蹟醫好的那人有四十多歲了。 (Acts 4:22, UV)

Yuánlái jiè zhe shén jī yī-hǎo de nà rén yǒu sìshí duō suí le.

As a matter of fact, the man who recovered through the miracle is already forty-something years old.

The modal particle le is a Mandarin equivalent to the classical modal particle yǐ 矣, which expresses the speaker's determination, volition, and prediction, as well as conveys his or her perception. 179 It is traditionally treated as a particle capable of expressing "change of state." 180

(13) 你的信該你了。 (Mark 10:52; Luke 17:19, 18:42, UV)

Nǐ de xīn jiù le nǐ le.

Your faith has saved you.

In (13), the first le is the perfective aspect marker, whereas the second one (in italics), which appears at the end of the sentence, is the modal particle le. The aspect marker -le is typically used in three different places: factual statements, subordinate clauses, and the

179 Ma had already pointed this out in the late nineteenth century. Ma 马建忠, Grammar, 341. See also, for example, Wang 王, Grammar, vol. 1, 332; Wang, Outline, 113–14; Zhu 朱德熙, Composition, 114; Dragunov, Grammatik, 140, n. 1; Li 黎锦熙, Grammar, 229; Hu and Fan, Verbs, 80–84; Takahashi, "Use of Two le," 165–228. Liu recently argues that the modal particle le functions as past tense similar to the temporal deixis yǐ ("already"). This assertion must be rejected. See Liu 劉勋宗, "Modal Particle," 75–77.

protasis of conditional sentences. Therefore, (13) could be rephrased as “it is your faith that has saved you.” The post-sentential le has the effect of making the assertion more firmly. The aspect marker -le (in bold) appears in the protases of (14):

(14) 既然說萬物都服他，顯然那使萬物服他的就不包括在內了。 (1 Cor 15:27, NCV)

Jírán shuō wànwù dōu fū-le tā, xiānrán nà shì wànwù fū tā de jiù bù bāokuò zāinèi le.

Since it says all things are subjected to him, obviously it does not include the one who put all things in subjection under him.

The second le (in italics) in the apodosis in (14) is a modal particle not only because of its position at the end of the sentence, but also because -le, quite naturally, cannot express the perfective aspect in negative sentences that are signaled by adverbs bù (“not”) or méiyǒu (“have not”) in non-interrogative sentences.182

The aspect marker -le often appears in imperative sentences, whereas -guò, on the other hand, cannot be used in such sentences. (15a–b) illustrate this use:

(15) (a) Ṭū-le chī! (Act 10:13, UV, TCV, SB, NCV, CLB)

Zāi-le chī!

Kill and eat!

(b) 不要忘lu用爱心接待人。 (Heb 13:2, NCV)

Bùyào wàng-le yòng àixin jiēdài rén.

Do not forget to welcome people with love.

---

182 See, for example, Lü 吕叔湘, 800 Phrases, 356–58.
β. Foregrounding in Mandarin Discourse

As mentioned in the introduction (3.2.5.1.b), foregrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse is achieved by utilizing two-morpheme aspect compounds. Two-morpheme aspect compounds, such as -guô-le, RVC-le, -le-RVC, -le-IDVC, are mainly formed by adding -le to a verb that is already marked with an aspect morpheme. Other aspect morphemes, including -guô, verb reduplication, and zài, are used to form aspect compounds, but to a lesser extent. 183 The following examples illustrate that the two-morpheme aspect compounds, RVC-le and -guô-le, are used to build foregrounded prominence in (16) and (17):

(16) 耶穌說完了這些話 (John 18:1, MSV)

Yēsū shuō-wán-le zhèxiē huà.

Jesus finished saying these words.

(17) 這福音你們聽過了，也傳給了天下萬民； (Col 1:23, NCV)

Zhè fúyīn nimen tīng-guô-le, yě chuángei le tiānxìà wànmin.

The gospel that you have heard has been passed on to all people in the world.

d. Verb Reduplication

Verb reduplication is treated in the discussion of aspect in Mandarin by leading scholars such as Edkins, Mateer, Lü Shuxiang, Wang Li, Gao, Ota, Chao, Jaxontov, and

183 For a study of the discourse function of -guô, see B. Wang, “Aspect,” 61–76. Wang argues that, within the framework of Aktionsart, the discourse motivation of -guô is to “end the situation that -guô co-occurs with and then directs the hearer’s attention to the next situation.” Wang, “Aspect,” 61. While his study of aspect morphemes beyond sentence-level is commendable, it is not without problems. For example, the corpus he chooses for analysis is limited to informal conversations of a few select individuals and, therefore, is not representative of different genres to support his theory. More importantly, he discusses the discourse motivation strictly in terms of Aktionsart and says nothing about other pertinent issues, such as prominence or cohesion.
Li and Thompson. Similar to -le, -guò, and RVCs, reduplicating verbs (formally unmarked with any aspect morpheme) also express the perfective aspect (following Smith). However, the function and meaning of verb reduplication are more specifically defined. It is formed with the reduplication of the main verb, sometimes with yī ("one") inserted between the two. For example, wèn-wèn in (19a) is used interchangeably with wèn-yī-wèn. Many, including Smith, define both forms in terms of Aktionsart, that is, they specify an event as short in terms of duration, and as small or little in terms of activity and importance. However, like other single aspect morphemes, verb reduplication is not used to build prominence in Mandarin discourse. It is best described simply as a perfective aspect morpheme. (18) illustrates:

(18) 這裏站站，那裏走走 (Prov 7:12, TCV)

Zhè lǐ zhàn-zhàn, nà lǐ zǒu-zǒu.

---

184 Some prefer the term “verb copying.” See, for example, Li and Thompson, Paris, and some Mainland Chinese authors. Li and Thompson, Grammar, 442-50; Paris, “Durational Complements,” 423-39; Li 李字明, “Verb Copying,” 18-37; Chu, “Sequence,” 227-41. Following Edkins, Chao calls verb reduplication “tentative aspect,” meaning that it conveys the sense of trying (to do something). Chao, Grammar, 252; Edkins, Grammar, 186. See also Maeth-Ch., “Aspectos,” 55. For reviews of authors, see discussions in 3.2.2-3.2.3, pp. 84-112 above.

185 The two-morpheme aspect compound V-zheV-zhe (i.e. verb reduplication + -zhe) express not the perfective, but rather the imperfective aspect in Mandarin (see 3.2.5.3.a., p. 133 below). Throughout this dissertation, the terms “form” and “morphology” are used interchangeably.

186 Those who treat verb reduplication as a perfective morpheme include Smith, Dai, and Xiao and McEnery. See Smith, Parameter, 271; Dai 賈耀宗, Aspect, 67-79; Xiao and McEnery, Aspect, 149-59.


188 Carr suggests that verb reduplication can usually be rendered by the verb take in English (e.g. -kàn-kàn 看看 “take a look.” Carr, “Characterization,” 80. Wang has recently compared Mandarin reduplicated forms -kàn-kàn and -shishi 挑狀 (“give a try”) with Japanese ～してみる and concludes that verb reduplication has two basic aspectual meanings: indefinite and partial perfectiveness. Her findings contradict Li and Thompson and others who see verb reduplication as “delimitive” aspect. Wang seems to be unaware of previous discussions (e.g. Li and Thompson, Smith). She confuses Aktionsart with aspect and discusses the problems in terms of volitional and non-volitional verbs making her theory weak and unconvincing. See Wang 王志英, Imperative Constructions, 49-106.
(She) stood here for a moment, and strolled there for a moment.

Verb reduplication often appears in imperative or hortatory sentences, as (20a–b) illustrate:

(a) 詢問那些聽過我講話的人吧 (John 18:21, NCV)

**Wèn-wèn nàxiē tíng guò wǒ jiānghuà de rén ba.**

Ask those people who have heard me speak.

(b) 等一等，看以利亞來救祂不來。 (Matt 27:49, CRV)

**Dēng-yī-dēng, kàn yǐ li yà lái jiù Tā bù lái.**

Wait awhile and see if Elijah comes to rescue Him or not.

In (19a), the reduplicated form wèn-wèn denotes “ask,” whereas dēng-yī-dēng in (19b) has the sense of “wait for awhile.” Verb reduplication also allows for two sets of reduplicated verbs, as (20) illustrates: 189

(20) 我們就吃吃喝喝吧，因為我們明天就要死了。 (1 Cor 15:32, NCV)

**Wǒmen jiù chī-chī hē-hē ba, yīnwèi wǒmen míngtiān jiùyào sǐ le.**

Let us eat and drink, because tomorrow we will die.

Verb reduplication more often appears in its variant form in non-imperative sentences, as in the case of dēng-yī-dēng in (20b). Dēng-yī-dēng is not to be confused with yī-dēng (lit. “one-wait”), which is marked with the 0 morpheme and is also used to convey the perfective aspect. Лу, for examples, calls this “single event aspect” (一事), which specifies that the completed action has a single and short duration. 190 This is, again, an observation of its Aktionsart. In other words, the meaning of having short duration is

189 Chu argues that the reduplicated form AABB denotes both the perfective and imperfective aspect in Mandarin. This assertion is problematic since it is based upon whether the reduplicated verb can take the perfective aspect marker -le. Chu, “Sequence,” 238.

190 Лу 吳叔湘, Grammar, 235–36.
expressed lexically by yī ("one," "once") and not by an aspect morpheme, as (21) illustrates:

(21) 主令一發, 冰就消化, 暖風一吹, 到處水流 (Ps 147:18, BURNS) \(^{191}\)

Zhǔ lǐng yī-fā, bīng jiù xiāohuà, nuǎnfēng yī-chuí, dàochū shuǐliú.

As soon as the Lord commanded, the ice melted; as soon as the warm wind blew, water flowed everywhere.

e. The 0 Morpheme

a. Introduction

The 0 morpheme is the unmarked indicator of Mandarin aspect. Rather than treating it as the "perfective 0" (e.g. Chang), it is better to say that when the 0 morpheme is used, the verb form may be construed as the perfective aspect. \(^{192}\) As the next section demonstrates, several key factors are involved when the 0 morpheme is used.

b. Preference of the 0 Morpheme over Other Aspect Morphemes

Three key factors may account for the decision to use the 0 morpheme instead of the other perfective morphemes. First, as pointed out above, discourse factors dictate the choice the author or speaker makes between, for example, the 0 morpheme (unmarked) and other perfective aspect morphemes (marked). Generally, the 0 morpheme is preferable when there is no shift in tense-forms in the Greek. When a verb form is accompanied by two perfective morphemes (e.g. -le and RVC) instead of the 0 morpheme, it marks foregrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse (see 3.2.5.2.c.β). Second, it can be explained in terms of style. Since classical Chinese does not employ

---

\(^{191}\) The character 宸 is printed as 宸 in the original publication. See Burns, *Psalms in Mandarin*, 125.

\(^{192}\) Chang, "Discourse," 144. See also 3.2.4.3, p. 113 above.
most of the Mandarin aspect morphemes, more frequent use of the ø morpheme would create the impression of classical tone. Third, temporal deixes such as yijing ("already"), céng ("ever"), xiànzài 現在 ("now"), zhèngzài （“in the process of”), zhèng ("just now"), and gānggāng 剛剛 ("just now"), are capable of expressing aspect and specifying temporal location. The ø morphemes are used to avoid redundancy.

The use of the ø morpheme may not be a matter of preference. As pointed out above (3.2.5.2.c.a), since -le cannot express the perfective aspect in negative sentences that contain biù (or méiyǒu in non-interrogative sentences), the ø morpheme is used instead. (22) illustrates:

(22) 撒羅卻沒有告訴叔叔。 (1 Sam 10:16, LÜ)

Sàoluó què méiyǒu gàosu shūshū.

But Saul did not tell his uncle.

In interrogative sentence, however, -le can be used with méiyǒu, as (23) illustrates:

(23) 誰到這裡來了沒有？ (1 Sam 10:22, LÜ)

Nà rén dào zhèlǐ lái-le méiyǒu?

Did that person arrive here yet?

3.2.5.3. Imperfective and Stative Aspects

The imperfective aspect is realized by three morphologically marked morphemes: zài, -zhe, and IDVCs. The marker -zhe also grammaticalizes the stative aspect in Mandarin. The ø morpheme is also used in contexts where verbal aspect may be construed as either imperfective or stative.

193 Norman predicts that like Latin and Greek, which have immense influence upon modern western languages, classical Chinese will continue to play an important role in future Chinese linguistic development. Norman, Chinese, 110.
a. Imperfective Aspect

a. The Imperfective ocard

The Imperfective ocard has been widely recognized by scholars (e.g. Gao, Halliday, Jaxontov, Gorelov, Li and Thompson, Smith, Shu and many others) as the aspect marker that grammaticalizes the imperfective aspect in Mandarin.\(^{194}\) ocard has two main functions: the locative ocard is used as a preposition, and the aspect marker ocard is used to express the imperfective, as (24a) illustrates. This dissertation calculates that while ocard occurs 3,104 times in the UV New Testament, it is used as an aspect marker only once (24a).

194 Xiao 蕭, “Zai nali,” 150–56; Gorelov, Practical Chinese Grammar, 71–72; Li 李楚成. Beitrdge, 257–77; Shu, Aspect, 40–60; Xiao and McEnery, Aspect, 205–16. For references from the aforementioned authors, see discussions in 3.2.2–3.2.3, pp. 84–112 above.

(24) (a) 你若能信，信的人，凡事都能 (Mark 9:23, UV)

Nǐ ruò néng xìn, zài xìn de rén, fânsì dōu néng.

If only you can believe, he who believes, all things are possible.

(b) 你在做甚麼？ (Eccl 8:4, LÜ)

Nǐ zài zuò shén me?

What are you doing?

The ocard in (24a–b) both specify that the action is perceived to be ongoing. The two closely related terms, zhèngzài and zhèng ("now," "just"), also occur in contexts where the aspect of a given action may be construed as imperfective. However, zhèngzài is treated here as a variant form of the aspect marker zài, with no significant difference in meaning or discourse function between the two. Zhèng, however, is treated as an adverb that does not grammatically express imperfectivity. ocard in (24b) is interchangeable

{\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Card} & \textbf{Card} & \textbf{Card} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}}
with *zhèngzài zuò*. On the other hand, *Nh zhèng zuò shén me?* may be construed as either “What are you doing now?” (imperfective), or “What have you just done?” (perfective).

**β. The Imperfective -zhe**

The marker -zhe has been widely treated as the aspect morpheme that grammaticalizes the imperfective aspect in Mandarin (e.g. Carr, Frei, Wang Li, Gao, Jaxontov, Ota Chao, Shimura, Li and Thompson, Smith, Paris, Hu and Fan, and many others). The suffix -zhe does not differ aspectually from *zài*. As (25) illustrates, -zhe and *zài* may be used interchangeably.

(25) Lìshí de, tā hái shuō-zhe huà de shíhou, jī jiù jiào le.

Immediately, as he was still speaking, the rooster crowed.

(26a) presents a complex situation in which a three-morpheme aspect compound occurs. The main verb, *kàn-zhe*, expresses the imperfective aspect, “he was watching.” As Lù rightly points out, reduplicated verbs that appear in the form *V-zhe V-zhe* (in this case, *zǒu-zhe zǒu-zhe*) express not the perfective but rather the imperfective aspect. The presence of *zài* in front of the reduplicated verb also makes it clear that the verb form signals the imperfective aspect. The three-morpheme aspect compound—*zài*, -zhe, and verb reduplication—is more heavily marked than the verb *zǒu* (“walk”) with the ø morpheme, and marks frontgrounded prominence in the narrative of John’s encounter.

---


196 Lù 吕叔湘, *800 Phrases*, 666.
with Jesus as presented in Lü’s Mandarin translation. The expression zài zǒu-zhe zǒu-zhe creates the effect of Jesus walking slowly right in front of John’s eyes, with each stride clearly in view.

(26) (a) 約翰看著耶穌在走著走著 (John 1:36, LÜ)

Yue han kàn-zhe Yēsū zài zǒu-zhe zǒu-zhe.

John notices that Jesus is taking a walk.

(b) 我正在等著他和弟兄們一同來。 (1 Cor 16:11, NCV)

Wǒ zhèngzài děng-zhe tā hé dixiongmen yǐtóng lái.

I am waiting right now for him to join the brothers and come here.

(26b) illustrates that zhèngzài (or zài) and -zhe are used together as a two-morpheme aspect compound to express the imperfective aspect of the verb děng (“wait”). As a result of the combination, the verb form becomes more heavily marked, hence, it is used to build foregrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse: Paul is indeed still waiting for Timothy and the brothers to arrive.

Less frequently, -zhe may occur with reduplicated verbs, such as rāng-rāng (“shout”) in Dàjiā zhèng rāng-rāng-zhe 大家正嚷嚷著 (“People were shouting”). In this example, the verb phrase rāng-rāng-zhe expresses not the perfective aspect but the imperfective aspect signaled by -zhe.

---

197 Gao has noted that various forms, zhèngzài, zài, zhèngzài...-zhe share the meaning of the progressive aspect. Gao, Grammar (rev. ed.), 191.
198 Ma terms this type of verb phrase “onomatopoeic verb reduplication-zhe.” See Ma 马静恒, Study, 83–89. Song, on the other hand, suggests that the verb phrase expresses the stative aspect, although he does not use the term “aspect” but simply zhuàngtài 狀態 (“state of affairs”). See Song, “Two Usages of zhe,” 27.
γ. DVCs and IDVCs

Directional verb complements (DVCs), notably qiáilí and xiàqu, are treated by many (e.g. Carr, Lù, Wang Li, Ota, Chao, Liu Yuehua et al., Li Lingding, Dai, Xiao and McEnery) as an aspect morpheme.199 While DVCs are primarily used to specify spatial direction of the verb, they are also used grammatically to signify imperfective (as well as perfective) aspect in Mandarin. Table 3.3 is a complete list of DVCs and their basic meanings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>来 lái, coming</th>
<th>去 qù, going</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>上 shàng, up</td>
<td>上来 shànglái, coming up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>下 xià, down</td>
<td>下来 xiàlái, coming down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>进 jìn, entering</td>
<td>进来 jìnlái, coming in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>出 chū, exiting</td>
<td>出来 chūlái, coming out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>回 huí, returning</td>
<td>回来 huílái, coming back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>递 guò, passing</td>
<td>递来 guòlái, passing by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>起 qǐ, rising</td>
<td>起来 qílái, coming up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>開 kāi, opening</td>
<td>開来 kāilái, opening up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>到 dào, arriving</td>
<td>到... 来 dào...lái, coming to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3. The 29 Mandarin DVCs

DVCs that are grammaticalized to express the imperfective aspect in Mandarin are referred to in this study as imperfective DVCs (IDVCs). Building upon the analysis conducted by Liu et al., common IDVCs include qí, qílái, lái, shàng, shànglái, xià, xiàlái,

---

199 Ota, Historical Grammar, 223–25; Li 李臨定, Modern Chinese Verbs, 33–34; Dai 戴耀昌, Aspect, 94–105. For reviews of other authors, see discussions in 3.2.2-3.2.3, pp. 84–112 above. Summers was the first to use the term “inceptive” to describe qiáilí as an indicator of “the beginning of an action.” See Summers, Handbook, 75.

200 Jìnqù is not included in the 26 DVCs listed in Meng 孟 琛 et al., Dictionary, 12–20.

201 Qíqù is rare in Standard Mandarin. Ota notes that it has the same meaning as qiáilí. For examples from vernacular writings, see Ota, Historical Grammar, 212.

202 In addition to qiáqù, kāiqù occurs least frequently among other DVCs in Standard Mandarin. Liu et al. cite a few examples in which kāiqù is used with verbs such as zòu 走 (“walk”), piāo 飄 (“flutter”), yì 焉 (“move”), and pāo 抛 (“throw”), etc. See Liu 劉月華 et al., Directional Verb Complements, 396–99. It is not included in Lù’s 800 Phrases.
In addition, other DVCs are also used to denote imperfectivity, especially when they appear in phrases such as V-guòláiV-guòqù, V-láiV-qiù, V-káiV-káiqù, and in stereotyped phrases such as kàn-shàngqù 看上去 (“looking”).

IDVCs and the other two formal imperfective aspect markers, zài and -zhe, may be used interchangeably. However, just like RVCs, IDVCs still retain their relative lexical meaning even though they are used grammatically to give rise to imperfective aspectual interpretations. This is why the IDVCs xiàqù (“going down”) and xià (“down”), for example, are frequently described as continuative aspect morphemes. (27) illustrates:

(27) 你们儘管做下去，去完成你們祖宗的暴行吧！(TCV, Matt 23:32)

Nǐmen jinguăn zuò-xiàqù, qù wánchéng nǐmen zūzōng de bàoxíng ba!

Continue to do what you are doing and complete your ancestors’ savage act.

However, these nuances between IDVCs and other imperfective aspect morphemes are lexical rather than grammatical distinctions. Therefore, IDVCs are best treated simply as suffixes that grammaticalize the imperfective aspect in Mandarin.

(28) illustrates a complex case in which IDVCs occur with -le as a two-morpheme aspect compound:

(28) 上帝曾叫他從死人中活了起來 (Rom 10:9, LÜ)

Shàngdì céng jiào tā cóng sǐrén zhōng huó-le-qílái.

God has raised him from the dead.

---

203 The DVC kái and lái are not treated as IDVCs in Liu et al. See Liu 劉月華 et al., *Directional Verb Complements*, 25–32. Li includes it as an alternative form to kái, which has the inchoative and continuative meaning (開始並繼續). See Li 李臨, *Modern Chinese Verbs*, 34. Similarly, Lü notes that lái may be used interchangeably with qílái. See Lü 呂叔湘, *800 Phrases*, 346.

204 For discussions of common DVCs and their aspectual meanings, see Liu 劉月華 et al., *Directional Verb Complements*, 25–32; Mullie, *Structural Principles*, vol. 2, 117–19, 172–204.
The two-morpheme compound *le-IDVC* (or *IDVC-le*) conveys not the perfective but rather the imperfective aspect in Mandarin. This is due to the fact that, for the purpose of building prominence in discourse, *-le* is added to the IDVC *qīlái*, which signals the imperfective aspect (cf. 3.2.5.2.c.β above). However, the two-morpheme aspect compound *le-IDVC* differs from other single imperfective aspect morphemes (i.e. *zài*, *zhe*, IDVCs) with regards to markedness. For example, in (28), *huó-le-qīlái* is formally more heavily marked than *huó-le* (*V-le*) or *huó-qīlái* (*V-IDVC*) because of the morphological bulk. Some Mandarin Chinese scholars argue that *-le* in this compound does not express perfectivity but rather “reality.”

Such assertions are unconvincing because they offer no meaningful explanation of Mandarin aspect. Therefore, it is better to say that, like other two-morpheme aspect compounds, the *le-IDVC* compound is more heavily marked than single imperfective aspect morphemes and, thus, is used to build foregrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse.

δ. The ø Morpheme

There are contexts in which the ø morpheme is preferable to other imperfective aspect morphemes for reasons (e.g. to create an impression of classical tone) similar to those explained in the discussions of the perfective aspect above (3.2.5.2.e.β). (29) illustrates the discourse motivation for the use of the ø morpheme in sentences where the imperfective aspect of an action is clearly intended:

(29) 我們他和別的兄弟同來。 (1 Cor 16:11, JOHM)

---

205 Liu argues that DVCs can only denote the imperfective aspect. Since these two morphemes of different aspects would contradict each other, he concludes that *-le* does not convey completion but “reality” (現實; English trans. mine). See Liu 劉勤, "Semantics," 323. Liu’s analysis is followed by Xiao and McEnery, who call the compound *V-le-qīlái* “actual inceptive” aspect. See Xiao and McEnery, *Aspect*, 10, 219–24. See also Dai 戴耀晶, *Aspect*, 99–101, 104–05.
Wǒ hòu tā hé bié de xiōngdī tónɡlái.

I am waiting here for him and the other brothers to arrive.

(29) and (26b) are taken from the same New Testament passage but from different translations. Here, the earlier Mandarin version, JOHMN, has hòu ("wait") with the ø morpheme, whereas the NCV has zhèngzài dēnɡ-zhe with two imperfective morphemes. (26b) is more heavily marked because the presence of zhèngzài and -zhe (see 3.2.5.3.a,b above) allows only the imperfective reading. On the other hand, (29) is unmarked because the ø morpheme does not specify the aspect of the action. The context makes it clear, however, that the imperfective aspect is intended (i.e. Paul is still expecting Timothy and the brothers to arrive). The ø morpheme is used instead because the Mandarin translator of JOHMN understands that Paul’s waiting in Ephesus is meant to serve as a piece of background information in the letter closing (1 Cor 16:1–24).

The ø morpheme is used in places where zài functions as a preposition, and the insertion of the aspect marker zài will result in redundancy. In (30), zài serves as the preposition as well as the imperfective marker. Sentences such as Tā zài shuǐchí lǐ zài yóuyōng or Tā shuǐchí lǐ zài yóuyōng are unacceptable. In such cases, the ø morpheme is used instead of zài in contexts where the imperfective aspect is clearly intended.

(30) 他在水池裏游泳。

Tā zài shuǐchí lǐ yóuyōng.

He is swimming in the pool.

---

206 See, for example, Chen 陈重瑜, “Aspectual Features,” 76–103.
b. Stative Aspect

Mandarin offers only one morphologically marked aspect morpheme, -zhe, to grammaticalize the stative aspect. The ø morpheme is also used in contexts where the action is perceived as stative.

a. The Stative -zhe

The marker -zhe is widely treated as an aspect morpheme that grammaticalizes the stative aspect in Mandarin by Gorelov, Jaxontov, Paris, Smith, Dai, Xiao and McEnery, and many others. The stative aspect marker -zhe is identical in form to the RVC zhào, and in both form and pronunciation to the imperfective aspect marker -zhe. Sentences marked with the stative -zhe suggest that events have entered a stable condition, and thus have stative aspect. (31a–c) illustrate:

(31) (a) 那死人就出來了，手腳裏著布，臉上包著手巾。 (John 11:44, UV)

Nhā sīrēn jiù chūlái-le, shǒu-jīāo guō-zhe bù, liǎnshàng bāo-zhe shōujīn.

That dead man came out, his hands and feet bound in cloths, his face wrapped in a handkerchief.

(b) 耶穌到了彼得家裡，見彼得的岳母害熱病躺著。 (Matt 8:14, UV)

Yēsū dàoliào bǐ dé jiālǐ, jiàn bǐ dé de yùèmǔ hài rèbīng tāng-zhe.

Jesus came to Peter’s house and saw Peter’s mother-in-law lying in bed sick with fever.

(c) 因為經上記著說：“他使萬物都服在他腳下。” (1 Cor 15:27, NCV)

Yīnwèi jīng shàng ji-zhe shuō: “tā shī wànwù dōu fú zài tā jiàoxià.”

---

Because the Scripture is written, "He puts all things under his feet."

β. The ø Morpheme

Examples (31a–c) are morphologically marked with -zhe, whereas (32a–c) are examples of the same verbs marked with the ø morpheme. Some observations may be made regarding the aspectual meanings of the two different groups. In (31a), the suffix -zhe in guō-zhe morphologically expresses the stative aspect. Without -zhe, the aspect realized by the ø morpheme of the verb form guō in (32a) may be construed not only as stative but also as perfective or even imperfective. However, the context suggests that the action is described as the stative aspect, since, on one hand, the perfective reading normally requires the RVC shàng, and, on the other hand, the imperfective reading demands the IDVC qì. In the same way, tāng ("lie") in (32b) and (33b), and jì ("record") in (31c) and (32c) may be treated similarly.

As with the perfective and imperfective aspects, the preference of the ø morpheme over -zhe may be explained by the author's intention to create an impression of classical tone. However, unlike the other two aspects in Mandarin, discourse motivation cannot account for the use of the ø morpheme in verb forms where the stative aspect is intended. This is due to the restriction that the stative -zhe cannot be used alongside any other aspect morphemes for the same verb. 209 As pointed out above, prominence in Mandarin discourse is built by utilizing two or three aspect morphemes in the same verb form. For this reason, even though the stative -zhe is considered more marked than the ø morpheme, both morphemes are used as backgrounding devices in Mandarin discourse.

(32) (a) 你要為亞倫的兒子作內袍、腰帶、裏頭巾，為榮耀、為華美。 (Exod

---

209 See, for example, Lü 呂叔湘, 800 Phrases, 665–66.
28:40, UV)
Nǐ yào wéi yà lún de érzi zuò nèi páo, yǎodài, guō tóujīn, wèi róngyào, wèi huáměi.

For Aaron’s sons you shall make tunic and belt and wear headdresses, for the sake of glory and magnificence.

(b) 主阿，我的僕人害癱瘓病，躺在家裡，甚是疼痛。 (Matt 8:6, UV)
Zhù a, wǒ de púrén hài tānhuànbing, tāng zài jiālǐ, shēnshì téng kù.

O Lord, my servant is paralyzed, lying at home in great pain.

(c) 經上所記：‘看哪，我差遣我的使者在你面前，他必在你前頭預備你的道路。’ (Matt 11:10, NCV)
Jīng shàng suǒ jī: “kàn na, wǒ chāiqiān wǒ de shīzhē zài nǐ miànrì, tā bì zài nǐ qiántou yàbèi nǐ de dàolù.”

The Scripture has written, “Look, I am sending my messenger before you.

He shall prepare your way before you.”

Like -le and verb reduplication, the stative marker -zhe often appears in imperative or hortatory sentences, as (33) illustrates:

(33) 記著 “近朱者赤，近墨者黑”。 (1 Cor 15:33, CLB)210

Ji-zhe “Jin-zhū-zhē-chi, jin-mò-zhē-hēi.”

Remember, “You are whom you associate with.”

3.2.6. Conclusion

This section begins with a survey of literature on the general study of aspect (3.2.1),
and continues with critical reviews of major approaches to Mandarin aspect (3.2.2–3.2.4).

210 The CLB is from the 1998 revised edition.
Section 3.2.5 provides an outline of methodology for treating Mandarin aspect. The notions of markedness and grounding are explored here to add explanatory force to the treatment of each aspect morpheme in Mandarin. To support the proposed outline of the Mandarin aspectual system, illustrations are drawn from the wenli and Mandarin Bible versions. This outline will serve as the theoretical basis for translating the Bible, with special emphasis on translating New Testament Greek verbal aspect into Mandarin verbal aspect. In the next section, the focus will turn to New Testament Greek aspect (3.3).

3.3. Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek

3.3.1. Introduction

The purpose of this section is two-fold: to critically examine previous studies on Greek aspect, all of which are monographs, and to outline a methodology for treating New Testament Greek aspect necessary for engaging detailed discussions on Bible translation issues in the following chapters. The review has its primary focus on examining the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed Greek aspect systems, as opposed to disputing the soundness of each on syntax and pragmatic problems of aspect. Specific issues that arise from syntax and pragmatics of the Greek New Testament will receive detailed treatment in the following chapters.

Grammatical studies of ancient Greek began as early as the second century B.C.E. and continue to receive rigorous contributions today. This is a stark contrast to classical Chinese in which no grammatical treatises existed until the eighteenth century C.E. In the late nineteenth century, Curtius introduced the terms Zeitstufe ("grade of time") to describe temporal locations and Zeitart ("kind of time"), which was later referred to by
many (e.g. Moulton and Robertson) as Aktionsart.\textsuperscript{211} It was not until the later editions of the Blass-Debrunner-Funk grammar that the term “aspect” appeared in connection with Aktionsart.\textsuperscript{212} However, major works that apply modern linguistic theories of aspect to Greek are relatively recent and few in number.\textsuperscript{213} This section primarily focuses on the theoretical contributions of seven authors on New Testament Greek aspect. All of the monographs reviewed here are revised doctoral dissertations published within the last two decades, except those by McKay and Mateos. The following reviews of Greek aspect models divide into two main groups: the first group, represented by McKay, Porter, Decker, and Evans, treats aspect as an independent category without conflating it with Aktionsart. The second group, represented by Mateos, Fanning, and Olsen, recognizes Aktionsart as a main component of aspect.\textsuperscript{214}

3.3.2. McKay, Porter, Decker, and Evans

a. K.L. McKay

McKay is credited as the first person to apply modern linguistic theories of aspect to ancient Greek, although his monograph on New Testament Greek aspect did not appear until 1994.\textsuperscript{215} McKay’s model of Greek aspect is not formed according to binary or

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{211} Curtius, \textit{Greek Verb}, 2; Moulton, \textit{Prolegomena}, 108–18; Robertson, \textit{Grammar}, 828–35.
\item\textsuperscript{212} BDF, §318. Aktionsart and aspect are not treated as distinct categories. This remains unchanged in the 18th German edition. See BDR, §318.
\item\textsuperscript{214} Banerjee has attempted to provide a contrastive study of Greek and Sanskrit aspectual systems. Unfortunately, he failed on several counts. For example, he confuses aspect with Aktionsart and appears to have no distinction between the two categories. More importantly, his comments on the Greek verbal system are almost entirely derived from secondary sources. In addition, there is very little treatment of contrasting the two different systems of aspect. In short, Banerjee contributes nothing to the theory of Greek aspect and, thus, his work deserves no further review here. See Banerjee, \textit{Tense and Aspect}, 23.
\item\textsuperscript{215} McKay, \textit{New Syntax}. McKay published his first article on Greek aspect as early as 1965. See also McKay, “Use,” 1–21.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
privative oppositions. He maintains the traditional tense-based terminology mainly for pedagogical reasons and the sake of convenience.\textsuperscript{216} He defines aspect in terms of a “category of verb system by means of which an author (or speaker) shows how he views each event or activity he mentions in relations to its context.”\textsuperscript{217} McKay sees Aktionsart as analogous and not identical to aspect. He thinks that while it is helpful to divide Greek verbs into activity and stative verbs, further divisions are unnecessary and can be misleading because classifications such as Vendler-Kenny’s taxonomy are based on English.\textsuperscript{218} McKay identifies four Greek aspects (both classical and Koine):\textsuperscript{219}

1. **Imperfective** (present, imperfect): expressing an activity as in process (in progress)

2. **Aorist** (aorist): expressing an activity as a whole action or simple event

3. **Perfect** (perfect, pluperfect, future perfect): expressing the state consequent upon an action

4. **Future** (future): expressing intention and consequently simple futurity\textsuperscript{220}

McKay emphasizes that his basic approach is a pragmatic one, and that contextual factors play the key role in the understanding of Greek aspects. Still, his quadripartite model presents several problems.\textsuperscript{221} First, according to McKay, Greek tense-forms do not signal time except “by implication from their relationship to their context.”\textsuperscript{222} Yet he often uses temporal references (i.e. present, past, future) to explain the distributional

\textsuperscript{216} McKay, *Greek Grammar*, ix. Others like Voelz, on the other hand, insist that “tense” should be replaced with “stem.” Voelz, “Present,” 156.

\textsuperscript{217} McKay, *New Syntax*, 27.

\textsuperscript{218} McKay, *New Syntax*, 29 n. 1.


\textsuperscript{220} McKay, *Grammar*, 140–41.

\textsuperscript{221} McKay, *New Syntax*, xi.

\textsuperscript{222} McKay, *New Syntax*, 39.
differences, for example, between present and imperfect tense-forms.\textsuperscript{223} Second, since he observes that the present, aorist, and imperfect tense-forms can all be interpreted as inceptive (which is essentially an \textit{Aktionsart} category), he is unable to account for the significance in their particular semantic contributions.\textsuperscript{224} Third, McKay identifies no aspectual oppositions; as a result, he is unable to differentiate aspectual meanings within each aspect (e.g. perfect and pluperfect tense-forms). Finally, the future tense-form classified as a separate aspect is unconvincing. “Expressing intention” in fact belongs to the category of mood, whereas “futurity” to the category of tense, both of which fall outside of aspect proper. In short, without a powerful linguistic model to serve as a theoretical basis, the application of McKay’s Greek aspect model to Bible translation is rather limited.

\textbf{b. Stanley Porter}

Stanley Porter’s model of Greek aspect “exploits,” as he says in the introduction of his monograph, a “functional linguistic model of fairly recent provenance, systemic linguistics.”\textsuperscript{225} His approach is similar to that of McKay on several points, however, the two are also quite different. Both retain traditional terminology. Another apparent but important similarity is that both reject \textit{Aktionsart} as a main component of aspect. Their classifications of tense-forms according to their corresponding aspects are basically the same, but not identical. One of their major differences is that Porter’s approach lends itself to modern linguistic theories (especially those of the Prague School) to serve as a solid foundation for developing a Greek aspect model far superior to McKay’s.

\textsuperscript{223} McKay, \textit{New Syntax}, 40, 42.
\textsuperscript{224} McKay, \textit{New Syntax}, 42–47.
\textsuperscript{225} Porter, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 7.
Porter defines aspect in terms of "a synthetic semantic category (realized in the forms of verbs) used of meaningful oppositions in a network of tense systems to grammaticalize the author's reasoned subjective choice of conception of a process."\(^{226}\) He shares the same convictions with McKay that Greek verbal forms do not convey temporal reference, even in the indicative mood. Porter's tripartite model of Greek aspect is summarized below:\(^{227}\)

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+Perfective [Aorist]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Imperfective [Present]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Stative [Perfect]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

**Chart 3.4. Porter's model of Greek aspect**

Some key linguistic theories Porter utilizes include the concept of markedness introduced by the Prague School linguists in order to account for a range of different types of aspectual oppositions and contrasts in Greek tense-forms.\(^{228}\) According to Porter, the privative oppositions represented by the labels [-remoteness] and [+remoteness] are necessary to differentiate the present and imperfect tense-forms of the imperfective aspect, and perfect and pluperfect tense-forms of the stative aspect, respectively.

Following Wallace, Porter believes that the present is primarily used in discourse as the foregrounding tense-form.\(^{229}\) Since he recognizes the [+stative] to be the most heavily

\(^{228}\) For example, Porter presents several different types of markedness, including material, implicational, distributional, and semantic markedness. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 178–81.
\(^{229}\) Wallace, "Figure and Ground," 208, 212; Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 92–93; Porter, *Idioms*, 302; Porter, "Date," 302–12.
marked aspect, the perfect and pluperfect are frontgrounding tense-forms, used to mark prominence in Greek discourse.\textsuperscript{230} The aorist, on the other hand, is less heavily marked against the tense-forms of the [-perfective] aspects; it is frequently used as means to mark cohesion in narrative discourse.\textsuperscript{231}

c. Rodney Decker

Many have criticized Porter’s nontraditional proposal for his apparent excessive reliance on exceptions of verb forms that are inconsistent with their temporal references (e.g. past-referring present tense-form).\textsuperscript{232} The problem with this objection is that there are many such “exceptions,” for example, as Rodney Decker observes, in 518 total occurrences of aorist indicative forms in Mark, 58 aorists are not used to denote past time.\textsuperscript{233} Decker’s corpus-based study is devoted to testing Porter’s theory by application to Mark. His semantic-pragmatic approach explores various means employed in the Gospel to express temporal locations. Supported by evidence gathered from his analyses on deictic indicators, discourse, and contextual factors, Decker concurs with Porter that the Greek verb does not grammaticalize temporal reference. In his conclusion, however, he hesitates to fully embrace Porter’s theory, fearing that such radical change would result in “far-reaching implications” beyond what people might feel comfortable.\textsuperscript{234}

\textsuperscript{231} Porter, \textit{Idioms}, 305. Porter adds that the present tense-form is used to mark cohesion in exposition.
\textsuperscript{232} Fanning, “Approaches,” 58; Schmidt, “Verbal Aspect,” 72; Mateos, “Recensión,” 222. McKay has criticized Porter for ignoring or misapplying the contextual evidence. McKay, “Time and Aspect,” 210, 225. Caragounis follows Jannaris’ diachronic analysis and argues for the existence of tense and aspect in Koine Greek. He repudiates Porter for his disregard of what he thinks to be a critical role of Modern Greek in our understanding of the New Testament Greek aspect. Caragounis, however, does not present his own model of Greek aspect, nor does he appear to have one. See Caragounis, \textit{Development}, 316–36; also 151–81.
\textsuperscript{233} Decker, \textit{Temporal Deixis}, 94–99, 151.
\textsuperscript{234} Decker, \textit{Temporal Deixis}, 153.
d. T.V. Evans

T.V. Evans published his study on the Greek verbal syntax in the same year as Decker did his.\textsuperscript{235} In contrast to any of the above reviewed authors, Evans discusses Greek aspect in relation to “translation technique” of the Septuagint. He sets out to demonstrate that Septuagint syntax does not equate with Hebrew syntax. However, similar to other scholars, Evans treats aspect as “a viewpoint feature, indicating the way in which a speaker or writer views a verbal occurrence with respect to its internal temporal constituency” involving “a binary opposition, grammatically expressed, between perfective and imperfective aspects.”\textsuperscript{236} Evans’ model, however, diverges significantly from those of McKay and Porter. According to Evans, Greek realizes five “aspectual tenses” and two “non-aspectual tenses.”\textsuperscript{237} The present, perfect, and imperfect tenses denote the imperfective aspect, whereas the aorist and pluperfect express the perfective aspect. The future and future perfect are the only non-aspectual tenses. Evans rejects Porter’s thesis of a purely aspectual interpretation of the Greek verb even in the indicative as “untenable” and argues from a diachronic point of view:\textsuperscript{238}

The exceptional patterns of verbal usages which provide the basis for this theory are better taken as fossilized survivals of an older aspectual structure overlaid by the growing importance of temporal reference. The comparatively late appearance of the future tense form and the introduction of the augment are consistent with the notion of rising temporal reference in the indicative.\textsuperscript{239}

On the other hand, Evans accepts Porter’s view insofar as the perfect is grammatically stative, however, he considers (following Szemerényi) it aspectually imperfective.\textsuperscript{240} The

\textsuperscript{235} Evans, Verbal Syntax.
\textsuperscript{236} Evans, Verbal Syntax, 50.
\textsuperscript{237} Evans, Verbal Syntax, 51.
\textsuperscript{238} Evans, Verbal Syntax, 45–50.
\textsuperscript{239} Evans, Verbal Syntax, 51.
perfect has identical aspectual meaning with the present tense; the difference between
them is the grammatically expressed stativity of the perfect. Hence, he does not
categorize the stative as a separate aspect.

The main thrust of Evans' argument lies in his structural comparison of the Hebrew
and Greek verbal systems, not in providing a detailed analysis of Greek verb forms and
their aspectual meanings. But even with such comparison there are many flaws in his
approach. The most problematic one is that he claims to find consistent matches between
Greek and Hebrew verb forms in the Pentateuch simply by overlaying his model of Greek
aspect onto traditionally categorized Hebrew verb forms, with little consideration of
modern discussions of Hebrew aspect and its related issues. 241 In short, Evans contributes
nothing original to our understanding of Hebrew aspect and very little to Greek aspect.

3.3.3. Mateos, Fanning, Olsen

a. Juan Mateos

Before Porter and Fanning, the first monograph solely devoted to New Testament
Greek aspect appeared in 1977 by Juan Mateos. He considers three key components
(“factores”) of aspect: lexematic, morphematic, and syntagmatic. 242 He intends to show
how these three components interact with each other, thereby discovering the aspectual
function of the Greek verb. The lexematic component, which corresponds to Aktionsart
or lexical aspect, divides into four classes: statives, instantatives, continuatives, and
resultatives. Mateos follows Vendler-Kenny's taxonomy and uses the binary oppositions
between the stative and dynamic verbs to classify New Testament Greek verbs and

241 Evans includes no more than 3 pages on Hebrew aspect. Evans, Verbal Syntax, 58–60.
Porter, Verbal Aspect, 61.
discuss their aspectual and syntactical meanings. The morphematic part corresponds to grammatical aspect, which he treats with *Aktionsart* categories. For example, the present tense expresses the durative aspect, whereas the aorist the punctual.\textsuperscript{243} As Porter has pointed out, Mateos’s model of Greek aspect is essentially a version of *Aktionsart*.\textsuperscript{244}

b. Buist Fanning

Buist Fanning published his monograph on New Testament Greek aspect within a year of Porter’s. Like Mateos, Fanning follows Vendler-Kenny’s classification, but goes much further in his modification of the taxonomy.\textsuperscript{245} More importantly, he departs from Mateos by adding grammatical aspect to his model of Greek aspect. His definitions of *Aktionsart* and (grammatical) aspect are very similar to (if not basically in agreement with) Porter’s.\textsuperscript{246} However, Fanning’s model of Greek aspect differs from Porter’s in several critical areas; most importantly, their differences are characterized by their methodological approaches.

Fanning posits a two-component theory of Greek aspect similar to the one Smith would later propose, conflating *Aktionsart* with aspect categories. He argues that while aspect is often regarded as a rather subjective category, it is in fact not entirely true. He explains,

\begin{quote}
[F]ully subjective choices between aspects are not common, since the nature of the action or the procedural character of the verb or verb-phrase can restrict the way an action is viewed by a speaker. In fact, aspect interacts so closely with such features and so significantly affected by them that no analysis of aspect can be fully meaningful without attention to these interactions.\textsuperscript{247}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{241} Mateos, *Aspecto*, 30–32.
\textsuperscript{242} Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 61.
\textsuperscript{243} For the purpose of the current study, Fanning’s further refinement of Vendler-Kenny taxonomy of verbs (i.e. the additional subcategories of “climaxes” and “punctuals”) is not revelent. See Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 126–96.
\textsuperscript{244} Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 31, 84–85. Porter has pointed out that he and Fanning have “very similar definitions of what verbal aspect is.” Porter, “In Defence,” 32.
\textsuperscript{245} Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 85.
Fanning posits two Greek aspects in the New Testament.\textsuperscript{248}

1. **Aorist**: presents an occurrence in summary, viewed as a whole from the outside, without regard for the internal make-up of the occurrence.

2. **Present**: reflects an internal viewpoint concerning the occurrence which focuses on its development or progress and sees the occurrence in regard to its internal make-up, without beginning or end in view.

Fanning stresses the aorist and present aspects as the primary aspecual relationship, and, as a result, the perfect can be omitted since its aspectual value resembles that of the aorist.\textsuperscript{249} Likewise, the imperfect has "virtually identical aspect-value" to the present tense-form so it, too, can be omitted from the discussion.\textsuperscript{250} He does add that the imperfect also indicates past tense in addition to conveying the progressive aspect. In contrast to Porter, Fanning only specifies equipollent oppositions between the aorist and the present aspects, and explains the differences between tense-forms (i.e. perfect and pluperfect, present and imperfect) according to their temporal references and \textit{Aktionsart} categories. The stative aspect, therefore, is defined by both stative situation (\textit{not} by perfect tense-form according to Porter) and by tense-feature of anteriority.\textsuperscript{251}

\textsuperscript{248} Fanning, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 97, 103. The explanations are direct quotations from Fanning; his emphases in italics are taken off.

\textsuperscript{249} Fanning, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 124.

\textsuperscript{250} Fanning, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 241.

\textsuperscript{251} Fanning, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 112--14, 19--20. Fanning follows Friedrich's interpretation of anteriority in the perfect form. Friedrich, "On Aspect Theory," S16--19, 36. Friedrich's analysis of the Greek perfect in turn owes to an earlier study by Kuryłowicz. See Kuryłowicz, \textit{Inflectional Categories}, 90--135. According to Friedrich, the perfect tense-form exists as "equivalent" (which he prefers to equipollent contrast) to the aorist and present tense-forms. Friedrich's model of Homeric Greek aspect is summarized below:

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (a) {\textit{Durative ("present")}};
  \node (b) [below of=a] {\textit{Durative}};
  \node (c) [above of=b] {\textit{Realized ("perfect")}};
  \node (d) [right of=b] {\textit{Realized ("aorist")}};
  \draw[-latex] (a) -- (b);
  \draw[-latex] (b) -- (c);
  \draw[-latex] (b) -- (d);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}
Fanning also holds views very different from Porter's regarding the roles of Greek aspect in discourse. He rejects the idea that aspect inherently conveys temporal sequence and marks prominence in discourse.\(^{252}\) Although the two share similar views concerning the future tense, Fanning sees it as a "non-aspectual tense-category" and excludes it from further discussions.\(^{253}\) Overall, Fanning's model of Greek aspect is too simplified and inadequate, for he relies heavily on Aktionsart and traditional Greek grammarians to influence his interpretation of Greek verbs.\(^{254}\)

c. Mari Olsen

Following Fanning, Mari Olsen's model of Greek aspect represents the most recent effort to embrace Aktionsart. Olsen adopts Smith's two-component theory of viewpoint and situation aspect as the basis for her model of Koine Greek aspect, though she departs from Smith on several significant points.\(^{255}\) For example, Olsen follows Smith's tripartite grammatical aspect model, that is, imperfective, perfective, neutral (renamed "unmarked") aspects, but argues that English simple forms (past, present, and future) are aspectually unmarked (contra Smith).\(^{256}\) Olsen also weighs pragmatic factors (adopting Grice's Maxims) to determine the aspectual meaning of a verb more heavily than Smith.\(^{257}\) The imperfect and pluperfect tense-forms are labeled [+past] under [+Durative] and [+Realized] in contrast to [-past] of the present and perfect tense-forms. Friedrich further divides [-Realized] into [+bounded] and three additional subcategories in his hierarchy of Homeric aspect. See Friedrich, "On Aspect," Sl2, 27, 37.

\(^{252}\) Fanning, _Verbal Aspect_, 72–77, 85.

\(^{253}\) Fanning, _Verbal Aspect_, 122–24.

\(^{254}\) See, for example, Porter, "In Defence," 39–40; Olsen, _Semantic and Pragmatic Model_, 254.

\(^{255}\) Olsen, _Semantic and Pragmatic Model_, 63, 77–81, 167–76. Another author Olsen frequently consults is Comrie.

\(^{256}\) Olsen, _Semantic and Pragmatic Model_, 182–91. Louw, on the other hand, argues that the Greek present is aspectually neutral or unmarked, and a zero tense. Olsen does follow Louw in treating the future as aspectually neutral. Louw, "Verbale Aspek," 25–26; Louw, "Verbal Aspect," 102. Among others who recognize tense in ancient Greek is Lorente Fernandez. She adopts Porter's tripartite aspectual model in her recent corpus-linguistic study of Greek verbal aspect in Isocrates. See Fernandez, _L'aspect verbal._

\(^{257}\) H. Paul Grice's maxims of conversation are understood as sort of "agreements" or "terms of communication" that both the speaker and his or her audience respect and hence according to which they
plan of her study closely resembles that of Smith, except she focuses only on English and Greek aspects, and she adds a treatment of tense. Olsen exhibits serious deficiency in her knowledge of non-western languages. It becomes obvious that, for example, all illustrations in Mandarin derive from secondary sources (especially from Smith’s). This deficiency will undermine the credibility as well as applicational value of her theory to general studies of aspect.

Olsen’s model of Koine Greek tense and (grammatical) aspect is summarized below:258

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENSE:</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Unmarked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASPECT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4. Olsen’s Greek indicative mixed tense and aspect system

Olsen has followed Fanning in his interpretation of the perfect and pluperfect tense-forms as signaling the perfective aspect, both of which McKay and Porter consider to be stative aspect, whereas Evans considers the former imperfective and the latter perfective.

According to Olsen, temporal reference is suggested by tense semantically and by implicature pragmatically. She argues for the existence of tense in Greek based on the assumptions of “cancelability” (deriving from the work by Grice), which states that


semantic meanings "may not be canceled without contradiction or reinforced without redundancy." 259 In other words, semantic meanings are uniform and uncancelable, whereas pragmatic meanings are variable and cancelable. 260 The present and aorist forms, therefore, are unspecified for tense since their temporal references are expressed pragmatically and, hence, cancelable. 261

Decker has demonstrated evidence that effectively disproves Olsen’s theory of cancelability. Consider the imperfect form in (34). 262

(34) ἠθελον δὲ παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἡρτι (Gal 4:20)

I wish I were present with you now (NRSV).

The imperfect ἠθελον clearly expresses the present time. This interpretation is supported by contextual information and temporal deictic ἡρτι. 263 Similarly, the perfect can also denote future reference (e.g. Jas 5:1-3). 264 Olsen’s claim, therefore, about Greek tense according to her theory of cancelability will not hold true. The other objections to Olsen’s mixed tense and aspect model have to do with the fact that she does not consider non-indicative moods.

261 Hewson and Duhoux both argue similarly for a co-existence of aspect and tense in ancient Greek. Hewson shares the same view with Olsen concerning the difference between the aorist and present as purely aspectual, but his Greek aspect model differs significantly from Olsen’s. He posits a tripartite aspect model of Greek similar to Porter’s but instead of stative aspect, he calls it the retrospective aspect. His “aspecto-temporal” system divides the indicative tense-forms into past (imperfect, aorist, pluperfect) and non-past (present, future, perfect). The key difference in Hewson’s model is that he recognizes the future form as “non-past perfective” aspect. See Hewson, “Verbal System,” 28–29. Duhoux, on the other hand, recognizes the present as present tense, aorist as past tense, and perfect as past and present tense. See Duhoux, verbe, §§124–30. Duhoux’s Greek aspect model includes four aspects: progressive (imperfect), punctual (aorist), stative (perfect, future perfect, pluperfect), and neutral (present and future).
262 Decker, Temporal Deixis, 46.
263 Paul is describing not a past but rather present desire, as τάλιν in the previous verse indicates.
264 Decker, Temporal Deixis, 48.
3.3.4. Methodology and Procedures: An Outline of Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek

3.3.4.1. Introduction

This section provides an outline of Greek aspect that is adopted as the principal methodology, along with Mandarin aspect outlined in 3.2.5, to be implemented in the discussions of translating New Testament Greek verb forms into Mandarin Chinese in the following chapters. Greek illustrations are primarily simple sentences in the active indicative mood from the New Testament that best describe the aspectual meaning of the verb. Special verbs (e.g. ὁδει and γίνωσκω), complex sentences (e.g. conditional sentences) and especially those in the non-indicative moods or passive/middle voice, along with temporal locations and discourse considerations will receive full treatment in the following chapters.

a. Binary Oppositions

The Greek aspectual system closely resembles the Mandarin aspectual system, though the two are not identical. Greek realizes three aspects, which divide into three sets of binary oppositions. The first two sets are equipollent oppositions: the first set is represented by [+perfective] and [−perfective]; the second set divides the [−perfective] into [+imperfective] and [+stative]. The third set exists as parallel to the first equipollent oppositions. It is a privative opposition represented by [+remote] and [−remote]. Table 3.5 summarizes the Greek tense-forms and their aspectual realizations. The proposed tripartite model of Greek aspect follows that of Porter, as Chart 3.5 and Table 3.5 illustrate:
Table 3.5. Greek tense-forms and their aspectual realizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+Perfective</th>
<th>-Perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+Remote</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>+Imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−Remote</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Markedness and Grounding

The current dissertation follows Porter in his application of the markedness theory to New Testament Greek aspect, especially the categorization of tense-forms according to grounding and discourse functions. The aorist is the least heavily marked tense-form and, thus, it is used as the backgrounding device in discourse. Foregrounded prominence in Greek discourse is achieved by the more marked present and imperfect tense-forms. The perfect and pluperfect are the most marked tense-forms, and both are used to contribute foregrounded prominence in discourse. Table 3.6 illustrates the five Greek tense-forms arranged in order from least to most marked:

---

266 A similar table is presented in Westfall, *Discourse Analysis*, 57.
3.3.4.2. Perfective Aspect: The Aorist Tense-form

Greek realizes a perfective aspect in the form of the aorist, as (35) illustrates:

(35) ἔδόκυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. (John 11:35)

Jesus wept (e.g. KJV, NAB, ESV, NIV, NLT).

The perfective aspect focuses on the event as a complete whole, without specifying any internal stage or process. It is used in past, present, and future time, or omnitemporal (gnomic) references. The aorist in its regular form is normally augmented by an ε, but only in the indicative mood.

(36) ἐσίγησεν δὲ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος, καὶ ἤκουσαν Βαρναβᾶ καὶ Παῦλου (Acts 15:12)

And all the assembly fell silent, and they listened to Barnabas and Paul (ESV).

McKay interprets ἐσίγησεν in (36) as inceptive or ingressive (“became silent”). This reading of the aorist is not adopted here since the inceptiveness or ingressiveness belongs to the Aktionsart category. Some English translations (e.g. KJV, NASB, NRSV) render ἐσίγησεν as “kept silence,” which reflects the perfective aspect of the Greek verb. Likewise, some render ἔδόκυσεν in (35) as ingressive (“Jesus began to cry,” e.g. NRSV, CEV). It, too, should be rejected here.

---

Table 3.6. Markedness and Greek aspect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Unmarked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

267 See, for example, Moulton, Introduction, 123.
268 McKay, New Syntax, 46.
269 The CEV has “Jesus started crying.” See also, for example, Robertson, Grammar, 834.
3.3.4.3. Imperfective and Stative Aspects

a. Present and Imperfect Tense-Forms

α. Present Tense-Form

The present tense-form expresses the immediate ([−remote]) imperfective aspect, whereas the imperfect tense-form conveys the remote ([+remote]) imperfective aspect. Both tense-forms focus on the event as progressive, with their internal stage or process clearly specified. The present tense-form is used in past, present, and future time, timeless, or omnitemporal (gnomic) references. It does not have an augment. (37a–b) illustrate:

(37) (a) οὐκ ἔχω ἀνδρα. (John 4:17)

I do not have a husband.

(b) Ἡλίας μὲν ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα. (Matt 17:11)

"Elijah is indeed coming and will restore all things." (NRSV)

β. Imperfect Tense-Form

The present form ἔρχεται in (37b) stresses the immediacy of the imperfective aspect, or better, futurity. The imperfective, on the other hand, is limited to past or non-past (conative) uses, as illustrated in (38a–b).[270] The imperfective tense-form is normally augmented by an ε.

(38) (a) οἱ δὲ ἤγγελον τὸ ἰῆμα, καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσατι. (Mark 9:32)

But they did not understand the saying, and were afraid to ask him (ESV).

---

[270] Porter has noted that the imperfective is “the closest that the Greek language comes to a form actually related to time.” Porter, Idioms, 33–34.
(b) νῦν ἔξητουν σε λαθόσαι οί Ἰουδαίοι (John 11:8)

The Jews are now seeking to stone you. 271

b. Perfect and Pluperfect Tense-Forms

The perfect tense-form expresses the immediate ([−remote]) stative aspect whereas the pluperfect tense-form conveys the remote ([+remote]) stative aspect. Like the Mandarin aspect marker -zhe, both tense-forms denote that an event has entered a stable condition. The perfect tense-form is used in past, present, future time, omnitemporal (gnomic), and timeless references, whereas the pluperfect has more restricted use in past-time references. 272 The perfect and pluperfect in their regular form have the reduplication of the first syllable in front of the verb. (39a–b) illustrate:

(39) (a) γεγραπταῖ γάρ· κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις (Matt 4:10)

For it is written, “You shall worship the Lord your God” (ESV)

(b) ἤδεισαν αὐτόν (Mark 1:34)

They knew him.

3.3.4.4. The Future Tense-Form

The future tense-form is not treated as an independent aspect nor is it included in current models of Greek aspect. As ἔρχεται in (37b) illustrates, the present form (as well as aorist and perfect) can express futurity. The interpretation of the future tense-form will follow Porter’s suggestion of expressing expectation. 273 The future tense-form is treated under the future conditional in 5.4.6.

271 Example and translation are from Porter. Porter, Idioms, 35. Eugene Peterson has “The Jews are out to kill you.” Peterson, Message.
272 Porter has noted several non-past-referring examples (e.g. Matt 24:43). Porter, Verbal Aspect, 288.
3.3.5. Conclusion

This section (3.3) contains critical reviews of seven monographs on the study of Greek aspect. The methodology outlined in 3.3.4 will be used to interpret New Testament Greek aspect for the purpose of translating it into Mandarin.

3.4. Conclusion

The aim of the current chapter is two-fold: first, to offer critical reviews of previous studies on Mandarin and Greek aspects; second, to provide an outline of a methodology for approaching each of the aspectual systems. In the next two chapters, all three Greek aspects will receive detailed analyses followed by discussions on how they may be translated into Mandarin aspects.
CHAPTER 4 TRANSLATING THE GREEK PERFECTIVE, IMPERFECTIVE, AND STATIVE ASPECTS IN THE INDICATIVE MOOD INTO MANDARIN

4.0. Introduction

4.0.1. Greek Grammatical References in Chinese

Grammatical references of New Testament Greek first became available in Mandarin in 1917, when the American missionary John Leighton Stuart (APMB) translated Huddilston’s *The Essentials of New Testament Greek*. Basing his translation on nineteenth century European comparative philology, Stuart merely outlined Greek grammar; nevertheless, his objective to train native Christian preachers in China was unprecedented. Stuart is also credited with his innovation in coining several Greek grammatical terminologies in Chinese.\(^1\)

The current selection of Greek grammars available in Mandarin is limited mostly to translations of beginner-level English titles. Commonly adopted as textbooks in Christian seminaries (Catholic and Protestant) in Hong Kong and Taiwan, they include beginning

---


\(^2\) For example, the names of several cases (zhúgē 主格, “nominative,” shūgē 屬格 “genitive,” hūgē 呼格, “vocative”) and grammatical categories (wèiyù zhī wèi 謂語之為 for the predicate position, xīngróng zhī wèi 形容之為 for the attribute position, jiùwùdōngzi 及物動字 for the transitive verb) are still in use today. Other terms are obsolete: e.g. the names of Greek moods (qíngtì 情體: zhǐshí 指實 for the indicative, xuānmì 感體 for the subjunctive, qiàngwàng 期望 for the optative, shílǐng 使令 for the imperative, jiǎnmíng 捷名 for the infinitive, jiānzhuàng 兼狀 for the participle) and tenses (shílì 時體: yíwàng 已往 for the aorist, jīnchéng 今成 for the present, xǐhéng 順成 for the imperfect, jīnchén 今陳 for the perfect, xíchéng 許成 for the pluperfect, jiànglái 將來 for the future). See also Stuart, *Greek-Chinese-English Dictionary*, xii. Some of Stuart’s renderings of certain categories, e.g. dōngzi 動字 for verb and zhùdōngzi 動字 for adjective, are clear indications of direct influences by the works of Morrison, Gützlaff, and Ma. See Morrison, *Grammar*; Gützlaff, *Notices*; Ma 馬建忠, *Grammar*. 

---
Greek grammars by Machen and Mounce, and an intermediate grammar by Greenlee. While there have been a few Greek grammars by native speakers in recent decades (e.g. Wong), not only do they lack originality, these new titles continue to treat Greek and Chinese in terms of tense-based categories and Aktionsart. Hence, they offer little insight into either our understanding of Greek verbal syntax and semantics or the practice of Chinese Bible translation. A comparative or contrastive study on verbal aspect in ancient Greek and Mandarin Chinese simply does not exist in any language.

4.0.2. Nishiwaki’s Comparative Phonological Study

The only linguistic study available to connect Greek and Chinese is Nishiwaki Junzaburo’s Notes on Comparative Studies of Greek and Chinese. Although Nishiwaki’s thesis may appear unfounded, his work is nevertheless unprecedented and, thus, deserves special notice here. In this volume, Nishiwaki seeks to discover a missing link between Chinese and Western civilizations. He argues that such a connection could possibly be established by means of comparative phonology between Greek and Chinese. After examining over two thousand selected Greek and Chinese words, Nishiwaki concludes that ancient Chinese and Indo-European languages do unmistakably share a common root.

The current scope of this study does not warrant a full review of Nishiwaki’s analysis, however, one example can illustrate Nishiwaki’s basic approach. For the Chinese verb jīng 敬 (“respect”), he first gives the Japanese readings kei ケイ and kyau キャウ, along with the Mandarin reading ching, followed by three Greek words οἰσχύω.

---

3 Greenlee, Gaο ji xin yue Xi la wen; Machen, Xin yue Xi la wen; Mounce, Sheng jing Xi la wen ji chu.
4 See, for example, Wong, Complete Guide; Wong, Introduction; Wang 汪敬仁, Beginning Greek; Xu 许宏度, Grammar.
5 Nishiwaki, Notes.
6 To my knowledge, Nishiwaki’s Notes has never been reviewed.
According to Nishiwaki, the underlined syllables in these three Greek verbs correspond closely to the ancient readings of the same Chinese verb, thereby establishing a link between the two languages. The various pronunciations, each followed by an arrow in square brackets, supposedly illustrate the pronunciation of a word in different periods of history. Throughout Nishiwaki's work, these pronunciations are based on the assumption that ancient pronunciations of Chinese characters are largely preserved in Japanese. The accuracy of ancient Chinese readings given by Nishiwaki is highly questionable; therefore, the phonetic connection between Greek and Chinese still cannot be established. However, it is true that it is more than just mere coincidence that a few historically documented Chinese and Greek words exhibit great phonetic affinity. These words include xīguā 西瓜 ("watermelon") [,siei ,ka'wa]10 from σίκυος/σίκυος, luóbo 雷膊 ("turnip") [,lā b'uok] from ρόφη, and pútáo 葡萄 ("grapes") [,b'uo ,d'āu] from βότρυς.11

---

7 Nishiwaki, Notes, 156. Compare Karlgen, who gives the reading [kjeng']. See Karlgen, Analytic Dictionary, s.v.
8 Nishiwaki uses an endash [–] to separate different conjectured archaic Chinese pronunciations in the square bracket. Here, in order to make his intention clear, an arrow [→] is used instead.
9 This is a common assumption held by many Japanese scholars, including P.Y. Saeki.
10 Compare Nishiwaki, who provides an alternative term, húguá 胡瓜 [kuo→ko] [ko→kuo→kua] for σίκυος/σίκυος. See Nishiwaki, Notes, 193.
11 The readings in square brackets are from Karlgen. See Karlgen, Analytic Dictionary, s.v. According to the Chinese Chronicles (Shiji 《史記》) grapes were introduced to China from Feghana together with fine horses from Arabia in 91 B.C.E. (Pútáo yǔ liángmá yǒu zì yánlábó shērū Zhōngguó zhé 葡萄與良馬有自亞 剌伯輸入中國者). See Watters, Essays, 332; Saeki, Nestorian Monument, 45; Stuart, Greek-Chinese-English Dictionary, iii, ix.
4.0.3. Use of Temporal Categories

The plan of the current chapter generally follows Porter’s treatment of the five major Greek tense-forms (i.e. aorist, present, imperfect, perfect, pluperfect) in *Idioms*. Two considerations justify the use of temporal categories. First, temporal categories are adopted because English—a non-aspectual, tense-based language—is used as the intermediate language to discuss verbal aspect in Mandarin and Greek. Furthermore, as English-speakers are the target audience of this dissertation, using grammatical categories that also apply to English will enable them to grasp the arguments of the proposed theory more easily. Second, both Mandarin and Greek verbs have traditionally been treated according to tense-based categories. By relating aspect to time, readers who are not familiar with verbal aspect in either language will be in a better position to engage the subject.

4.0.4. Use of Wenli Versions

Wenli versions of the Chinese Bible are utilized in the illustrated examples as well as throughout this dissertation primarily because of their close relation to and great influence upon Mandarin versions. As already pointed out in 3.1.5.4 and 3.2.5.2.b above, RVCs—and to a lesser extent, IDVCs—are employed grammatically in classical Chinese as aspect morphemes in the same way they are used in Mandarin. Also, the use of wenli versions is justified because they address pertinent issues in Chinese Bible translation, including those pertaining to lexical, phonological, formal, and functional translation.

---

13 See also 2.1.4.6, p. 26 above.
4.0.5. Conclusion

The goal of this chapter is to formulate a system of consistent rendering of Greek tense-forms in the indicative mood with Mandarin aspect morphemes. The chief emphasis of analysis will be on translating the tense-forms according to the three aspect categories (perfective, imperfect, stative)—with special attention to discourse considerations—rather than on representing their temporal values (past, present, future). Following the conventional treatment of Greek verbs, five tense-forms in the indicative are investigated here: the aorist, present, imperfect, perfect, and pluperfect. The future form is not treated until the next chapter under conditional clauses because it is concerned more with mood than with aspect. In order to contrast the aspect systems of Greek and Mandarin, examples taken from more than sixty Chinese versions (both wenli and Mandarin) are critically examined and serve as a starting point to illustrate how the various uses of the Greek aspect in the indicative are translated into Mandarin.

4.1. The Perfective Aspect in the Indicative Mood

4.1.1. Introduction

In both New Testament Greek and Mandarin, the perfective aspect views an event as a complete whole, without focusing on its internal constituents. The Greek perfective aspect offers only one choice of tense-form. The Mandarin perfective aspect, on the other hand, is realized by four morphologically expressed (single) morphemes and one morphologically unmarked form, the $\theta$ morpheme, as shown in Table 4.1:
Greek [+Perfective] | Mandarin [+Perfective]
---|---
**Aorist** | 
Single aspect morpheme: 
-\(le\), -\(guo\), RVCs, verb reduplication, \(\varnothing\) 
Two-morpheme aspect compounds: 
RVC-\(le\), -\(guo\)-\(le\), RVC-\(guo\), -\(le\)-RVC, V-\(le\)-V

| Table 4.1. The Greek perfective aorist and its corresponding Mandarin perfective morphemes |

4.1.2. Past-Referring Aorist Indicative

The Greek aorist is less heavily marked than other tense-forms (e.g. imperfect, perfect).\(^{14}\) The aorist indicative form used in past reference is frequently rendered in Mandarin by the perfective marker \(-le\), as (1e) illustrates:\(^{15}\)

(1) ἔδωκεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. (John 11:35)

(a)耶稣哭了。 (e.g. UV, NCV, CRV, WANG)

Yesu kū-le.

Jesus wept.

(b)耶稣流泪了。 (SB, CSB)

Yesu liúlèi le.

\(^{14}\) For a statistical analysis of the distribution of Greek tense-forms in different moods used by Greek authors in classical and Hellenistic periods, see Duhoux, *Verbe grec ancien*, §§351-457.

Jesus shed tears.

(c) 耶穌流淚哭了。 (LÜ)

Yesu liúlèi ku le.

Jesus shed tears and cried.

(d) 耶穌流下淚來。 (CPB)

Yesū liú-xià lèi-lái.

Jesus shed tears.

(e) 耶穌流下淚。

Yesū liú-le lèi.

Jesus wept.

(f) 耶穌哭了眼淚。

Yesū kū-jin yānlèi.

Jesus wept until his tears ran dry.

(g) 耶穌哭了眼淚。

Yesū kū-jin-le yānlèi.

Jesus wept until his tears ran dry.

The two less frequently used Mandarin perfective morphemes, -guò and verb reduplication, cannot substitute for -le because the expressions liú-guò lèi and kū-kū are unacceptable in this context.¹⁶ Note that the DVC xiàlái in (1d) is not used to express the imperfective aspect, but rather to indicate the downward motion of the tears.

¹⁶ Armstrong posits the hypothesis that the classical Greek aorist is the “tense of countable action” and of “event predication.” He follows the traditional binary oppositions between the perfective and imperfective, but treats only their realizations in the aorist and present stems. His hypothesis is rejected here because he conflates Greek aspect with Aktionsart, and because the reduplication of verbs in Mandarin cannot be used to render all occurrences of the Greek aorist tense-form. See Armstrong, “Ancient Greek Aorist,” 1–12.
a. Discourse Function of -le

It should be noted that the *le* in (1a–c) are modal particles, and therefore do not express the perfective aspect.17 RVCs, such as *jìn* ("exhaust"), also reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form in Greek, therefore, they may be used interchangeably with the perfective aspect marker -le, as (1e–f) illustrate. The difference between the two morphemes is that -le serves as a foregrounding device in spoken and written discourse when coupled with RVCs (or -guò) to form a two-morpheme aspect compound. (1g) illustrates that the two-morpheme aspect compound *jìn-le* is used to build foregrounded prominence. In this context, however, two-morpheme aspect compounds are not preferable, since the aorist tense-form ἔδέκρυσεν is not used to add any prominence to the discourse.

b. The Aorist Tense-Form and the Mandarin Perfective Morphemes

The aorist indicative tense-form may be translated by the perfective aspect marker -guò in Mandarin. (2a) illustrates:

17 The modal particle *le* is equivalent to the classical *yān*, e.g. as in *Yēsū qì yān* 耶穌泣焉 (WV).
Yīnwèi qīxiōngdǐ dōu gēn tā jié-le hūn le.

Because seven brothers were all married to her.

The expression ἔσχον σύρην is understood as “had her” in the sense of having had a close relationship with her, in this case, as a wife. The majority of Mandarin versions (2a) use the perfective morpheme -guò, which is preferable to the ə morpheme used in the CLB (2b), because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect signaled by ἔσχον. Here, -guò and the aspect marker -le may be used interchangeably. Jiéhūn le in (2b) could be rephrased as jié-le hūn le, in which the addition of the aspect marker -le expresses the perfective aspect, as (2c) illustrates.

The aspect marker -guò is frequently used in negative sentences signaled by particles such as méiyòu (“have not”), méi (“not [yet]”), or wèi (“not yet”). Since the perfective marker -le generally does not occur in negative sentences or clauses, any one of the three perfective morphemes—the ə morpheme, RVCs, -guò—can be used in its place.

Consider the following examples (English translation is provided below):

(3) ἡ ὕπαλλημι οὐκ ἔδει κἀ οὗς οὐκ ἱκουσεν κἀ ἑπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνεβη, ἡ ἤτοιμασεν ὦ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπτῶσιν σωτόν (1 Cor 2:9)

(a) 上帝給愛他的人所豫備的，是眼睛沒有看見過、耳朵沒有聽見過、人心
沒有感受過。 (LÜ)

Shàngdì gěi ài tā de rén suǒ yùbèi de, shì yānjǐng méiyǒu kān-jian-guò,
ěrduo méiyǒu tīng-jian-guò, rénxīn méiyǒu sǐxiǎng-guò de.

---

18 BDAG, s.v. Many English versions (e.g. NRSV, NIV, NAB) support this reading of ἔσχον σύρην.
19 Gildersleeve calls this use of the aorist an “empirical aorist.” Gildersleeve, Syntax, §259. Burton calls it the “English perfect of experience.” Burton, Syntax, §46. For a dissenting opinion, see, for example, Robertson, Grammar, 843–44.
(b) 天主為愛他的人所準備的，是眼所未見，耳所未聞，心所未想到的。

(SB; UV, CLB, CPB)

天主為愛他的人所準備的，是眼所未見，耳所未聞，心所未想到的。 

(c) 神為愛他的人所準備好的，是眼睛沒有見過，耳朵沒有聽過，心頭沒有想到的。（FOLEY）

神為愛他的人所準備好的，是眼睛沒有見過，耳朵沒有聽過，心頭沒有想到的。

(3a–b) render the aorist form in the subordinate clause ἐν ητοίμασεν ὅ θεός with the θ morphemes γεμισε (“arrange beforehand”) and θυμήσει (“prepare”), which are acceptable, but not preferable to the RVC ὑάο (“ready,” “well,” “finished”) in (3c), which morphologically conveys the perfective aspect of the aorist. As for εἰδεν and ἐκουσεν, LÜ uses -guó and the RVC jiàn (“see”) for the verbs καν (“see”, “看-jiàn, “have seen”) and ἀν (“hear”; ἀν-jiàn, “have heard”), whereas (3b) uses the θ morpheme for both verbs. The combination of -guó and RVC is not preferable here, since it marks the foregrounded prominence that is uncalled for in the Greek. As for ἀνεβη, LÜ in (3a) uses -guó, whereas several Mandarin versions (e.g. SB, UV, CLB, TCV, NCV) prefer the RVC ὑάο (“arrive”) for the verbs σκεψι (“consider,” “think”) and xiǎn (“think”).

Xiǎn-dào is a better translation of ἔτι καρδιαν...·ανεβη because the context of the passage (1 Cor 2:6–16) suggests that the emphasis is on the fact that people have not yet
truly comprehended God's wisdom (v. 8), not that they lack such experience. In summary, (3c) presents a better translation of the aorist tense-forms in 1 Cor 2:9: "What God has prepared for those he loves, is what eyes have not seen, ears have not heard, and hearts have not yet arrived at full comprehension."

4.1.3. Non Past-Referring Aorist Indicative

The examples in (1)–(3) above illustrate the most frequent past-referring uses of the aorist indicative in the Greek New Testament. The Greek aorist tense-form is also commonly used to refer to non past action. As Péristérakis observes, the non past-referring use of the aorist has been frequently attested in classical Greek writings. Although Greek verbs do not grammaticalize temporal reference, they often occur in situations where temporal location is specified by pragmatic and contextual factors. For example, ἔδωκεν in (1) refers to an event that takes place in the past as it is conveyed by the sequence of events in the narration.

4.1.3.1. Present-Referring Aorist

The aorist can be used in an event that takes place in the present time, as (4) illustrates. The present use of the aorist is referred to by some grammarians as “dramatic aorist,” which always occurs in the first person singular. Burton, for example, points out that the dramatic aorist has the effect of conveying “greater vividness than is

---

23 Hence, Louw and Nida include the definition “begin to think about something” for ἄνοιξαίω. Louw and Nida, Greek-English Lexicon, 352.

24 See Péristérakis, Essai. Péristérakis posits a non-temporal (intemporel) use of the ancient Greek aorist on the basis of three considerations: context, synonymous expressions, and verbal aspect. The weakness of his theory, as Porter points out, lies in his explanation of the different aspects that the aorist and present express (i.e. accomplishment vs. process in evolution). A detailed and critical review of Péristérakis has already been done by Porter and, therefore, need not be repeated here. See Porter, Verbal Aspect, 211–16.

given by the more usual Present.” However, this assertion must be dismissed, since the aorist tense-form is construed as less heavily marked, unless emphasis is added syntactically (e.g. the repetition of the exact verb form). 

(4) νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν (Rom 5:11)

(a) 我們…得…和好 (UV, PK)

Wōmen…dé…héhāo.

We may reconcile.

(b) 我們已經得以…和好 (TCV)

Wōmen yījīng délǐ…héhāo.

We may have already reconciled.

(c) 我們…和好 (WANG)

Wōmen…héhāo.

We reconcile.

(d) 我們現在已經…復和 (NCV, JOHNM)

Wōmen xiànzài yījīng…fúhé.

26 Burton, Syntax, §45. Similarly, Smyth adds that the dramatic aorist is used “in the dialogue part of tragedy and comedy to denote a state of mind or an act expressing a state of mind (especially approval or disapproval) occurring to the speaker in the moment just passed.” Smyth and Messing, Greek Grammar, §1937. See also Kühner and Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik, vol. 1, 163–65; Goodwin, Syntax, §60; Schwytzer, Griechische Grammatik, vol. 2, 281–82; Dana and Mantey, Manual Grammar, 198–200; Rijksbaron, Syntax (1st ed.), 28–29; Black, Intermediate Greek, 105. Compare Cooper and Krüger, who argue that the “past time reference of the aorist indicative is strictly maintained.” See Cooper and Krüger, Greek Syntax, vol. 3, 2379–80. Ruipérez, however, describes the dramatic aorist and the present in terms of neutralization of the two tense-forms in the indicative in which the privative oppositions between the two aspects (i.e. durativeness or momentariness) and temporal values (past and present) no longer exist. Ruipérez, “Neutralization,” 241–52; Ruipérez, Estructura, 72. Ruipérez’s hypothesis is unconvincing since his argument is largely based on Aktionsart, and, as Porter points out, his reliance on semantic transformation and non-transformation distinctions is problematic. See Porter, Verbal Aspect, 43.

27 See the commentary on συνάψουσαν συνάψουσαν (John 19:6) in chapter 6 below.

28 PK has xiànghé 相和 (“reconciliation”) instead of héhāo.

29 JOHNM uses rújīn 如今 (“today”) instead of xiànzài.
We have now already reconciled.

(e) 我們現在...獲得了和好 (SB, LÜ)

Women xiànjīn...huòdé-le héhāo.

We have now achieved reconciliation.

(f) 我們現在...和好了 (CSB)

Women xiànzài...héhǎo-le.

We now have reconciled.

The aorist tense-form is translated by the ø morpheme in (4a–d), and by -le in (4–f). The perfective aspect marker -le is preferable to the ø morpheme because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect signaled by aorist in Greek. The temporal deixis vûv clearly indicates the present time, and should be translated into Mandarin by the adverb xiànzài (“now”) or xiànjīn (“now,” “today”), as in examples (4d–f). The auxiliary verb dé/déyì used in (4a–b) is not suitable here because it conveys contingency that does not reflect the indicative mood in Greek. (4b) and (4d) add the temporal deictic indicator yǐjīng (“already”), which is not preferable because the aorist is not grammaticalized to express past-time reference. In summary, the present-referring aorist may be translated by the perfective aspect marker -le with the temporal deixis that indicates the present time, as (e–f) illustrate.

4.1.3.2. Epistolary Aorist

A classic example of the epistolary aorist is from the passage in 1 John 2:12–14. Here, John repeats the verb “I write” three times both in the present (γράφω) as well as in the aorist (ἐγράψα). Several grammarians (especially those comparing it with Latin) explain

---

30 LÜ has wōmen rújīn lìngshòu-le fùhé le 我們如今領受了復和了 (“now we received reconciliation”).
the use of epistolary aorist by identifying the shift in viewpoint from the author to the audience, that is, the author now looks at the letter from the audience’s perspective (i.e. already written in the past). In fact, the epistolary aorist is better understood, as Porter argues, in terms of discourse. All three aorist tenses refer to the whole, simple undifferentiated process of letter writing. “Rather than using the more heavily marked Present to re-introduce his repeated assertions,” Porter explains, “the author uses the less heavily marked Aorist in the second set so as not to detract emphasis from the message itself.”

Expressing the nuances of the shift from 𝜒𝜋𝜌φο to 𝜒𝜋𝜌𝜋α is as difficult for Chinese translators as it is for Greek grammarians and English translators. Mandarin versions generally render the present and aorist tenses into the equivalent Mandarin aspect morphemes using one of three options. These three options all render the three present tense-forms with the same ø morpheme, however, each offers a different way to render the aorist. The first option reflects the influence of the literal translation of the KJV (“I write” vs. “I have written”), that is, using the ø morpheme for the verb xièxin 写信 (“write a letter”) to render 𝜒𝜋𝜌φο, and adding deictic indicators céng (“ever”), yǐ (“already”), or gāng (“just now”) to the front of xièxin (hence, “have written”) for 𝜒𝜋𝜌𝜋α in order to indicate past-time reference. This choice is by far the most frequently adopted by translators of Chinese versions, both in wenli and in Mandarin (e.g. JOHN,M,

31 Winer, Treatise, 347–48; Green, Handbook, 304; Burton, Syntax, §44; Robertson, Grammar, 845–46; Mayser, Grammatik, vol. 2, part 1, 143–44; Nunn, Short Syntax, §95; Smyth and Messing, Greek Grammar, §1942; Moule, Idiom Book, 12; Mandilaras, Studies, 44; Cooper and Krüger, Attic Greek Prose Syntax, vol. 1, 667.
33 Porter, Verbal Aspect, 230. See also Porter, Idioms, 36–37.
PK, UV, GURY, WANG, SJ, GÜ, CRV). The second option, represented by several Mandarin and wenli versions (e.g. NCV, TCV, LÜ, DV), uses the ḍ morpheme for the verb xiēxin to render both γράφω and ἔγραψα in all six occurrences in the passage. The third option has the verb compound xiē shuo (lit. “write saying”) with the ḍ morpheme to render γράφω, but uses -guo (xiē-guo) to render the three repetitions of ἔγραψα (e.g. SB).

Following the interpretation of the shift in tense-forms by Porter, the epistolary aorist, ἔγραψα in 1 John 2:14 may be rendered by the verb láixin (“write a letter” or as a noun, “correspondence”) in Mandarin, as (5b) illustrates. Láixin is a better translation than xiēxin because it denotes the letter-writing as a whole (i.e. simple, undifferentiated process) as opposed to stressing the mere action itself. Láixin is used with the ḍ morpheme because it is unmarked in relation to the other perfective morphemes, which correspond closely to the markedness feature of the Greek aorist tense-form and its function in discourse. The addition of the temporal deictic indicator cēng, as well as the use of the perfective marker -guo, convey the past-time reference and the sense of experience that ἔγραψα does not call for, hence, they must be rejected. Since the present tense-form is more heavily marked in Greek discourse than the aorist, γράφω may be

34 GURY has jìn (“now”; jìn shū yī ěr 今書送爾) in front of the verb shū only for the first γράφω, and uses the ḍ morpheme for the next three occurrences of γράφω and ἔγραψα. GURY and PK add cēng (wǒ cēng shū yú ěr 我書信爾) in front of shū and xiēxin for the last two addressees, i.e. πατέρες and νεανίσκοι. Similarly, SJ uses the ḍ morpheme for the verb shū (“write”; 我書信爾) in the first four occurrences and adds cēng (wǒ zhī cēng shū yú ěr 我書信爾) to the front of shū for the last two addressees in v. 14. GÜ has ji (“send”; yú ji rù shū 余寄汝書) with the ḍ morpheme and adds yī (yú yī shū ěr 余寄爾) to the front of shū for the last two addressees. The CRV adds gāng (“just now”; wǒ gāng xiēxin gěi nǐ) to the front of xiēxin for the last two addressees.

35 The CLB closely adheres to the first option but adds the deictic indicator xiànzáì (“now”) to the front of xiēxin for the addressees πατέρες to render the second γράφω (wǒ xiànzáì xiēxin gěi nǐ). Such an addition appears to be random and unfounded, therefore it is not considered here.
represented by *xiē-xiàlái* ("write down"). Here, the IDVC *xiàlái* expresses the imperfective aspect, as (5a) illustrates.\(^{36}\)

(5) (a) 我写下来此封信的目的是要告诉你们 · · ·

> Wǒ *xiē-xiàlái* cǐ fēngxin de mùdì shì yào gāosù nǐmen....

The reason that I am writing this down is to tell you....

(b) 我给你们来信 · · ·

> Wǒ gěi nǐmen láixin....

This letter I am writing to you....

*4.1.3.3. Aorist of Future Reference*

The aorist can also be used in an event that takes place in the future, as (6) illustrates.\(^{37}\)

(6) Ἰδοὺ ἡλθὲν κύριος ἐν ἀγίας μυριάσιν σῶτοῦ (Jude 14)

(a) 看，主必同他的千萬聖者降臨 (NCV)

> Kàn, zhù bì tóng tā de qiānwàn shèngzhě jiànglín.

 Behold, the Lord shall come with his ten thousand saints.

(b) · · · 降臨 (UV, CRV)

> ...jiànglín.

---

\(^{36}\) Many define the meaning of *xiàlái* in terms of its Aktionsart. Lū, for example, treats it in terms of a DVC specifying *dongzuò cóng guòqù chīxù dào xiànzài* 動作從過去持續到現在 ("an action that continues from the past to the present") [my translation]. See Lū呂叔湘, *800 Phrases*, 570. Others argue that it signals an entering into a new state, from active to stative situations. See, for example, Liu 劉月華 et al., *Directional Verb Complements*, 174–80.


Compare Winer, who thinks that the aorist may stand for the future “only in appearance.” Winer, *Treatise*, 345–46.
...came (or is coming).

(c) 랫גע (SB)

...jianglái.

...came (or is coming) here this way.

(d) 仫來了 (FOLEY)

...kuài lái-le.

...will come soon.

Neither verb reduplication nor -guò can be used here with the verbs jianglin or jianglái; the available options are the ø morpheme, -le, and RVCs. 38 (6a) and (6b) both render ἔλθειν with the ø morpheme for jianglin (“arrive”); the difference is that (6a) uses the auxiliary verb bi, which clearly suggests that the Lord’s coming with his ten thousands is a future event. (6b) and (6c) are similar in that neither is morphologically marked with auxiliary verbs, such as bi, yào (e.g. CLB), or jīng, to denote futurity or expectation. Both use the ø morpheme (unmarked), which allows for either perfective or imperfective readings. Although both (6b) and (6c) are considered acceptable translations, the disyllabic verbs jianglin and jianglái are not preferable because they are more marked than monosyllabic verbs.

The temporal deixis kuài (“soon”) is preferable to auxiliary verbs (e.g. bi) because it better reflects the aorist indicative mood in Greek, which is not used to convey volition. Therefore, the future-referring aorist may be translated by the perfective aspect marker -le, as (6d) illustrates.

38 Reduplicating jianglin and jianglái or adding -guò to the verbs will result in an ungrammatical sentence in Mandarin, because one does not make much sense when he says that, e.g. “he is trying to arrive for awhile” or “he has experienced arriving.”
4.1.3.4. Omnitemporal Aorist

The aorist can also be used for an event that can take place at any time (omnitemporal aorist), as (7) illustrates. The omnitemporal use of the aorist is time-bound, but temporally unrestricted.

(7) ἔξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος, καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἔξεπεσεν (1 Pet 1:24)

(a) The grass will wither; the flower will fall.

(b) The grass will wither; the flower will fall.

(c) The grass withered and the flower also fell.

(d) The grass withers; the flowers fall.

---


41 The CPB uses another auxiliary verb, *hui*, instead of *bi*.

42 GÜ has *cao-kū huā-diāo* 草枯花凋; the DV and UVW have *cao-kū huā-xiè* 草枯花凋; JOHN has *cao-kū huā-luò* 草枯花凋.
(7a–b) employ the auxiliary verb bi to convey futurity as well as expectation, that is, "The grass will wither; the flower will fall" or "The grass is expected to wither, and the flower to fall." The SB in (7c) renders the two aorist tense-forms with the perfective -le. Peter is making a general observation about the nature of the grass and the flower, without specifying a particular time when they wither and fall. Therefore, (7c) is not a preferable translation. In English, such general statements are often expressed in simple present tense; for example, the NRSV has "The grass withers, and the flower falls." In Chinese, general statements about nature normally take on the form of set phrases (e.g. maxims, proverbs, idioms, aphorisms). Set phrases in Mandarin are often derived from ancient literary classics or formed in imitation of the classical style, meaning that these phrases are most frequently expressed with the ø morpheme. However, four-character (or quadruplet) set phrases are normally reserved for the Mandarin translation of the stative aspect in Greek (see discussions below). Here, the set phrase cǎo-kū-huā-wěi is appropriate because the phrase is expressed by two aorists in Greek as opposed to one. The ø morpheme reflects not only the perfective aspect of the Greek aorist, but also its less heavily marked feature in Mandarin. It should be noted that the auxiliary verb bi (or hui) in (7a–b) does not reflect either the perfective aspect or the indicative mood of the aorist. Hence, the ø morpheme in (7d) is the preferred translation of the Greek omnitemporal aorist into Mandarin.

4.1.3.5. Timeless Aorist

Similarly, the aorist can also be used in events that take place as timeless temporal references, as (8) illustrates: 44

(8) καὶ ἐξείσαβλη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἀτέμνων αὐτῆς (Luke 7:35)

(a) 但智慧之子，都以智慧為是。 (UV)

Dan zhihui zhizì, dōu yí zhihui wéi shì.

But the children of wisdom are all reckoned to be righteous by wisdom.

(b) 但一切智慧之子，必彰显智慧的正義。 (SB, WV) 45

Dan yíqiē zhihui zhizì, bì zhāngxiàn zhihui de zhèngyi.

But every child of wisdom shall proclaim the righteousness of wisdom.

(c) 但智慧總從她所有的兒女得箊為對的。 (LÜ) 46

Dan zhihui zōng shì cóng tā suǒyuǒu de ér-nǚ dézhèng wéi dui de.

But wisdom is always proven right by all her sons and daughters.

(d) 惟智者以其諸子表義矣。 (MOR)

Wéi zhīzhě yí qí zhūzǐ biāoyì yǐ.

Only the wise man manifests righteousness in his children.

The timeless use of the aorist is similar to the omnitemporal use of the aorist in the sense that both express general truths or statements of habitual activities, as in similes, proverbs, or aphorisms. 47 Unlike the omnitemporal aorist, the timeless aorist is, as its

---

45 The WV has Shí wéi zhízhè zhízhì, néng shì zhízhè zhí yún ér 是惟智德之子，能識智德之疑耳 (“Therefore only the child of wisdom is able to understand the contents of wisdom”).
46 Similar to LÜ, the CRV has Dàn zhihui cóng tā suǒyuǒu de ér-nǚ dé chéngwéi yì 但智慧從她所有的兒女得稱為義 (“But wisdom is declared righteous by all her sons and daughters”).
name suggests, unbound by time; and because it is timeless, the Greek aorist cannot be translated with perfective morphemes, such as -guó and verb reduplication. All the versions represented in (8a–d) use the θ morpheme to render the timeless aorist. (8b) can be ruled out as a good translation because it uses the auxiliary verb bi, which expresses both futurity and expectation. Both (8a) and (8c) use the passive constructions yī...wéi and shì...wéi to render the aorist passive indicative ἐδικαίωθη (“is vindicated,” e.g. NRSV). The UV in (8a), however, has taken πάντων τῶν τέκνων to be the subject. (8d) and (8c) are also very similar. Although Morrison uses the active voice biāoyì with the θ morpheme and Lü instead uses the passive voice, both insert a modal particle, yī and de respectively, to express certainty. In this case, (8d) and (8c) are both natural and acceptable translations for the passive construction of the Greek timeless aorist.

4.1.4. Conclusion

In summary, the Mandarin aspect system offers the locutionary agent five different (single) morphemes to express the perfective aspect, whereas the Greek aspect system has only the aorist tense-form. Examples taken from Chinese versions are critically examined and used to illustrate how the various uses of the Greek aorist indicative are actually translated into Mandarin. These examples primarily serve as starting points for discussion on contrasting the two aspect systems. This section concludes that the past-referring Greek aorist in the indicative mood may be rendered interchangeably by -le, RVCs, -guó, verb reduplication, and the θ morpheme in most contexts. The first four

48 In his recent study, George argues that the fact that Greek passive constructions (expressed by ἔπτω or ἐπτώ) occur with a greater frequency in the Septuagint and New Testament than in other ancient Greek texts is due to Hebraism, i.e. translating the Hebrew preposition יִפְט. See George, Expressions, 232–46. Unfortunately, George addresses only certain pragmatic issues of Greek passive constructions, and leaves out discussions of syntactic or semantic problems, especially their relationship to active constructions.
aspect morphemes may be preferable, however, because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist.

In addition to aspect, discourse factors also play a decisive role in translating. For example, two-morpheme aspect compounds (e.g. -guò-le, RVC-le) are used to build foregrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse. Since the aorist tense-form does not serve as a foregrounding device in Greek discourse, two-morpheme aspect compounds in most cases are not used for translation into Mandarin, except when prominence in the Greek text is indicated by syntactic or pragmatic features. In order to reflect the non past-referring uses of the aorist, temporal deictic indicators, such as xiànzài ("now") and kuài ("soon"), may be added. In rendering the omnitemporal and timeless references as well as the epistolary aorist, the ϕ morpheme is preferred to other morphemes due to its correspondence to the less heavily marked feature of the aorist tense-form in Greek.

4.2. The Imperfective and Stative Aspects

4.2.1. Introduction

The Greek imperfective and stative aspects ([−perfective]) are realized by four morphologically expressed tense-forms. In addition to the ϕ morpheme, the Mandarin aspect also realizes four different morphologically expressed (single) morphemes. The notable difference between the two languages is that the notions of remoteness or immediacy grammaticalized by Greek tense-forms in the indicative mood do not apply to Mandarin. Tables 4.2–4.3 summarize the two aspect systems with their tense-forms and morphemes:

49 These features include the repetition of the exact verb form (e.g. John 19:6). See chapter 6 below.

50 Conceptual distance ([+remoteness]) grammaticalized by the imperfect and pluperfect tense-forms in the Greek indicative mood may be rendered in Mandarin by lexical means (i.e. by adding extra words such as lǎo, zào, nà, qù). This is not treated until chapter 6 for two reasons: first, the primary focus of the present
### Table 4.2. The Greek imperfective tense-forms and their corresponding Mandarin morphemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek [−Perfective]</th>
<th>Mandarin [−Perfective]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+Imperfective</td>
<td>+Imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Remote</td>
<td>imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple single aspect morpheme:</td>
<td>-zhe, zai, IDVCs, ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex single aspect morpheme:</td>
<td>V-láiV-qù, V-shàngV-xià,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V-guóláiV-guòqù, V-kāiláiV-kāiqù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple two-morpheme aspect compounds:</td>
<td>-le-IDVCs, verb reduplication-zhe, zài...-zhe, zài...IDVCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−Remote</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex two-morpheme aspect compounds:</td>
<td>zài...V-láiV-qù, zài...V-shàngV-xià,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zài...V-guóláiV-guòqù,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zài...V-kāiláiV-kāiqù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-morpheme aspect compounds:</td>
<td>zài...verb reduplication-zhe, zài...V-zheV-zhe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.3. The Greek stative tense-forms and their corresponding Mandarin morphemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek [−Perfective]</th>
<th>Mandarin [−Perfective]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+Stative</td>
<td>+Stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Remote</td>
<td>pluperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-zhe, ø with four-character set phrases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−Remote</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.2. The Present Tense-Form

The Greek present tense-form expresses the immediate ([−remote]) imperfective aspect, focusing on the event as progressive, with internal stages or processes clearly specified. As Table 4.2 illustrates, Mandarin aspect offers the locutionary agent more study is grammatical translation of Greek verbal aspect; second, the format of this section limits the discussion because the location of words added to express remoteness may occur elsewhere in the discourse rather than be confined to the example sentences presented in this section.
than a dozen formally expressed aspect morphemes and compounds, as well as the ὅ morpheme to render the Greek present. The present tense-form is used in past, present, future, and timeless (omnitemporal) references.

4.2.2.1 Present for Present Reference

The present tense-form commonly refers to an event that takes place in the present time, as (9) illustrates:

(9) οὐδὲ λογίζεσθε ὅτι συμφέρει ύμῖν ἵνα εἰς ἀνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μὴ ὁλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπολήται (John 11:50)

You never considered that it is for your good that one man dies for the people in order to avoid annihilation of the whole nation.

(b) 獨不懼.... (UV, WANG)

Dú bù xiāng....

You just do not think....

(c) 難道看不出.... (TCV)

Nándào kàn-bu-chū....

You have not yet figured it out that....

(d) 也沒有在考慮.... (FOLEY)

---

51 The CPB phrases it positively: Xiàng-xiàng kàn: xǐshēng yīge rèn, qǐ bù shì bǐ kān-jìu zhēngge mínzú sàngwàng yào hǎo de duō? (Consider this: isn’t it much better to sacrifice one man than the entire nation?). The CSB has xiàng-yī-xiàng instead of xiàng-xiàng.
Ye meiyou zai kaolu....

You are not considering....

Several versions, represented by (9a), use the verb reduplicated form xiăng-xiăng ("consider," "give it a thought") to render λογίζεσθε. This translation is not preferable because verb reduplication signals the perfective aspect in Mandarin. For the same reason, (9c) is not preferable because the RVC chu ("out") conveys the perfective aspect. (9b) uses the ø morpheme, which is considered acceptable but not without problems. The ø morpheme, as noted above, allows both the perfective and imperfective readings, although the context suggests the latter. Hence, an aspect morpheme is needed here in order to differentiate the two aspects. Since the present tense-form is considered more heavily marked than the aorist, a dissyllabic verb with the ø morpheme and/or the imperfective marker zài would be quite fitting to render λογίζεσθε because of its heavier morphological bulk, as (9d) illustrates.

4.2.2.2 Present for Future Reference

In addition to its common use in the present, the Greek present tense-form also appears in future references, as (10) illustrates:\textsuperscript{52}

(10) Ἡλίας μὲν ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα. (Matt 17:11)

(a) 以利亞來，要復興萬事！ (LÜ)

Yīliá lái, yào fūxīng wànshi.

Elijah is coming, and restoring all things!

(b) 厄里亞是來重整秩序。 (CPB)

\textsuperscript{52} Robertson calls this futuristic present (following Karl Brugmann) that is "generally punctiliar or aoristic." Robertson, Grammar, 869, 69–70, 81–82, 91. See also Moulton, Prolegomena, 119–20; Mayser, Grammatik, vol. 2, part 1, 131–32; BDF, §323; Greenlee, Concise Exegetical Grammar, 48.
Èliyà ｓｈｉ ｌáｉ ｃｈǒｎｇ ｚｈēｎｇ ｚｈīｘù.
Elijah comes in order to reset order.

(c) 以利亞當然要來・・・(NCV, CRV)
Yíliyà ｄāngrán ｙào ｌáí・・・
Indeed Elijah wants to come・・・

(d) 以利亞固然先來・・・(e.g. UV, SB, TCV, WANG, SJ, MOR; cf. DV)53
Yíliyà ｇùrán ｘｉān ｌáí・・・
No doubt that Elijah is coming first・・・

(e) 依理當固須先至・・・(WV)
Yílíái ｇù ｘū ｘｉān ｚｈī・・・
Indeed Elijah must come first・・・

(f) 以利亞確實先來・・・(FOLEY)
Yíliyã ｑｕèｓｈí ｑｉánláí・・・
Elijah is indeed coming・・・

The present form ἔρχεται in (10) stresses the immediacy of the imperfective aspect, or better, futurity, as expressed in the NRSV, for example: “Elijah is indeed coming and will restore all things.” While (10a–f) all use the φ morpheme to translate the imperfective aspect of ἔρχεται, there are slight differences in approach. (10c) and (10e) use auxiliary verbs, ｙào and ｘū, to express futurity and volition. (10a) and (10f), on the other hand, have no such addition; therefore they may be interpreted as either the perfective or imperfective aspect. (10b) uses two verbs, ｓｈｉ (“be”) and ｌáｉ (“come”) for ἔρχεται, in an

53 WANG has ｑｕèｓｈí (“really”) instead of ｇùrán. MOR has Ｙｉｌｉａｚｈè ｇù ｘｉān ｄào 以来者固先到・・・ (“Elijah is indeed coming first”). The DV does not translate μέν: Ｙｉｌｉｙａ ｘｉān ｚｈī (“Elijah is coming first to…”).
apparent attempt to translate the English verb phrase, “is coming.” In fact, the
construction *shi* + verb is not suitable in this context because it does not express futurity
in Mandarin.

Unlike the simple progressive *be* + *ing* in English, which signals both futurity and the
imperfective aspect, *zài* signals only the imperfective aspect. To express futurity in
Mandarin, one would normally (though it is not obligatory) employ auxiliary verbs, such
as *yào*, *bì* (*bìxū/xū*), *jiāng*, or *huì*, as in (10c) and (10e).\(^{54}\) In translation, however, the
future use of the present tense-form (as the future-referring aorist noted above) should be
distinguished from the future form. The adverb *xiān* alone used in (10d–e) does not
express futurity, but rather it indicates the sequence of the actions, which is absent in the
Greek. Therefore, the φ morpheme without auxiliary verbs or *xiān* is preferable to those
with such additions for the rendering of the future-referring present tense-form, as (10a)
and (10f) illustrate. Still, (10f) is preferable to (10a) because disyllabic verbs better
correspond to the more heavily marked Greek present tense-form.

### 4.2.2.3 Present for Past Reference (Narrative or Historic Present)

A commonly held explanation of the so-called historic (or historical) or narrative
present by many Greek grammarians is that it has the same *Aktionsart* as the aorist
(“punctiliar”) but with an added sense of vividness or vivacity that typically occurs in
narratives.\(^ {55}\) Another commonly held explanation credits Aramaic influence.\(^ {56}\)

---

\(^{54}\) Other common auxiliary verbs that express futurity include *kēnēng*, *kēyi*, *nénggòu*, *hào*, *miānbùliǎo*, *déyí*, *róngyì*, *lèyì*, *yuànyì*, *xiāng*, *xīwàng*, *qītú*, *lèdé*, *kēn*. Mandarin auxiliary verbs (能願動詞 or 助動詞) have
been studied by many. See, for example, Wang 王, *Treatise*, vol. 1, 140–53; Hong, *Auxiliary*, 1–20;
102–09. For English translations of these auxiliary verbs, see Table 5.1, p. 231 below.

\(^{55}\) Along this line of interpretation, see, for example, Green, *Handbook*, 297; Jelf, *Grammar*, vol. 2, §359;
Winer, *Treatise*, 333–34; Jannaris, *Historical Greek Grammar*, §1835; Goodwin, *Syntax*, §33; Babbitt,
these two approaches, however, is satisfactory. The narrative present is better explained by verbal aspect. As Porter argues, the narrative present is a thoroughly Greek phenomenon that is used "whenever one wishes to draw added attention to a given event." 57

4.2.2.4. Discourse Function of the Narrative Present

The narrative present maintains its full force as a more heavily marked tense-form at the discourse level. Rijksbaron, for example, has suggested that the narrative present is used to mark "state of affairs that are of decisive importance for the story." 58 Similarly, Young states that it is used to mark prominence. 59 Also, Black concludes from her analysis of the narrative present in Matthew that the tense-form serves a variety of different functions in discourse, including creating a dramatic effect, indicating the development to a climax, and distinguishing between two interwoven storylines. 60 These

57 Porter, Verbal Aspect, 135; Porter, Idioms, 31. See also McKay, "Further Remarks," 247–51. McKay refutes Kiparsky for overlooking the role of context and for seeing the historical present in terms of time reference, which left him to conclude that it normally alternates with preterite forms in rapid succession and is never sustained over longer passages. Kiparsky, "Tense and Mood," 30–57.
58 Rijksbaron, Syntax (3d ed.), 22–24. This is an amended statement of the first edition, in which he argues that the historic present not only marks decisive actions but also highlights turning points in the narrative. Rijksbaron, Syntax (1st ed.), 22–24.
59 Young, Intermediate New Testament Greek, 263.
60 Black, "Historic Present," 120–39. Buijs arrives at similar conclusions by noting two major discourse functions: first, to highlight "the relative importance of the actions as related to the specific aims of the speaker" and second, to mark the boundary between two larger thematic structures. See Buijs, Clause Combining, 6 n. 10; 182 n. 30; 168, 186.
remarks are consistent with the critical assumption, as noted previously in chapter 3, that the Greek present tense-form is used in discourse as a foregrounding device.

In Mandarin, the foregrounding function of the narrative present may be represented morphologically by two-morpheme aspect compounds (e.g. zài...-zhe, zài...IDVCs, -le-IDVCs).\(^{61}\) Consider the following example from the passage in Mark 1:21, 30:

(11) καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ...καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς

(a) 进迦百農...或以告耶稣 (DV, MOR, MAR, GÜ, GO, BCV, GURY, SJ, YAN, JOHN, BB, UVW, WV)\(^ {62}\)

Jīn Jiābāinóng...huò yī gào Yēsū.

(They) entered (or were entering) Capernaum...and told (or were telling) Jesus at once.

(b) 到了迦百農...就有人告訴耶穌。(UV, JOHN, WANG, CLB, CPB)\(^ {63}\)

Dào-le Jiābāinóng...jiù yǒurén gào sù Yēsū.

(They) arrived in Capernaum...someone told (or was telling) Jesus.

c) 他們走到迦百農...有人立刻向耶穌說到她。(CRV)

Tāmen zǒu-dào Jiābāinóng...yǒurén likè xiàng Yēsū shuō-dào tā.

They walked to Capernaum...someone immediately told Jesus about her.

d) 他們來到迦百農...他們就把她的病情告訴耶穌。(TCV)

Tāmen lái-dào Jiābāinóng chéng...tāmen jiù bā tā de bìngqíng gào sù Yēsū.

---

\(^{61}\) For a helpful essay on major issues of foregrounding and translation, see Martin-Asensio, “Foregrounding,” 189–223.

\(^{62}\) BB has lǎi gào 来告 (“came-telling”) instead of gào. GÜ adds jī 即 (“at once”). JOHN has zhi...yǒu rén gào Yēsū 之...有人告耶稣 (“came...and someone told Jesus”).

\(^{63}\) The NCV adds likè 立刻 (“at once,” v. 30); PK has lái gào sù 來訟 (“came-telling,” v. 30) instead of gào sù; the CPB has jīn-le 進了 (“entered”) in v. 21 and adds mǎshàng 馬上 (“right away”) in v. 30.
They came to Capernaum...someone immediately told Jesus about her illness.

(e) 他們進了葛法翁 ...有人就向耶穌提起她來 (SB)

Tāmen jìn-le Géfǎwēng...yǒurén jiù xiàng Yēsū tí-qí tā-lái.

They entered Capernaum...someone was immediately telling Jesus about her.

(f) 他們進迦拿 ...人隨即對耶穌說起她的事。 (LÜ)

Tāmen zòujìn Jiājiānóng...rén suíji dui Yēsū shuō-qí tā de shì.

They walked into Capernaum...people at once were telling Jesus about her.

(g) 他們走了一去，到迦拿 ... 對耶穌說起了她的事。 (FOLEY)

Tāmen zòu-le-xiàqù, dào Jiājiānóng...duì Yēsū shuō-qí-le tā de shì.

They were walking into Capernaum...were talking about her.

The Chinese wenli versions, represented by (11a), use the ø morpheme for both occurrences of the present tense-form. (11b) has the perfective aspect marker -le for the first present but not the second. (11e) also uses -le to render εἰσπορεύονται, however, it changes to the IDVC qǐlái for λέγοντας. (11c) uses the RVC dào (“arrive”) for both present tense-forms. Similarly, (11d) uses the same RVC for the first present tense-form but the ø morpheme for the second. Although the ø morpheme is considered an acceptable translation of the Greek present, it does not render the added emphasis of the narrative present. Examples (11b, d–f) are not preferable because they do not render the narrative present with the same aspect morphemes. As for (11c), the two RVCs do not reflect the imperfective aspect signaled by the present tense-forms in Greek. The aspect morpheme used in zòujìn in (11f) must be glossed as the ø morpheme rather than as an RVC since jìn (“into”) represents the lexical meaning of εἰσπορεύονται εἰς (“going into”). Therefore, the two-morpheme aspect compounds, -le-IDVC and IDVC-le, in (11g)
most adequately render the Greek imperfective aspect expressed by the narrative present, with an added attention to the narrative, in this case, indicating a change of setting.

4.2.2.5. Omnitemporal and Timeless Present

a. Omnitemporal Present

The present tense-form is used for an action occurring at any time. Some traditional grammarians refer to this use of the present as gnomic or general present (e.g. Burton, Goodwin, Smyth, Robertson), while others refer to it as universal present (e.g. Gildersleeve). These grammarians typically define it, as Robertson does, in terms of "timeless in reality, true of all time." Two types of gnomic presents are differentiated here: the omnitemporal present, which refers to an action that occurs at any time, and the timeless present, which has no temporal relevance. As Porter observes, the distinction between the omnitemporal aorist and present is not temporal reference but use of verbal aspect, with the aorist "grammaticalizing the omnitemporal process as complete and the Present grammaticalizing the omnitemporal process as in progress." (12) illustrates:

(12) τὸ πνεῦμα ὁποῦ θέλει πνεῖ (John 3:8)

(a) 風任意而吹 (GÜ, MOR, DV, GURY, BCV, JOHN, JOHM, SJ, BB, UVW, WV, NCV)

Fēng rènyì ér chuī.

---

64 Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar, §1832; Burton, Syntax, §12; Goodwin, Syntax, §1253, §1292; Smyth and Messing, Greek Grammar, §1877; Robertson, Grammar, 866; Moule, Idiom Book, 8; Gildersleeve, Syntax, §189. Fanning explains it in terms of Aktionsart, arguing that the gnomic present is "usually an absolute statement of what each one does once, not a statement of the individual's customary or habitual activity." He adds that this is true when the verb is a "bounded action (an accomplishment, climax or punctual)." See Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 217.

65 Robertson, Grammar, 866.

66 Porter, Verbal Aspect, 222. See also Porter, Verbal Aspect, 222–25; Porter, Idioms, 32–33.

67 JOHNM has suìyì instead of rènyì; the WV has Tiān fēng xiăorán ér zuò 天風嘯然而作 ("The wind in the sky blows according to its wishes").
The wind does as it wishes and blows.

(b) 風隨意地吹 (LÜ)

Fēng suíyì de chuī.

The wind blows voluntarily.

(c) 風隨著意吹 (PK, UV, WANG, CRV, CSB)

Fēng suízhe yisi chuī.

The wind blows according to its wishes.

(d) 風隨意吹動 (TCV, CPB)\textsuperscript{68}

Fēng suíyì chuǐ-dòng.

The wind blows according as it wishes.

(e) 風隨處吹起。 (FOLEY)

Fēng suí chuǐ chuǐ-qǐ.

The wind blows in anywhere it wishes.

(12a) uses the \(\emptyset\) morpheme for both \(\theta \varepsilon \lambda e\) and \(\tau \nu e\), but adds a conjunctive \(\acute{\epsilon}r\).\textsuperscript{69} (12b) translates the clause \(\delta \tau r o\ \theta \varepsilon \lambda e\) by an adverb, suíyì \(\text{de}\) ("voluntarily"). (12c) on the other hand renders the clause by a prepositional phrase, suízhe yisi ("according to its wishes"). Finally, the TCV in (12d) uses suíyì ("as it wishes") with the \(\emptyset\) morpheme to translate \(\theta \varepsilon \lambda e\), but chuǐ-dòng with the RVC dòng ("move") to translate \(\tau \nu e\). RVCs express the perfective aspect in Mandarin, therefore, they do not reflect the imperfective aspect of the Greek present tense-form. It is also not preferable to translate \(\delta \tau r o\ \theta \varepsilon \lambda e\) either by an adverb or a prepositional phrase, as in (12b) and (12c).\textsuperscript{70}

\textsuperscript{68} The CPB has Fēng suíyì chuǐ xiàng nà\(l\)ì 風隨意吹向哪裡 ("The wind blows to where it please")

\textsuperscript{69} LÜ 邹淑湘, Grammar, 331–56, 83–85, 406–08.

\textsuperscript{70} Suízhe (or imzhe) is normally used as a preposition ("according to"). It is not to be confused with a verb that is marked with the remote imperfective morpheme \(-zhe\).
While the ϕ morpheme is considered an acceptable rendering of the imperfective aspect, it is not adequate to render the omnitemporal present of θέλει and πνεῖ. The clause ὄποιον θέλει is better translated by sui chù (lit. “in whichever place”), which focuses on the direction where the wind blows, than by rènyì or suiyì (lit. “whatever its wishes”), a general term which merely describes the volition of the wind. In this case, the Mandarin syntax permits only the ϕ morpheme for sui chù because it is immediately followed by another verb. The IDVC qí is a good fit for the imperfective aspect expressed by the present tense-form, as (12e) illustrates. Therefore, it is preferable to render the use of the omnitemporal present in Greek by IDVCs. IDVCs also have the advantage of differentiating the omnitemporal present from the omnitemporal aorist, which is indicated by the ϕ morpheme.

b. Timeless Present

The timeless present is used to refer to situations where temporal information is irrelevant, as (13) illustrates (English translation is provided below).71

(13) ἰλαπρόν...δότην ἀγαπᾷ ὁ θεός (2 Cor 9:7)

(a) 上帝所愛者、樂助也 (DV, JOHNM, WV)72

Shàngdì suǒ ài zhě, lèzhù yě.

(b) 上帝愛歡心樂意的捐獻者。 (LÜ, PK, BCV, BB, UVW, SB, TCV, CRV, CPB)73

71 Porter, Idioms, 33. See also Schwytzer, Griechische Grammatik, vol. 2, 270; Bornemann and Risch, Griechische Grammatik, 219.
72 JOHNM has the same wordings as the DV but in Mandarin: Shàngdì suǒ ài de, shì lèyú shīshē de rén 上帝所愛的、是樂施舍的人 (“He who is loved by God is someone who gives generously”); the WV switches the word order: yì zhù rén wéi lè, nǎi wéi Tíānzhū zhì suǒ lè zhù ér 以助人為樂，乃為天主之所樂助耳 (“He who takes pleasure in helping others, is also someone whom God takes pleasure in helping”).
73 The BCV has Shén, ài lè shǐ zhě yě 神、愛樂施者也 (“God loves generous givers”); BB has Shén àixí lèyú shīshē zhī rén 神愛樂於施捨之人 (“God loves those who enjoy almsgiving”); the UVW has
Shàngdì ài huānxīn lèyi de juānxiàn zhē.

(c) 捐得乐意的人是神所喜爱的。(UV, WANG, CLB, NCV, GURY, SJ)\textsuperscript{74}

Juān de lèyi de rén shì Shén suǒ xǐài de.

(d) 慷慨奉献者是在讨神喜爱。(FOLEY)

Kāngkǎi fèngxiàn zhē shì zài tǎo Shén xǐài.

The first three examples (13a–c) all use the φ morpheme to translate the imperfective aspect of ㄛγ([^]_φ), however, there are slight differences in syntax. (13a) breaks the sentence into two independent clauses separated by a comma: “The one whom God loves, is indeed the one who loves to give.” The modal particle ye accents the certainty of the statement. (13b) and (13c), on the other hand, have no such emphasis. (13b) places the cheerful giver as the direct object of loving: “God loves a happy and generous giver.” (13c) makes the cheerful giver the subject of the sentence: “He who gives generously is loved by God.”

In Chinese, where expressions of love and affection (especially the word ài) are not normally verbally communicated, it is unnatural to place the agent of these expressions as the direct subject of the verb. In other words, while (13b) is considered acceptable grammatically, it is unnatural to Mandarin native speakers. The passive construction expressed by suǒ...de in (13c) is therefore a more appropriate translation. However, because of its unmarked feature in the case of omnitemporal present, the φ morpheme

\textsuperscript{74} GURY and SJ have the same wording but in wenli style: Gàn shì jī zhè, nǎi Tiānzhǔ suǒ xǐ 甘施济者、乃天所喜 (“He who gives generously is loved by God”) and Lèshì zhè, Shén suǒ ài yě 樂施者、神所愛也 (“Generous givers are loved by God”), respectively.
is not the best choice for the rendering of the imperfective aspect of the timeless present.

The difficulty is that the verb ṭāi does not normally take on any imperfective aspect morphemes, especially the imperfective marker zài. This problem can be solved by opting for a different verb for ḏāγετ in Mandarin. Zài can be added to the idiomatic phrase tāo...xī'āi (“loved by...”), as (13d) illustrates (“A generous giver is loved by God” or “A generous giver pleases God”). In summary, the imperfective marker zài renders the timeless present most appropriately in Mandarin.

4.2.3. The Imperfect Tense-Form

The imperfect tense-form is closely connected with events that have taken place in the past, thus, it is considered by some to be the “past tense par excellence of Greek” and treated by others as past tense.⁷⁵ Almost all Greek grammarians regard the imperfect as the tense-form denoting a repeated (or iterative) action occurring in the past or continuance of that action in the past.⁷⁶ Many also describe its Aktionsart as inchoative (inceptive or ingressive).⁷⁷ The imperfect denotes the same imperfective aspect as the present and shares very similar functions with the narrative present.⁷⁸

---


⁷⁶ Representatives of this position include Kühner and Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik, vol. 1, 142; Goodwin, Syntax, §35; Burton, Syntax, §24; Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar, §1847; Winer, Treatise, 335–36; Gildersleeve, Syntax, §205; Smyth and Messing, Greek Grammar, §§1893–94, 1889; Goodwin and Gulick, Greek Grammar, §1253b; Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik, vol. 2, 275–80; Robertson, Grammar, 884; Rijksbaron, Syntax (1st ed.), 15–16; Greenlee, Concise Exegetical Grammar, 49; Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 315.

⁷⁷ Green, Handbook, 300; Goodwin, Syntax, §402; Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik, 277; Robertson, Grammar, 885; Rose, Durative, 11–13; BDF, §331; Greenlee, Concise Exegetical Grammar, 49; Black, Intermediate Greek, 106.

⁷⁸ Porter, Idioms, 34. Porter has noted that both the historical present and the imperfect are used to render Aramaic participles. See Porter, Verbal Aspect, 134–36.
between the two imperfective tense-forms is made by the notions of remoteness. The imperfect conveys the remote ([+remote]) imperfective aspect, whereas the present conveys the immediate ([−remote]) aspect. The following discussion divides into the past and non-past use of the imperfect tense-form.

4.2.3.1. Past Use

The past use of the imperfect accounts for the most frequent occurrences. It is often considered to be progressive, descriptive, or iterative in past-time references, as (14) illustrates:

(14) ἐκλαίων δὲ πάντες καὶ ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν (Luke 8:52)

(a) 屋内的人，哭哭啼啼 (CLB)

Wùnèi de rén, kū-kū tí-tí.

Those inside the house bawled.

(b) 異人都在痛哭哀弔女孩子。 (SB, CPB)

Zhòngrén dōu zài tòngkū àidiào nǚháiizi.

The crowd was mourning for the girl.

(c) 那裏的人都在為這女孩子號啕大哭。 (TCV)

Nà lǐ de rén dōu zài wèi zhè nǚháiizi háotáo dàkū.

---


81 The CPB has Zhòngrén dōu zài nàlǐ kūqí bēishāng 羣人都在那裡哭泣悲傷 ("The crowd is mourning there"). Here, zài functions as both a preposition and aspect marker.
People there were weeping loudly for the girl.

(d) 眾人都為女孩子哭泣撲胸。 (LÜ, CRV, PK, JOHN)82

Zhòngrén dōu wèi nǚháizi kūqì chuǐxiōng.

The crowd cried and beat their breasts for the girl.

(e) 眾人都在為女孩子撲著胸大聲號哭了起来。 (FOLEY)

Zhòngrén dōu zài wèi nǚháizi chuí-zhe xiōng dāshēng háokū-le qīlái.

The crowd were beating their breasts and weeping loudly for the girl.

(14a) uses the reduplicated verbs kū-kū tí-tí (lit. "cry-cry weep-weep") to translate both imperfectives, ἐκλαίον and ἐκόπτοντο. This rendering is not preferable because verb reduplication expresses the perfective aspect in Mandarin. (14b–c) on the other hand use zài to reflect the imperfective aspect signaled by both imperfect tense-forms, which is preferable to the ο morpheme in (14d) because zài morphologically expresses the imperfective aspect. However, (14b) does not sound natural in Mandarin because the verb phrase tōngkū āidīào ("weep and mourn") is not normally used in the transitive sense.

Still, (14c) is not necessarily the best translation because zài alone does not reflect the more heavily marked imperfect tense-form in Greek, especially in this case where one has the option to add a second imperfective aspect morpheme. As (13e) illustrates, the two-morpheme aspect compounds, zài...-zhe and -le-IDVC, mark foregrounded prominence at the discourse level, thereby closely reflecting not only the aspect but the discourse function of the more heavily marked imperfect tense-form in Greek.83

82 PK has Zhòngrén wèi zhè nǚhái āikū 眾人為這女孩兒哀哭 ("The crowd wept for the girl"); JOHN has Zhòngrén wèi zhè nǚér kūqì āishāng 眾人為這女兒哭泣哀傷 ("The crowd cried and mourned for the girl").

83 See 4.2.3.3, p. 199 below for a discussion of the discourse function of the imperfect tense-form.
4.2.3.2. Non-Past Use (Conative)

The so-called conative use of the imperfect tense-form expresses volition and refers to, as Porter puts it, "contemplated but unbegun or unaccomplished action." The non-past use of the imperfective also occurs in second class (contrary to fact) conditional clauses, however, this will be discussed in chapter 5. (15) illustrates the conative imperfect:

(15) ἐξήτουν σε λιθάσσει οἱ Ἰουδαίοι (John 11:8)

(a) 猶太人近來要拿石頭打你 (UV, WANG, PK, JOHNM, BCV, NCV, CRV, CPB, CSB)

Yóutài rén jìn lái yào ná shí tou dá nǐ.

The Jews will stone you one of these days.

(b) 近今來猶太人主願法子要用石頭打你呢。 (LÜ)

Jin jìn lái Yóutài rén zhèng xiàng fǎzi yào yòng shí tou dá nǐ ne.

Recently the Jews were just devising to stone you.

(c) 近來猶太人圖謀砸死 (SB)

Jìn lái Yóutài rén tú móu zá sī.

Recently the Jews plotted to stone you to death.

(d) 此刻猶太人在患著策法要用石頭打你呢。 (FOLEY)

Cǐ kè Yóutài rén zài xiǎn zhe bān fā yào yòng shí tou dá nǐ ne.

The Jews are now seeking to stone you.


85 The BCV uses yù (“desire,” 欲) instead of yào; the CRV has xiǎng yào ná (“wanted to take”); the CPB and CSB have xiǎng yòng (“wanted to take”).
All Chinese versions represented in (15a–c) use the ø morpheme to express the imperfect ἐξήρωσ, however, each conveys different nuances. (15a) has the auxiliary verb yào to convey not only volition but also futurity. (15b) uses xiǎng fùzǐ ("devise means") with the ø morpheme to render ἐξήρωσ. Similarly, (15c) uses túmóu ("plot") with the ø morpheme. In (15b), yào is connected not to the first but rather to the second verb (i.e. stoning) in order to form an infinitive construction in Mandarin. The ø morpheme is not preferable here because it does not reflect the more heavily marked imperfect tense-form in Greek. Therefore, as (15d) illustrates, the two-morpheme aspect compound zài...-zhe (or zhèngzài...-zhe) may be utilized to reflect the foregrounded prominence in the pericope marked by the conative imperfect in Greek.

4.2.3.3. Discourse Function of the Imperfect

Some observations may be made regarding how to render the discourse function of the imperfect tense-form into Mandarin. In contrast to the aorist, the imperfect is semantically more heavily marked and, therefore, is used as a foregrounding device in narrative discourse. Based on his observation of historical narratives in Herodotus, Rijksbaron argues that unlike the aorist indicative, the imperfect "unequivocally locates the state of affairs in the past." He states,

On the level of small-scale narrative units it serves as the time anchor for other states of affairs; on the level of large-scale narrative units it establishes cohesion between different and, more specifically, distant parts of a given narrative, if, for some reason or other, this is split up.

---

86 See, for example, Lü 吕叔湘, 800 Phrases, 592.
87 Porter, Verbal Aspect, 199, 206. McKay has suggested an opposite view, seeing the imperfect as providing the background to the activities of an event. McKay, New Syntax, 42, 43. From this standpoint many argue that the aorist is capable of moving the narrative forward, whereas the imperfect does not make progress in the storyline. See, for example, Sedgwick, "Some Uses," 116–17; Bakker, "Remark," 26–27; Rijksbaron, "Discourse," 249; Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 243.
88 Rijksbaron, "Discourse," 254.
This statement is true if one considers only the past use of the imperfect, and not conative or other uses such as contrary to fact conditional clauses. His comment on textual cohesion, however, is worth noting. Porter has also pointed this out but noted further that the imperfect serves as a means to mark cohesion less frequently than the aorist in the narrative of the New Testament. Generally speaking, the function of cohesion signaled by the imperfect in Greek may be represented accordingly with consistent imperfective aspect morphemes and compounds in Mandarin, as illustrated in (14e) and (15d). For example, in the story of Jesus casting out demons and healing a boy in Luke 9:45, the imperfects may be rendered by two-morpheme imperfective aspect compounds. This provides cohesion with the story of raising a girl in the previous chapter, where imperfects are also found, as in (14). (16) illustrates:

(16) οἱ δὲ ἠγιώσου τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο...καὶ ἐρεφότης τοῦτον περὶ τοῦ ῥῆματος τούτου. (Luke 9:45)

(a) 他們不明白這話...他們也不敢問這話的意思。 (UV, NCV, WANG, TCV, CLB, CRV, DV, SJ, BCV, WV, GO, PK, JOHNLM, CPB) 90

Tāmen bù míngbái zhè huà...tāmen yě bù gàn wèn zhè huà de yìsi.

They neither understood this...nor were they brave enough to ask its meaning.

(b) 他們不明白這話...他們也怕將這話問他。 (LÜ, SB, MOR) 91

Tāmen bù míngbái zhè huà...tāmen yě pà jiāng zhè huà wèn tā.

---

89 Porter, Idioms, 304–05.
90 The BCV has měntú wèi dà cǐ yán...rán bùgăn wèn cǐ yán 門徒未達此言...然不敢問此言 (“the disciples did not understand these words...but dared not to inquire about these words”). The WV has gù wèi jǐe yán zhī, rán yí bùgăn yí wèn 故未解言旨，然亦不敢以問 (“[they] did not understand the meaning of the words, but dared not to ask”).
91 MOR uses jù 懼 (“fear”) for pà.
They did not understand this... they were also afraid to ask him about it.

(c) 他們對這席話的意思都在表露著無知... 反而害怕了起來。(FOLEY)

Tāmen dui zhè xī huà de yísi zài biāolù-zhe wúzhī... fān'ér hàipà-le-qílái.

They were showing no comprehension of the words... in fact they were in fear.

All Chinese versions examined here use the ø morpheme. The two-morpheme aspect compounds, zài...-zhe and -le-IDVC in (16c), are preferable to the ø morpheme because they morphologically reflect the imperfective aspect signaled by the two imperfect tense-forms (ηγνόουν and ἐφοβοῦντο). More importantly, the two aspect compounds in Luke 9:45 establish textual cohesion to the previous narrative discourse, which is also heavily marked with the same imperfective aspect compounds, zài...-zhe and -le-IDVC, as shown in (14e).

4.2.4. The Perfect Tense-Form

4.2.4.1. Introduction

The perfect is one of the most studied tense-forms in ancient Greek. The chief aim of this section is not to add a new theory or explanation to previous studies of the Greek perfect, but rather to discover the most suitable equivalence to render the Greek perfect into Mandarin, especially at the discourse level.

Previous discussions of the Greek perfect tense-form have involved the so-called subjective (intransitive) vs. objective (resultative/transitive/intensive) perfects.92 The theory proposed by Wackernagel and Chantraine argues that, in the evolution of Greek, the perfect changed its original subjective or stative use into a more objective or transitive

92 Goodwin, Syntax, 18; Moulton, Prolegomena, 141; Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik, vol. 2, 286–87; Smyth and Messing, Greek Grammar, §1947; BDF, §340; Zerwick, Biblical Greek, §285; Turner, Syntax, 81–8; McKay, “Use,” 1–21; McKay, “Perfect and Other Aspects,” 309–14; Porter, Verbal Aspect, 251–56; Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 105–06; Sauge, Degrés, 33.
use in late classical and Hellenistic periods.\textsuperscript{93} This theory supports the traditional belief that the Greek perfect in the New Testament period conveys both stative aspect and continuance of a completed action.\textsuperscript{94}

Studies by McKay and Porter offer a more attractive and convincing theory of the Greek perfect. The Greek perfect tense-form expresses the immediate ([I–remote]) stative aspect. In Mandarin, on the other hand, the aspect marker -zhe is the only formally expressed aspect morpheme available in Mandarin that grammaticalizes the stative aspect. Unlike the perfect tense-form in Greek, -zhe does not differentiate between the immediate and remote stative aspect. Also, because the stative aspect marker -zhe is identical in form to the RVC zhāo, and in both form and pronunciation to the imperfective aspect marker -zhe, it cannot be used consistently to translate every occurrence of the perfect tense-form in Greek. Furthermore, -zhe is not used to build frontgrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse since there are simply no two- or three-morpheme aspect compounds available to express stative aspect in Mandarin.

The solution to this problem is sought by utilizing the heavily marked Chinese four-character set phrases with the $\varnothing$ morpheme, especially in cases where the use of the $\varnothing$ morpheme is no longer an option but a necessity. The following sections divide the

\textsuperscript{93} Wackernagel, "Studien," vol. 2, 1000–21; Chantraine, \textit{Historie}.

\textsuperscript{94} See, for example, Burton, \textit{Syntax}, §74; Babbitt, \textit{Grammar}, §534; Gildersleeve, \textit{Syntax}, §§226–27; Robertson, \textit{Grammar}, 893; Nunn, \textit{Short Syntax}, §97; BDF, §340; Mandilaras, \textit{Studies}, 46–49; Bornemann and Risch, \textit{Griechische Grammatik}, 222; Brooks and Winbery, \textit{Syntax}, 94; Greenlee, \textit{Concise Exegetical Grammar}, 50; Duhoux, \textit{Verbe grec ancien}, 142–43. This view is disproved by McKay, who argues that the state signaled by the perfect aspect is "properly and always that of the subject: this is necessarily true in the case of intransitive and passive verbs, is logically the only possibility for some transitive uses, and for the remainder yields a meaning that is either as satisfactory in its context as the object-state possibility or preferable to it." McKay, "Perfect and Other Aspects," 310, 289–329. See also McKay, "Use," 17; Louw, "Semantiese waarde," 23–32.
discussion into pragmatic uses of the Greek perfect tense-form in past, present, future
time, omnitemporal (gnomic), and timeless references.

4.2.4.2. Present-Referring Perfect

The most common use of the Greek perfect tense-form occurs in the present reference,
as (17) illustrates:

(17) γέγραπται γάρ· (Matt 4:10)

(a) 因為有記著說 (LÜ, BCV)

Yǐnweis yǒu jì-zhe shuō.

Because there exists a written record that says....

(b) 記有之 (DV, GO, UVW, UVE)

Jī yǒu zhī.

It has been recorded....

(c) 因為經上記著說 (UV, WANG, NVC, CRV)

Yǐnweis jīng shàng jì-zhe shuō.

Because it is recorded in the scriptures saying....

(d) 蓋經載云 (SJ, JOHN)

Gài jīng zài yún.

Therefore the scriptures have recorded saying....

(e) 聖經言 (TCV, GÜ, GURY, BB, WV)

96 This is expressed in the wenli style: e.g. gài lù yǒu yún 蓋錄有云 (BCV).
97 GO has ji yì yǒu zhī 記亦有之 ("it has also been recorded").
98 WANG, NVC, CRV omit shuō ("saying").
99 JOHN omits zài.
100 This expression is found also in the wenli style: e.g. gài shū yún 蓋書云 (GÜ), jīng yún 經云 (GURY, BB, WV), gài lù yún 蓋錄云 (MOR).
Shèngjīng shuō.
The Bible says....

(f) 經書上說 (JOHN, PK)\(^{101}\)

Jīngshū shàng shuō.
The scriptures read....

(g) 因為經上記載 (SB)

Yīnwèi jīng shàng jīzāi.
Because the scriptures read....

(h) 因為經上這樣寫的 (CPB)

Yīnwèi jīng shàng zhèiyàng xiē de.
Because the scriptures are written that....

All translations except (17a) and (17d) use the φ morpheme to express the stative aspect, but each with slightly different nuances. The verb yǒu (“have”) in (17a–b) is often used in passive constructions where the agent of the activity is unspecified. Here, yǒu is not obligatory, however, it emphasizes the statement (“There does exist a written record...”). (17a, c-f) include shuō (“say”) or yún (“say”) at the end of the sentence to introduce a direct quotation. This addition is not considered inappropriate in Mandarin translation, even though the participle λέγων is absent in the original. The addition of “scriptures” expressed in various terms (e.g. jīng, jīngshū) is optional but preferable for clarifying that Jesus is quoting the Old Testament. Shèngjīng, on the other hand, is not preferable because the term exclusively refers to the “Bible.” The particle de attached to the end of xiē (“write”) in (17d) functions as the modal particle and does not necessarily

---

\(^{101}\) PK has jīng shàng shuō 經上說 (“the scripture says”).
convey the stative aspect. While the \( \mathbf{o} \) morpheme is acceptable, it is formally unmarked and does not reflect the heavily marked perfect tense-form in Greek. Therefore, the stative marker -\( \mathbf{zhe} \) is preferable to the \( \mathbf{o} \) morpheme for the translation of the Greek present-referring perfect.

### 4.2.4.3. Future-Referring Perfect

The perfect also occurs with future reference, but is infrequent in the New Testament.\(^{102}\) (18) illustrates (English translation is provided below):

(18) \( \alpha \lambda \eta \theta \delta \varsigma \ \varepsilon \nu \tau \omicron \upsilon \ \iota \alpha \gamma \alpha \tau \tau \eta \ \tau \omicron \upsilon \ \theta \epsilon \omicron \upsilon \ \tau e\tau \epsilon \lambda \iota \omega \tau \omicron \upsilon \) (1 John 2:5)

(a) 愛神的心在他裏面實在是完全的。 (UV, PK, CLB)\(^{103}\)

Ài Shén de xīn zài tā lǐ miàn shǐzāi shì wánquán de.

(b) 上帝的愛在他心裏，實在是完全的 (JOHN, WANG)

Shànɡdǐ de ài zài tāxīn lǐ, shǐzāi shì wánquán de.

(c) 愛上帝的心就真地在這人裏面得完全了。 (LÜ, BB)\(^{104}\)

Ài Shànɡdǐ de xīn jiù zhěn de zài zhè rén lǐ miàn dé wánquán le.

(d) 他愛神的心就的確在他裡面完全了。 (NCV)

Tā ài Shén de xīn jiù díquè zài tā lǐmiàn wánquán le.

(e) 神的愛在這人裡面實在是得了成全。 (CRV)

Shén de ài zài zhè rén lǐmiàn shǐzāi shì dé-le chéngquán.

(f) 他對上帝的愛就達到完全。 (TCV)

---

\(^{102}\) Porter, Idioms, 41. Future perfect is rare in the New Testament Greek and in non-literary papyri. It occurs more often in the form of periphrastic construction (future of \( \epsilon \iota \mu \iota \) with the perfect participle), for example, \( \epsilon \iota \omicron \nu \tau \omicron \upsilon \delta \iota \alpha \mu \epsilon \sigma \rho \iota \epsilon \omicron \nu \) in Luke 12:52. See Robertson, Grammar, 906–07; Mandilaras, Verb, §525.

\(^{103}\) The CLB has 他愛神的心在這人裏面實在是完全的。 (lit. “Indeed it can be said that their God-loving heart is complete”).

\(^{104}\) BB phrases it in wenli style: Ài Shén zhī xīn zài qìzhōng, shì wéi wánquán zhē 愛神之心在其中，實為完全者。
(g) 天主的愛在他內就能達到完全圓滿了。（CPB）

(g) Tā dui Shàngdì de ài jiù dá-dào wánquán.

(h) 天主的愛在他內纔得以圓滿；（SB）

(h) Tiānzhū de ài zài tā nèi cài dé-yì-yuán-mǎn.

(i) ・・・就圓滿達成 (FOLEY)

(i) jiù yuán-mǎn-dá-chéng.

(18a–b) both translate τετελείωται as an adjective, the difference being that the former reads "The God-loving heart inside him is indeed complete," whereas the latter reads "God's love in his heart, is indeed complete." Similar to (18a), (18c–d) also render ἐν τούτῳ ἢ ὁγάπατη τοῦ θεοῦ with “His God-loving heart,” and use the ἐ morpheme to render the Greek perfect (“has been completed”). The modal particle jiù (“indeed”) used in (18c–d) and (18f–g) is a good translation for ὅληθῶς because it conveys the sense of certainly.105 However, the perfective morphemes -le and the RVC dào (“arrive”) in (18e–g) express the perfective aspect in Mandarin (“attain completion”) and, therefore, are not preferable for the future-referring Greek perfect.106 On the other hand, the auxiliary verb néng and dé/déyǐ in (18c, g–h) are not suitable additions because they convey contingency that does not reflect the indicative mood in Greek (see also example (4) above). Here, the stative aspect marker -zhe cannot be used due to the fact that the expressions wánquán and chéngquán contain the words wán (“end”), quán (“complete,” “perfect”) and chéng (“complete”) that are frequently used as RVCs. Therefore, the four-

105 Lű asserts that jiù expresses “firm determination” (意志堅決). Lű 吕叔湘, 800 Phrases, 316.
106 The TCV has “His love for God is completed,” which is directly influenced by the GNB (cf. also TNIV).
character set phrase with the ø morpheme, *yuán-mán-dá-chéng* ("complete with satisfaction"), is preferable because it reflects both the aspect and the discourse function of the heavily marked future-referring perfect tense-form in Greek as the frontgrounding device, as (18i) illustrates.

### 4.2.4.4. Discourse Function of the Perfect

As noted previously in chapter 3, due to its heavily marked feature, the Greek perfect (as well as pluperfect) tense-form is used as a frontgrounding device in discourse. In Mandarin, however, both -zhe and the ø morpheme are used to translate the stative aspect signaled by the perfect tense-form in Greek. In (17), while -zhe is used to translate the perfect tense-form, it does not effectively mark frontgrounded prominence in discourse. Here, a four-character set phrase with the ø morpheme would be an excellent alternative to -zhe except for the fact that it is not always available to the translator. In such cases, the translator may utilize a commonly used four-character phrase, such as *yuán-mán-dá-chéng* ("complete with satisfaction") in (18i), or take two disyllabic words to form a four-character unit, as *qīn-yān kàn-jian* in (19f) illustrates.

### 4.2.4.5. Past-Referring Perfect

The past use of the perfect is often found in narrative contexts, as (19) illustrates:

(19) καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἐὼρακεῖς; (John 8:57)
(a) 倘見亞伯拉罕乎 (DV, MOR, MAR, GÜ, GO, BCV, UVW, UVB)\footnote{The BCV has "And you have you seen Abraham?". Abraham is transliterated as Yiibiiilahan (MOR, MAR), Yiib6lan (GU), and Yiibohan (GO).}

Qi jiàn Yábóláhàn hū.

How could you see Abraham?

(b) 色見亞伯拉罕乎 (SJ)

Yì jiàn Yábóláhàn hū.

You have already seen Abraham?

(c) 難見亞伯拉罕乎 (BB, WV)\footnote{The WV has "And you have seen Abraham?"}

Qi céng jiàn Yábóláhàn hū.

How have you ever seen Abraham?

(d) 命得見我太祖 (GURY)\footnote{The particle dé conveys possibility in both classical and Mandarin Chinese. See Lü 吕叔湘, Grammar, 251–52.}

Qi dé jiàn wǒ táizuì.

How could you possibly have seen my ancestor?

(e) 竟見過亞伯拉罕乎？(LÜ, SB, UV, NCV, CLB, CRV, TCV, WANG, JOHNM, PK, CPB, CSB)\footnote{PK uses both RVC and -guó: Qi kàn-jiàn-guó Yábóláhàn ne? (How is it possible that you have seen Abraham?); the CSB adds the auxiliary verb hui: Zěnme hui jiàn-guó Yábóláhàn? 怎么 \( \n \) would you have seen Abraham?; the CPB adds the second person singular pronoun ni and uses its own transliteration Yábóláng 亚伯郎 for Abraham.}

Jìng jiàn-guó Yábóláhàn me?

You have actually seen Abraham?

(f) 你親眼看見亞伯拉罕？ (FOLEY)

Nǐ qīn-yǎn-kàn-jiàn Yábóláhàn?

And you have you seen Abraham?". Abraham is transliterated as Yiibiiilahan (MOR, MAR), Yiib6lan (GU), and Yiibohan (GO).}

The WV has "And you have seen Abraham?")

The particle dé conveys possibility in both classical and Mandarin Chinese. See Lü 吕叔湘, Grammar, 251–52.

PK uses both RVC and -guó: Qi kàn-jiàn-guó Yábóláhàn ne? (How is it possible that you have seen Abraham?); the CSB adds the auxiliary verb hui: Zěnme hui jiàn-guó Yábóláhàn? 怎么 \( \n \) would you have seen Abraham?; the CPB adds the second person singular pronoun ni and uses its own transliteration Yábóláng 亚伯郎 for Abraham.
You have seen Abraham with your own eyes?

The cited wenli versions in (19a–d) all use the ø morpheme for the verb jiàn ("see"). (19b–c) both add the temporal deictic indicators yí ("already") and cěng ("ever") to refer to the past. The Mandarin versions, on the other hand, render the stative aspect in Greek signaled by the perfect tense-form with the perfective aspect marker -guó. In this instance, it is not possible to express the stative aspect in Mandarin by using -zhe, because, when used with the verb jiàn ("see"), this character is always read as the RVC zhāo, which conveys the perfective aspect.

As (19f) illustrates, the four-character set phrase, qīn-yán-kàn-jiàn, with the ø morpheme is the most fitting translation for the past-referring perfect because it reflects the aspect and the discourse function as the frontgrounding device.

4.2.4.6. Omnitemporal and Timeless Perfect

a. Omnitemporal (Gnomic) Perfect

Like the aorist and present tense-forms, the perfect is also used in omnitemporal (gnomic) contexts, as (20) illustrates.114

(20) ἀλλὰ καὶ σὲ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν πᾶσαι ἡρίΘμηνται. (Luke 12:7)

(a) 就是你們的頭髮也都數過了。 (UV, SB, LÜ, NCV, TCV, CLB, CRV, JOHNM, BB, WANG)115

Jiushi nǐmen de tóufā yě dōu bèi shǔ-guó le.

All your hair has been counted.

114 Robertson, Grammar, 897; Chamberlain, Exegetical Grammar, 73; Porter, Verbal Aspect, 267–68; Porter, Idioms, 41.
115 LÜ uses the modal particle ne instead of the post-sentential le. JOHNM does not have a modal particle at the end of the sentence. BB has Ji ēr shǒu zhī fà, yì jiē shǔ-guó yǐ 既爾首之髮，亦皆數過矣 ("Even all hair on your head has already been numbered").
(b) 既爾髮皆已見數 (DV, SJ, MOR, MAR, JOHN, GURY, BCV, UVW, UVB)

Jì ěr fà jiē yǐ jiàn shǔ.
All your hair has already been numbered.

(c) 唯爾首髮，皆已數明 (GÜ)

Wéi ěr shǒú fà, jiē yǐ shù-míng.
All your hair has been counted.
Even all your hair has been counted carefully.

(d) 就是你們的頭髮，也都數過了 (PK, CPB)

Jiǔshì nǐmen de tóufā, yè dōu shǔ-guò le.
Even all your hair is numbered.

Most Mandarin versions, represented in (20a) and (20d), use the perfective aspect marker -guo to render 既爾之髮皆已數 ("Even all the hair on your head has already been numbered"). The difference between (20a) and (20d) is that the former is phrased in the passive construction signaled by the particle bèi, whereas the latter is phrased in the active voice and has a comma before the predicate. The particles bèi and jiàn used to signal passive voice in (20a–b) are unnecessary additions since Mandarin syntax does not require them here.\(^\text{118}\) As for the comma, its presence or 

\(^{116}\) MAR has Zhì ěr shǒu zhī fà jiē yǐ shǔ 既爾首之髮皆已數 ("Even all the hair on your head has already been numbered"). JOHN has Jì ěr shǒu zhī fà jiē běi shǔ 既爾首之髮皆已數 ("All the hair on your head has also already been numbered"). GURY and BCV omit yǐ. The UVW and UVB have Jì ěr shǒu zhī fà, yì jiē jiàn shǔ 既爾首之髮，亦皆數 ("All the hair on your head has also already been numbered").

\(^{117}\) The CPB has Jiǔliàn nǐmen tòushāng de tóufā tā dōu shǔ-guò le 就連你們頭上的頭髮他都數過了 ("He has already counted even the hair on your head").

\(^{118}\) The particle bèi used in passive construction in Mandarin is not obligatory, although modern influence of European languages has increased its use, as Wang and others have pointed out. See Wang 王才, Treatise, vol. 2, 294–98; Wang 王才, Outline, 128–33; Lü and Zhu, Syntax, 82–85; Ota, "Some Remarks," 139–40. For further discussions of the passive construction in Chinese, see chapter 6 below.
absence is immaterial to the meaning of the sentence. The wenli versions in (20b–c), on the other hand, add the temporal adverbial yi (“already”) to indicate past-time reference. The two, however, differ with respect to the aspect morphemes they use. (20b) has the ø morpheme, whereas (20c) has the RVC ming (“clear”) to express perfective aspect. Hence, the first four examples are not preferable because (20a), (20c), and (20d) convey the perfective aspect, whereas yi in (20b) indicates past-time reference.

The stative aspect marker -zhe might be an option here (e.g. shù-zhe tóufā, “at the state of counting the hair”). However, as (20e) illustrates, the four-character set phrase with the ø morpheme lì-lì-kē-shū (“that which can be numbered”) is preferable because it performs the same function as the Greek perfect tense-form in marking frontgrounding prominence at the discourse level. Four-character set phrases also differentiate from the ø morpheme used to render Greek omnitemporal aorist into Mandarin.

b. Timeless Perfect

The perfect tense-form is used in contexts where the temporal reference is considered irrelevant, as (21) illustrates:¹¹⁹

(21) θεόν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώτερε (John 1:18)

(a) 從來沒有人看見 神。 (UV, JOHNM, CRV)

Cónglái méiyǒu rén kàn-jian Shén.

No one has ever seen God.

(b) 未有人見上帝 (DV, GO, GÜ, GURY, BCV, UVW, UVB, UVE, SJ, CSV, BB, WV)¹²⁰

¹¹⁹ Porter, Verbal Aspect, 268–70; Porter, Idioms, 42.
¹²⁰ GÜ has wùrén (“no one”) instead of wèi yǒu rén. GO, GURY, BCV and SJ have Cóng wèi yǒu rén jiàn Shén/Tiānzhǔ 從未有人見 神/天主 (“Never before had anyone seen God”). The UVW, UVB, and UVE add zhē 者 at the end of the clause; the CSV has Wèi cháng yǒu rén jiàn Shàngdǐ 未曾有人見上帝
Wei you ren jiàn Shàngdi.

Never had anyone seen God.

(c) 從來沒有人見過上帝 (LÜ, SB, CPB, CSB)121

Cónglái méiyōu rén jiàn-guò Shàngdi.

No one has ever had the experience of seeing God.

(d) 神是沒有人看見過的 (PK, SYD, WANG)122

Shén shì méiyōu rén kàn-jian-guò de.

God has never been seen by anyone.

(e) 無人何時而見神 (MOR, MAR)

Wúrén hénghí ér jiàn Shén.

No one has at any time seen God.

(f) 從未有人在任何時候親眼目睹神 (FOLEY)

Cóngwèi yóurén zài rènhé shíhou qīn-yǎn-mù-dǔ Shén.

No one has ever at any time seen God with his or her own eyes.

Most Mandarin versions use the perfective morphemes to translate the stative aspect of the perfect tense-form. (21a) uses the RVC jiàn (“see”), whereas (21c) uses -guò.

(21d) has the combination of an RVC and -guò. Most wenli versions represented in (21b) and (21e) use the monosyllabic verb jiàn (“see”) with the Φ morpheme, which is not preferable to render the Greek perfect tense-form for the same reason pointed out above with respect to markedness and discourse considerations. In this example, it is not

---

121 Tiānzǔ (SB) and Shén (CSB) are used instead of Shàngdì to refer to God.
122 WANG has Cónglái méiyōu rén kàn-jian-guò Shàngdì 從來沒有人看見過上帝 (“Never had anyone ever seen God”).
possible to express the stative aspect in Mandarin by using -zhe. As noted in example (19) above, when used with the verb jiàn (“see”), the character 著 is always read as the RVC zhāo, which conveys the perfective aspect. Therefore, the perfect is best translated by a four-character set phrase with the φ morpheme, as (21f) illustrates. The sense of timelessness may be conveyed lexically in Mandarin by zài rènhé shíhou (“at any time”).

4.2.5. Pluperfect Tense-Form

The pluperfect is the least frequently used tense-form in the New Testament. Many traditional grammarians interpret its origin as being along the lines of “a perfect provided with an augment, the preterite or a verb of state.” However, the pluperfect is best described as a heavily marked tense-form that grammaticalizes the remote [+remote] stative aspect in Greek. Like the perfect tense-form, the pluperfect also serves as a frontgrounding device in discourse. The pluperfect not only occurs in past-referring contexts, but also in non-past contexts, as in protases of conditional constructions. The non-past referring pluperfect will be discussed along with conditional sentences in the next chapter.

Because aspect in Mandarin does not differentiate between remoteness and immediacy, the stative aspect marker -zhe and four-character set phrases with the φ morpheme are used not only to render the perfect but also pluperfect tense-forms in Greek. (22) illustrates:

(22) ἴδεισαν αὐτόν (Mark 1:34)

123 Kurylowicz, Inflectional Categories, 91. See also Kühner and Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik, vol. 1, 151f; Gildersleeve, Syntax, §§235–37; Goodwin, Syntax, §43; Burton, Syntax, §§89–90; Nunn, Short Syntax, §97; Stahl, Kritisch-historische Syntax, 119–23; Moulton, Prolegomena, 148; BDF, §347; Turner, Syntax, 86; Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 308–9.
124 Porter, Verbal Aspect, 287–90; Porter, Idioms, 42.
(a) 他們認識祂。 (WANG, LÜ, UV, NCV, SB, CRV, JOHNM)

Tāmen rènshi Tā.

They know Him.

(b) 他們知道他是誰。 (TCV)

Tāmen zhīdào tā shì shéi.

They know who he is.

(c) 他們對他耳熟能詳。 (FOLEY)

Tāmen dui tā ěr-shóu-néng-xiáng.

They know him well.

Most Mandarin versions represented in (22a) render the pluperfect ἐφησίαν with the ø morpheme for the verb rènshi (“know [a person]”). (22b) also uses the ø morpheme, but rephrases the original with a subordinate clause. This is an unnecessary change because the Greek is phrased in a simple sentence. With the perfect tense-form, the stative aspect signaled by the pluperfect may be reflected in Mandarin transition by employing the stative aspect marker -zhe and four-character set phrases with the ø morpheme. In (22), however, -zhe cannot possibly be used to realize the stative aspect in Mandarin because the same character is used mainly as the RVC, especially in the expression rèn-zháo 認著 (“recognize”). As (22c) illustrates, the four-character set phrase ěr-shóu-néng-xiáng (lit. “have heard something many times that one can make a detailed explanation of it”)\(^{125}\) with the ø morpheme, on the other hand, reflects the aspect and performs the same function as the pluperfect tense-form in building frontgrounded prominence at the discourse level.

\(^{125}\) See also the commentary on ἐφησίαν in John 18:21 in chapter 6 of this dissertation below.
4.2.6. Conclusion

In summary, when used in contexts with different temporal references, the present, imperfect, perfect, and pluperfect tense-forms in Greek may be consistently rendered by the imperfective and stative morphemes in Mandarin. Because aspect in Mandarin does not differentiate between remoteness and immediacy, the morphologically expressed (single) aspect morphemes, zài, -zhe, and IDVCs, may be used interchangeably to translate both the present and imperfect tense-forms in Greek. For the same reason, -zhe is used to translate both the perfect and pluperfect tense-forms in Greek.

It is argued here that when the translator has the option to choose between the ø morpheme and the morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes, the latter is preferable because they are formally and semantically marked. In order to reflect the discourse functions of the present and imperfect tense-forms in Greek, two-morpheme aspect compounds (e.g. zài...-zhe, zài...IDVCs, -le-IDVCs) may be utilized. However, in contexts where morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes are unavailable, a disyllabic verb with the ø morpheme may be used in order to represent the more heavily marked present and imperfective tense-forms in Greek.

Similarly, the translator may use -zhe to translate the perfect and pluperfect tense-forms in Greek as it morphologically reflects the stative aspect in Mandarin. However, for reasons discussed earlier in this section, -zhe cannot be consistently used to translate each occurrence of the perfect or pluperfect tense-forms, and, more importantly, it does not serve as a frontgrounding device in Mandarin discourse. Four-character set phrases with the ø morpheme are utilized in order to reflect the stative aspect in Greek and
perform the same function as the Greek perfect and pluperfect tense-forms in building frontgrounded prominence at the discourse level.

4.3. Conclusion

The primary task of this chapter is to devise a system of consistently translating the Greek tense-forms in the indicative mood into Mandarin. In formulating the system, key criteria include the consistent matching of aspect in Greek and Mandarin, discourse considerations, and notions of markedness. The result is encouraging and promising; the tripartite model of Greek aspect outlined in the previous chapter can be closely represented by equivalent aspect morphemes in Mandarin with a high degree of morphological consistency. In the next chapter, the focus will turn to the translation of the Greek verbal syntax in the non-indicative moods into Mandarin.
CHAPTER 5 THE NON-INDICATIVE MOODS AND CONDITIONAL CLAUSES

5.0. Introduction

This chapter builds upon the findings of the previous chapter on New Testament Greek aspect in the indicative mood and applies them directly to the non-indicative moods. As in the previous chapter, the primary objective is to formulate a consistent system of grammatical translation of Greek tense-forms with Mandarin aspect morphemes. This chapter also addresses pertinent translation issues concerning the syntax of clauses and sentences, as well as larger discourse units. It is argued here that many of the grammatical constructions and syntactical nuances in Greek discourse (e.g. periphrasis) can only be translated into Mandarin by lexical means. Over sixty Chinese Bible versions are reviewed in the example sentences. The discussion divides into four parts: Imperative (5.1), Subjunctive and Optative Moods (5.2), Infinitives and Participles (5.3), and Conditional Clauses (5.4).

5.1. Imperative

The imperative mood is used to express command, entreaty, or prohibition in Greek. Unlike Greek, Mandarin does not grammaticalize the perfective, imperfective, or stative aspects in the imperative mood by morphemes different from those in the indicative mood.

---

5.1.1. Aorist Imperative

The aorist imperative is frequently used to express commands in the New Testament, as (1) illustrates:

(1) πορευθέντες δὲ μάθετε τί ἐστιν· ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν· (Matt 9:13)

(a) 你們去研究『我喜愛憐憫，不喜愛祭祀』是甚麼意思。 (LÜ)

Nimen qu yánjiu-yánjiù “wǒ xiǎi’ài liánmín, bù xiǎi’ài jìsi” shì shénme yìsi.

Go figure out what “I love mercy; I do not love sacrifice” means.

(b) 你們去想一想··· (NCV)

Nimen qu xiǎng-yí-xiǎng···

Go think about···

(c) 你們去研究··· (CRV, CPB, TCV)

Nimen qu yánjiù···

Go study···

(d) 你們且去揣摩··· (UV, PK, JOHM, WANG)

Nimen qiě qu chuāimó···

Just go figure out also···

(e) 你們去研究一下··· (SB)

Nimen qu yánjiù yǐxià···

Go study for a while···

(f) 你們不如回去細心咀嚼這句話··· (CLB)

Nimen bùrú huíqù xi-xīn-jǔ-jué zhè jù huà.

Why don’t you go back and chew on these words more carefully···
(1a–b) both use reduplicated verbs to convey the perfective aspect of the aorist imperative. (1c–e) use the Ø morpheme to express perfectivity, providing an appealing translation, except that the adverb yǐxià in (1e) is an unnecessary addition because it suggests a short duration, an Aktionsart-based concept of the aorist imperative held by many traditional grammarians.² The four-character phrase xǐ-xīn-jū-jué combined with the Ø morpheme in (1f) is a less appealing translation, since it is reserved specifically for rendering the Greek stative aspect into Mandarin. While verb reduplication and the Ø morpheme are considered good translations of the aorist imperative, the latter is preferable since its unmarked feature corresponds more closely to the less heavily marked aorist tense-form.³ More importantly, the Ø morpheme serves as a backgrounding device in Mandarin discourse, marking cohesion of the narrative text in the same way as the Greek aorist.⁴ Conversely, however, verb reduplication is preferable to the Ø morpheme because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect signaled by the aorist tense-form in Greek. Therefore, both the Ø morpheme and verb reduplication are considered preferable for the rendering of the aorist imperative, as (1a, c–d) illustrate.

5.1.2. Present Imperative

The present imperative expresses imperfective aspect in Greek. Command or entreaty expressed in the Greek present imperative should be rendered by imperfect morphemes in

³ For a different opinion on notions of markedness of Greek tense-forms in the imperative mood, see McKay, “Aspects,” 41–58. McKay endorses the Aktionsart theory of classifying Greek verbs according to state and action (or activity): the present imperative is the “residual, or unmarked, aspect of a stative verb, most readily chosen in a neutral context where is no contrast of other feature which points positively to a particular realisation of the imperative,” whereas the aorist imperative is the “residual, or unmarked, aspect of an action verb” (italics added). McKay, “Aspects,” 55.
⁴ Porter, Idioms, 305.
Mandarin. Except for zài, the ø morpheme and the imperfective morphemes (IDVCs, -zhe) may be used to translate the present imperative. Discourse consideration remains the primary criterion for choosing aspect morphemes in Mandarin. (2) illustrates:

(2) ἀκούετε (Mark 4:3)

(a) 你們要聽！ (LÜ, CRV, BB)

Nimen yào tīng!

You should listen!

(b) 你們聽啊！ (UV, WANG, TCV)

Nimen tīng a!

Hey! Listen!

(c) 你們聽 (SB)

Nimen tīng.

You listen.

(d) 宜聽 (GÜ)

Yí tīng.

You should listen.

(e) 注意聽！ (CPB)

Zhùyì tīng!

Listen up!

(f) 注意 (CLB)

Zhùyì.

---

5 BB has Ėr xū tīng 屬須聽 (“You ought to listen”).

6 The TCV adds liùxīn 留心 (“attentively”) in front of tīng.
Pay attention.

(g) 你们聽著 (PK, JOHNM, NCV)

Nimen tīng-zhe!

You listen up!

While most Mandarin versions render the present imperative with the ø morpheme, as represented in (2a–e), there are still slight nuances. With the exception of (2f), the above examples all use the verb tīng ("hear," "listen"). The addition of auxiliary verbs, such as yào in (2a) and yí in (2d), is not ideal for translating the imperative mood in Greek because auxiliary verbs in Chinese are used to express volition or contingency. 7

Exclamative particles, on the other hand, such as a ("ah," "hey") in (2b), zài (DV, SJ, GO, BCV, GURY, Tīng zhī zài 聽之哉, "Listen to it!"), yě (MOR, MAR, Ėr tīng yě 聽也, "You listen!") and hū (YAN), are preferable additions here. 8 (2c) uses the monosyllabic verb tīng ("hear") with the ø morpheme. (2e) and (2f) both use zhùyì, the difference being that in the former it is used as an adverb ("Listen carefully!") whereas in the latter it is used as a verb ("Pay attention!"). While the ø morpheme used in (2a–e) is a good translation of the Greek present imperative, it does not render the more heavily marked features of ἀκούει.

The imperfective aspect morpheme -zhe in (2g) is preferable to the ø morpheme because it is formally and semantically marked. However, as pointed out in the previous chapters, a single aspect morpheme alone does not effectively mark foregrounded prominence in Mandarin. Furthermore, since zài is never used in imperative sentences,

---

7 For a list of commonly used Mandarin auxiliary verbs, see Table 5.1, p. 231 below.
8 For a summary of the usage of various Chinese exclamation particles, see Lü 吕叔湘, Grammar, 315–23.
the translator may choose disyllabic verbs such as lingtīng instead of the monosyllabic verb tīng in order to build more prominence in discourse. For example, (2g) may be rephrased as Nīmen lingtīng-zhe! 你們聆聽著.

5.1.3. Aorist vs. Present Imperative

Many grammarians explain the difference between the aorist and present imperatives by means of Aktionsart, that is, the former expresses a punctiliar or instantaneous action, whereas the latter expresses linear or durative action. Still many others continue to recognize the distinction between the two tense-forms in the imperative mood in terms of general versus definite.

These traditional views are no longer convincing. The difference between these two tense-forms in the imperative mood is best explained by verbal aspect, which means that the present imperative is a more heavily marked form than the aorist imperative. As Porter notes, the use of the present imperative represents the author’s self-conscious choice to “draw attention to the theme that is pursued in the following material.” The two versions of the Lord’s Prayer recorded by Matthew and Luke illustrate this nuance:

---


12 In the context of prayers to God, the aorist imperative occurs more frequently than the present imperative or subjunctive. See Mozley, “Notes,” 280; Bakker, *Imperative*, 128–41; Voelz, “Use,” 45–48; Pulleyn, *Prayer*, 221.
(3) τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον· (Matt 6:11)

(a) 我們日用的食物，今天賜給我們； (LÜ, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, CRV)

Wŏmen riyòng de shíwù, jǐntiān cǐ gěi wŏmen.
Our food we need daily, give to us today.

(b) 賜給我們今天所需的飲食。 (TCV)

Cǐ gěi wŏmen jǐntiān suòxū de yīnshí.
Give to us the food and drink we need today.

(c) 我們每天所需的飲食。 (NCV, SB, CPB, CLB)\(^\text{13}\)

Wŏmen měitiān suòxū de shíwù, qīū nǐ jǐntiān cǐ gěi wŏmen.
Our food we need daily, we ask you to give to us today.

(4) τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ ἡμέραν· (Luke 11:3)

(a) 我們日用的食物，天天賜給我們； (LÜ, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, CRV)\(^\text{14}\)

Wŏmen riyòng de shíwù, tiāntiān cǐ gěi wŏmen.
Our daily food, give to us everyday.

(b) 賜給我們每天需要的飲食。 (TCV, CLB)

Cǐ gěi wŏmen měitiān xūyāo de yīnshí.
Give us food and drink we need everyday.

(c) 我們每天所需的食物，求你每天給我們； (NCV, SB, CPB)\(^\text{15}\)

Wŏmen xūyòng de shíwù, qīū nǐ měitiān gěi wŏmen.
Our food we need, we ask you to give to us daily.

---

\(^{13}\) The CPB has Qīù nǐ jǐntiān shāng gěi wŏmen riyòng de shíliáng 賜你今天賜給我們日用的食糧 (“We ask you today to give to us daily food”); the CLB has Qīù Nǐ cǐ wŏmen jǐntiān suòxū de yīnshí 賜你賜 (sic) 我們今天所需的飲食 (“We ask You to give to us the food we need today”).

\(^{14}\) PK has rírì chū wŏmen 自日賜與我們 (“give to us everyday”).

\(^{15}\) The CPB has Qīù nǐ měitiān gěi wŏmen suòxū de shíliáng 賜你每天給我們所需的食糧 (“We ask you to give us the food we need”).
The Chinese versions cited above do not differentiate the aorist δὸς in (3) from the present imperative δίδου in (4), all of which use the ὅ morpheme for the verb “give” (cité (3a–c, 4a–b), δίδου (4c)). The construction that begins with τί οὖν (“we ask you”) in (3c) and (4c), however, is not preferable because it renders the Greek imperatives as though they were in the indicative mood. For the aorist imperative, the monosyllabic verb δίδου with the ὅ morpheme is preferable because it reflects the aspect and the less heavily marked aorist tense-form in Greek. The present imperative, on the other hand, may be rendered by the disyllabic verb χαριτωμένον (“give”) with the IDVC xiàlài, expressing the imperfective aspect.

5.1.4. Perfect Imperative

The perfect imperative, as Cooper and Krüger have observed, has intensive and peremptory force in classical Greek.16 It is, however, very rare in the New Testament. The perfect imperative grammaticalizes the same stative aspect as it does in the indicative mood.17 (5) illustrates a salutatory term used in Hellenistic letter closing:18

(5) ἔπρωσθε (Acts 15:29)

---

16 Cooper and Krüger note that it is almost offensively strong as a form of address to persons but it is sometimes used “precisely for shock value” in certain verbs (e.g. συντάσσω). Cooper and Krüger, Attic Greek Prose Syntax, vol. 1, 629–31.

17 Porter, Idioms, 54. Goodwin observes that, in classical Greek, the perfect imperative occurs most frequently in the third person singular of the passive, where it expresses “a command that something just done or about to be done shall be decisive and final” (italics original). Goodwin, Syntax, §105. See also Gildersleeve, Syntax, §§408–13.

18 “ἔπρωσθε” (second person singular ἔπρωσθο does not occur in the New Testament) has widespread attestation in papyri. See Mayser, Grammatik, vol. 2, part 1, 185; Mandilaras, Verb, §691.
(a) 伏惟萬福 (DV)

富為萬福。

Blessings!

(b) 敬祝康泰。 (WV)

景蝠康泰。

Wish you health and safety.

(c) 幸甚、並候平安。 (GÜ)

幸神，並候平安。

[May you find] true happiness! Peace be with you!

(d) 幸甚、伏為獲安。 (GURY)\(^{19}\)

幸神，伏為獲安。

[May you find] true happiness! Peace be with you!

(e) 幸甚 (MOR, MAR)

幸神。

[May you find] true happiness!

(f) 願你們平安。 (PK, JOHN, UV, WANG, TCV, BCV, BB, SJ)\(^{20}\)

願你們平安。

Peace be with you.

(g) 願你們安康！ (LÜ)

願你們安康！

Peace be with you.

\(^{19}\) GURY uses the character 華 for 華 爲.

\(^{20}\) The BCV, BB, and SJ have 順耳平安（“Peace to you!”).
Wish you all good health!

(h) 祝你們安好！ (SB, CLB, NCV)\textsuperscript{21}

Zhù nǐmen ānhǎo.

Safe and sound to you all!

(i) ⋯⋯敬請

台安 (FOLEY)

Jìng-qīng-táì-ān.

May you find happiness and peace.

The above are examples of epistolary conventions used to conclude a letter in Chinese writing. These examples all render the perfect passive imperative $\text{r}p\theta e$ with the $\emptyset$ morpheme, nevertheless some are more fitting than others are. The phrases xìngshèn, fū-wéi-wàn-fù, jìngzhù kāngtài, and xìngshèn, bìng-hòu-píng-ān used in several wenli versions are still used in modern formal correspondence. The combination of xìngshèn and the four-character phrase in (5c–d), however, is redundant. Several Mandarin versions render the perfect imperative with constructions that begin with the particles yuàn ("wish," "hope" (5f–g)) or zhù ("may you" (5h)). In these instances, the constructions are inappropriate because they are unmarked in both written and spoken discourse.

The four-character phrases with the $\emptyset$ morpheme in (5a–b) and (5i), thus, best translate the perfect imperative $\text{r}p\theta e$ in letter closing. According to the conventions of

\footnote{The CLB has Zhù ping'ān 祝平安 ("Peace"); the NCV has Zhù nǐmen ping'ān 祝你們平安！ ("Peace to you!")}
Chinese letter-writing, the last two characters of the four-character phrases used in the closing must be written at the top of the letter, as (5i) illustrates.22

5.2. Subjunctive and Optative Moods

5.2.1. Subjunctive

5.2.1.1. Aorist and Present Subjunctives

The subjunctive mood has well-defined roles in the Greek New Testament. Two tense-forms, the present and aorist, grammaticalize the perfective and imperfective aspects in the subjunctive mood.23 The subjunctive mood is often used in contexts where volition or potential is intended.24 When translating into Mandarin, the two tense-forms in the subjective must be represented by equivalent aspect morphemes, as (6) illustrates.

(6) εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε, τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύετε, ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ

γινώσκητε ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί. (John 10:38)

(a) 若我行這事、你們雖然不信我、也當信這事、叫你們知而且信、父在我裏面、我在父裏面 (JOHN, PK)25

Ruò wǒ xíng zhè shì, nínmen suīrán bù xīn wǒ, yě dāng xīn zhè shì, jiào nínmen

---

22 Chinese is written from top to bottom. For an introduction to Chinese letter-writing, see, for example, Cornaby, *Chinese Letter-Writing*. Cornaby further points out that four-character phrases are preceded by words such as zhuànchǐ (“just this much”). Cornaby, *Chinese Letter-Writing*, 13–14.


25 PK has jiào nínmen yǒu zhīdào yǒu xīn (“so that you know and also believe”).
zhī érqíě xīn, fū zài wǒ lǐ miàn, wǒ zài fū lǐ miàn.

If you do these deeds, even though you do not believe me, you should believe these deeds, in order that you know and believe, that the Father is in me, and I am in the Father.

(b) • • • 叫你們又知道，又明白 • • • (UV, WANG, LÜ, CSB)

...jiào nǐmen yòu zhīdào, yòu míngbái....

...to let you know and understand....

(c) • • • 好使你們確實知道 • • • (NCV, TCV, CPB)26

...hǎoshí nǐmen quèshí zhīdào....

...to make sure that you know....

(d) • • • 你們就會清楚明白 • • • (CLB)

...nǐmen jiù hùi qīngchǔ míngbái....

...you will be able to understand clearly....

(e) • • • 叫你們可以知道，且一直知道 • • • (CRV)

...jiào nǐmen kěyī zhīdào, qiě yízhí zhīdào....

...so that you can understand, and continuously understand....

(f) • • • 如此你們必定認出 • • • (SB)

...rúcǐ nǐmen bidìng rèn-chū....

...so that you will certainly recognize....

(g) • • • 好讓你們認出並且領會著 • • • (FOLEY)

...hǎo ràng nǐmen rèn-chū bìngqǐe lǐnhuì-zhe....

...so that you may recognize and be figuring it out....

26 The CPB uses liàojié 瞭解 (“comprehend”) instead of zhīdào.
Here, two subjunctives occur in the apodosis of the conditional clause, \( \gamma ν ότε \) (aorist) and \( \gamma ν \omega όκιτε \) (present). Most Mandarin versions, as represented in (6a–e), render both tense-forms with the \( \sigma \) morpheme. The fact that (6a) has \( xīn \) ("believe") instead of \( mīngbái \) ("understand") is unmistakably due to the influence of the Vulgate and KJV, which have the variant reading \( πτρεύσιτε \) instead of \( γ ν \omega όκιτε \).27

However, the textual issue is not the only concern. The \( \sigma \) morpheme used in (6a–e) is not preferable because it does not morphologically reflect the different aspects signaled by the present and aorist subjunctives in Greek. (6c) uses only one verb, \( zhīdào \) ("know"), to render both \( \gamma ν ότε \) and \( \gamma ν \omega όκιτε \), but adds the adverb \( quēshī \) ("certainly") to denote the emphasis of the repeated Greek verbs. Similarly, (6d) uses only one verb, \( mīngbái \), however, not only does it add an adverb, \( qīngchū \) ("clearly"), it also employs an auxiliary verb, \( huī \). (6e) reflects the traditional grammarians' interpretation of the two tense-forms in the subjunctive in terms of Aktionsart, that is, by adding the adverb \( yīzhī \) ("continuously") in front of \( zhīdào \) to convey durative or continuative meaning of the present imperative. (6f) stands out from the rest of the Mandarin versions for it uses the RVC \( chū \), however, because \( rēn-chū \) ("recognize") alone reflects only the perfective aspect signaled by \( γ ν ότε \) and not the imperfective aspect signaled by \( γ ν όκιτε \), this version is also less than ideal.

In order to differentiate the aorist and present tense-forms in the subjunctive mood, it is necessary to use the RVC \( chū \) to reflect the perfective aspect signaled by the former,

27 The reading \( πτρεύσιτε \) is supported by \( \text{A K Δ Π Ψ} f^{13} (\text{N πτρεύσιτε}) \). All wenli versions and early Mandarin versions (e.g. JOHN-M, PK) adopt this reading. Metzger points out that this variant is closer to the original reading than the pleonastic expression \( γ ν ότε κοί \gamma ν \omega όκιτε \). Metzger, Textual Commentary, 198.
and the imperfective aspect marker -zhe (with a disyllabic verb) to reflect the more heavily marked imperfective aspect signaled by the latter, as (6g) illustrates.

Auxiliary verbs are often employed to express volition and contingency in Mandarin, and therefore are appropriate additions to translate the subjective mood in Greek. Table 5.1 contains a list of commonly used auxiliary verbs in Mandarin.
Table 5.1. List of commonly used auxiliary verbs in Mandarin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Pinyin</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>巴不得</td>
<td>bàbúde</td>
<td>earnestly wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>必/必要/必須/必定</td>
<td>bì/biyào/bixū/bīnèng/bìng</td>
<td>must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>得/得以</td>
<td>děi/déyi</td>
<td>be able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>得</td>
<td>děi</td>
<td>must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>敢</td>
<td>gǎn</td>
<td>dare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>好/好使/好讓</td>
<td>hǎo/hǎoshǐ/hǎoràng</td>
<td>may, so that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>恨不得/恨不能</td>
<td>hènbúde/hènbunèng</td>
<td>earnestly wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>會</td>
<td>huì</td>
<td>will, can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>將/將要</td>
<td>jiāng/jiāngyào</td>
<td>will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>叫</td>
<td>jiào</td>
<td>let</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>肯</td>
<td>kěn</td>
<td>be willing to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>可能</td>
<td>kěnèng</td>
<td>can, be possible to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>可/可以</td>
<td>kě/kěyì</td>
<td>can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>來</td>
<td>lái</td>
<td>let, come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>樂得</td>
<td>lèdé</td>
<td>be only too glad to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>樂意</td>
<td>lèyi</td>
<td>be willing to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>免不了</td>
<td>miànbùláo</td>
<td>be unavoidable to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>能/能夠</td>
<td>néng/nénggòu</td>
<td>can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>企圖</td>
<td>qítú</td>
<td>attempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>讓</td>
<td>ràng</td>
<td>let, allow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>容易</td>
<td>róngyì</td>
<td>be likely to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>使</td>
<td>shǐ</td>
<td>let, make, can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>望不能</td>
<td>wàngbunèng</td>
<td>earnestly wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>務要</td>
<td>wùyào</td>
<td>must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>想</td>
<td>xiǎng</td>
<td>suppose, want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>希望</td>
<td>xīwàng</td>
<td>wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>要/必要/必</td>
<td>yào/biyào/bì</td>
<td>want, will, must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>宜</td>
<td>yí</td>
<td>should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>應/應當/當/應該/該</td>
<td>yīng/yīngdāng/dāng/yīnggài/gāi</td>
<td>should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>欲</td>
<td>yù</td>
<td>desire, wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>願/願意</td>
<td>yuàn/yuànyì</td>
<td>want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>足以</td>
<td>zúyì</td>
<td>be sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1.2. Negated Subjunctive and Prohibitions

While prohibitions in Greek occur in all moods, they occur more often in the present imperative and aorist subjunctive. Traditional grammarians explain the difference between the present imperative and aorist subjunctive by *Aktionsart*: the former denotes
the stopping of an action already in process, whereas the latter conveys a sense of “do not start” performing an action.\textsuperscript{28} As Jannaris has pointed out, the imperative in prohibitions eventually disappeared from current use in the later development of Greek.\textsuperscript{29} Although translations of negated imperatives and negative subjunctives used as prohibitions “can be virtually identical” in English, as Porter notes, they need not be so in Mandarin.\textsuperscript{30} The present tense-form is more heavily marked than the aorist in the subjunctive mood, thus, it should be rendered with the equivalent aspect morpheme in Mandarin. (7) and (8) illustrate:

(7) \textit{μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σοῦ ὀμόσης} (Matt 5:36)

(a) 勿指親首發誓 (DV, GO, GÜ, BB, SJ, UVB)\textsuperscript{31}

\textit{Wù zhī qīn shǒu fāshì.}

Do not point to your head and swear.

(b) 母指闊首而誓 (WV, GURY, BCV, UVW, UVB, UVE)\textsuperscript{32}

\textit{Wù zhī ěr shǒu ěr shì.}


\textsuperscript{29} Jannaris, \textit{Historical Greek Grammar}, §§1918–19.

\textsuperscript{30} Porter, \textit{Idioms}, 221.

\textsuperscript{31} GÜ has \textit{wú shī zhī shǒu} 勿誓指首 (“do not swear by pointing your head”); BB has \textit{wú zhī ěr zhī shǒu ěr shì} 又勿指頭之首而誓 (“also, do not point your head and swear”).

\textsuperscript{32} GURY has \textit{wú zhǐ ji shǒu shì} 母誓指己誓 (“do not point to your own head and swear”); the BCV has \textit{yòu wú zhǐ ěr shǒu ěr shì} 又母指頭而誓 (“also, do not point to your head and swear”); the UVB and UVE have \textit{wú} 勿 (“not”) instead of \textit{wú} 毋.
Do not point to your head and swear.

(c) 他又不可指著你的頭來起誓 (LÜ, UV, JOHNM, WANG, NCV, TCV, CLB, SB, CRV, MOR)

You  búkē zhī-zhe nǐ de tóu lái qishì.

Do not point to your head and swear.

(d) 他又指著你的頭起誓 (PK)

You  búxū zhī-zhe nǐ de tóu qishì.

You are not permitted to point to your head and swear.

(e) 你更不要指著你的頭起誓 (CPB)

Nǐ gèng  bùyào zhī-zhe nǐ de tóu fāshì.

You will not point to your head and swear.

(8) µ̣νυετε (Jas 5:12)

(a) 总须戒誓 (GÜ)

Zōng xū jiè fāshì.

You must restrain from swearing at all times.

(b) 勿誓。 (GO, BCV, UVW)

Wù fāshì.

Do not swear.

(c) 不要...起誓。 (CPB)

Bùyào...qishì.

Do not swear.

---

33 The NCV, TCV, and SB have fāshì ("swear") instead of qishì. MOR has yòu èr  bù kěyǐ zhī èr shǒu èr fāshì 又爾不可指爾守誓 ("neither can you [point] to your head and swear").

34 The UVW has wú zhī zhī èr shì 毋指之誓 ("do not point to it and swear").
(d) 切莫宣誓 (WV)

Qiè mò xuānshì.

Do not ever make an oath.

(e) 凡最繁之事勿发誓 (MAR)

Fán zui jīn zhī shì wù shìshì.

The most important thing is not to swear.

(f) 至要者乃毋发誓 (GURY)

Zhiyào zhě nǎi wù fāshì.

The most important thing is not to swear.

(g) 最要緊的、是不可起誓 (PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, NCV, SB, CRV, BB, TCV) 35

Zuí yàojǐn de, shì bùkē qīshì.

The most important thing is not to swear.

(h) 問起誓了。 (LÜ)

Bié qīshì le.

Stop swearing.

(i) 千萬不可起誓 (CLB)

Qiān-wàn-bù-kě qīshì.

Never ever swear.

(j) 不要再這樣發誓下去了。 (FOLEY)

Bùyào zài zhèyàng fāshì-xiàqù le.

35 BB has it in the wenli style: zuí yàozhí, bùkē qīshì 最要者，不可起誓 (“most important is not to swear”).
Do not go on swearing.

The Chinese versions in (7a–e) all render the aorist subjective ὅμωσης in Matt 5:36 with the ο morpheme. They differ only in the choice of words for negation (italics) and for the act of swearing (highlighted in bold). In the case of the present subjunctive ὁμνύετε in Jas 5:12, Chinese versions in (8a–i), without exception, render it with the ο morpheme. Here, the difference between versions is not limited to merely the choice of words. (8a) and (8e–g) are not preferable because they do not translate ὁμνύετε as a prohibition in Chinese. McKay has pointed out that the aorist subjunctive in Matthew’s account denotes that Jesus is “dramatizing a new command, not just to limit swearing, but not to swear at all,” as opposed to the present subjunctive in the James passage, where the apostle is “giving without contrast a mild series of exhortations to ὕδελφοι μου ‘my brother, don’t be in the habit of swearing.’”36 McKay’s assertion reflects the traditional understanding of the difference between the aorist and present subjective in terms of “do not start swearing” versus “stop swearing.” In fact, the present tense-form in the subjunctive mood, as Porter notes, indicates the conscious aspectual choice of emphasizing the importance of not swearing.37

The foregrounding use of the present tense-form in Greek applies to the subjunctive mood. However, such use cannot be reflected in Mandarin by a two-morpheme aspect compound since zài cannot be used in commands. The translator does have the option of choosing between the formally unmarked (ο morpheme) and marked (IDVCs), as xiàqù

37 Porter, Verbal Aspect, 353.
in (8j) illustrates. The latter choice is preferable because it morphologically differentiates the present and aorist subjunctive forms in Greek.

5.2.2. Optative

The optative mood, as Gonda remarks, “enables the speaker to introduce elements of visualization and contingency, the latter being...the main character of this mood.” In addition to contingency, Moule adds that the optative mood conveys a sense of “remoter, vaguer, less assured in tone.” In independent clauses, the Greek optative mood occurs less frequently than other moods in the New Testament, however, its primary use of expressing volition (e.g. mild or modest assertion of command) and potentiality is found in stereotyped phrases, such as μὴ γένοιτο in (9). The optative mood is often translated by auxiliary verbs in Chinese. Its functions in subordinate clauses will be discussed in 5.4.

38 Gonda continues, “he visualizes this process as non-actual: it is possible, or it is wished for, or desirable, or generally advisable or recommended.” Gonda, Moods, 51–52; see also 47–67. Porter follows Gonda, labeling the optative mood as [+contingency] in addition to [+projection]. Porter, Verbal Aspect, 322; Porter, Idioms, 60.
39 Moule, Idiom Book, 23. The idea of remoteness was noted earlier by Babbitt, that the optative mood may be characterized “as a more remote subjunctive.” Babbitt, Grammar, §557.
41 Mandilaras observes that, in papyri, γένοιτο is utilized in the closing of a prayer or a charm to express volition, whereas (ὁ) μὴ γένοιτο and ὃ μὴ εἴη are used parenthetically in a “formula of wish or prayer to avert disaster.” See Mandilaras, Verb, §629, §632.
42 See, e.g. Wang, Treatise, vol. 1, 140–53.
5.2.2.1. Volitive

a. Aorist Optative

(9) μὴ γένοιτο· (Rom 3:4)

(a) 非也 (MAR, GÜ, DV, BCV, GO, GURY, JOHN, SJ)

Fēi yē.

No!

(b) 無是理也！ (WV)

Wú shì lǐ yē!

There is no such thing!

(c) 斷乎不能 (PK, JOHN, BB, UV, WANG, LÜ, SB)

Duàn-hū-bù-néng.

Absolutely not.

(d) 絕不可能！ (NCV, CRV)

Jué bù kěnéng!

Absolutely impossible.

(e) 絕對不會！ (CSB)

Juéduì bù huì!

Definitely not!

(f) 當然不會！ (CLB, TCV, CPB)

Dāngrán bù huì!

Of course not!

---

43 For another example of the aorist optative, see the discussion on ἐπὶ τοῦχοι in 1 Cor 15:37.

44 The CRV has juéduì bùnéng 絕對不能！ (“Absolutely impossible!”)

45 The TCV omits hui.
(g) 可能不是！ (FOLEY)

KENÉNG BÙ SHI!

Probably not!

The set phrase μη γένοιτο in (9) accounts for fifteen occurrences of the optative mood in the New Testament, fourteen of which are found in the Pauline Epistles. This expression has in fact survived in Modern Greek. Many traditional grammarians believe that the best translation of μη γένοιτο is found in the sense described by the KJV: “God forbid!” Other grammarians, however, have also suggested, “let it not happen” or “may it not happen” or “may it never be.” Considering the less heavily marked aorist tense-form, it is clear that μη γένοιτο does not have added emphasis, at least grammatically speaking.

Back in the early eighteenth century, Varo noted that auxiliary verbs, such as bābude (“earnestly wish”) or yuàn (“wish”), are used to express the optative mood in Mandarin. Obviously, bābude would not work in (9), whereas yuàn or dànyuàn might be appropriate. A century before Varo published his Mandarin grammar, Ricci used the expression wù yī

46 Mandilaras, Verb, §629. Pring gives the definition “God forbids!” See Pring, Pocket Oxford Greek Dictionary, s.v.
47 See, for example, Green, Handbook, 313; Burton, Syntax, §177; Robertson, Grammar, 939; Machen, New Testament Greek, §550; Machen and McCartney, New Testament Greek (2d ed.), §592; BDF, §384; Boyer, “Classification of Optatives,” 130–31; Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 464; Young, Intermediate New Testament Greek, 141.
48 Goodwin, Greek Grammar, §1322; Chamberlain, Exegetical Grammar, 211; Porter, Idioms, 60.
49 Varo, Arte, 121. Varo is followed by many other Chinese grammarians of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, who add hēnbude, hēnbuméng, and wàngbunéng to the list of auxiliaries used to express the optative mood in Mandarin. See Bayer et al., Museum Sinicum, 27–28; Gützlaff, Notices, 78–79; de Prémare and Rémusat, Notitia Linguae Sinicae, 42, 46, 49; Rémusat, Éléments, 138–39; Bazin, Grammaire Mandarine, 46; Mateer, Course, vol. 2, 387–90; Edkins, Grammar, 194; Lobscheid, Grammar, vol. 1, 75; Courant, Grammaire, 300.
("Wrong!") as a rhetorical question in his apologetic work T'ien-chu Shih-i. 50

Interestingly, a very similar term, fēi yě, is used in most of the wenli versions (9a).

All the examples render the aorist optative with the ø morpheme. Most of the wenli versions render it simply with the negative particle fēi with the post-sentential modal particle yě. (9a) is inappropriate because fēi alone does not express the contingency called for by the optative mood. (9b), on the other hand, uses shì ("be"), which corresponds to the lexical meaning of γίνομαι, but not to that of the optative mood. (9c–f) are better translations because they employ auxiliary verbs such as něng, kěněng, and huì. However, the forceful tones added by adverbs such as duànzhū ("certainly"), jué/juéduì ("absolutely"), and dāngrán ("surely") as well as the modal particle yě in (9a–f) are inappropriate to render the less heavily marked feature of the aorist tense-form. The solution may be found by using the auxiliary verb kěněng without the added expressions of emphasis in order to express contingency and the less heavily marked feature of the aorist optative, as (9g) illustrates.

b. Present Optative

The present optative is less common in the New Testament; most examples are from Acts. Here, the present tense-form in the optative expresses the imperfective aspect as it does in the indicative, imperative, and subjunctive moods. (10) illustrates:

(10) τί ἐὰν θελῶι ὁ στρομολόγος οὗτος λέγειν; (Acts 17:18)

(a) 這個胡亂拉扯的想妥說甚麼？ (Lű, CRV) 51

Zhège húluàn lāchē de xiāngyào shuō shénme?

50 Ricci, T'ien-chu Shih-i, 436, line 564. Wūhū! Zi yì shì wéi píng shí hū? Wù yīl. 哎呀！子以是為平世乎？漢矣。 ("Alas! Do you think that we are living in the time of peace? Wrong!" [my translation]).

51 The CRV has Zhè húyánluànyū de xiāngyào shuō shénme? 這胡言亂語的想妥說甚麼？ ("This babbler—what does [he] want to say?").
What does this babbler wish to say?

(b) 这胡言乱语的人、要说甚麽 (PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, NCV)

Zhè húyánluànyǔ de rén, yào shuō shénme.

This babbler—what does [he] want to say?

(c) 這個饒舌多言的人、愈說什麼？ (SB, CPB)

Zhège ráoshé duòyán de rén, xiǎng shuō shénme?

This chatterbox—what does [he] want to say?

(d) 這個走江湖的在胡吹些什麼？ (TCV)

Zhège zǒu jiānghú de zài húchuī xiē shénme?

What is this vagrant babbling about?

(e) · · · 又在打算著什麼話說？ (FOLEY)

...yòu zài dǎsuàn-zhe shénme huà shuō?

...what is he trying to say now?

(10) is an example of the Greek catenative construction (θेलω + infinitive). As represented in (10a–c), most Mandarin versions use the auxiliary verbs xiǎngyào, xiǎng, or yào with the ṣ morpheme to translate the present optative θेलωi. (10d), on the other hand, uses the imperfective aspect marker zài, but without an auxiliary verb; húchuī (“babble”) alone does not convey the contingency of the optative mood. It is difficult to translate the more heavily marked feature of the present tense-form because auxiliary

---

52 The UV and WANG lack rén 人 (“person”); the NCV adds the interrogative particle ne 呢 (Zhège shirényàhuì de rén yào shuō shénme ne? 這個偷人牙慧的人要說甚麼呢？lit. “What does this one who steals others’ ideas wish to say?”).
53 The CPB has Zhège zǒu jiānghú de xiǎng shuō shénme? 這個走江湖的想說什麼？ (“What is this vagrant wish to say?”).
54 See, for example, Porter, Idioms, 197–98.
verbs in Chinese cannot take the imperfective aspect morphemes. A possible solution—in this case—is to use a Chinese verb that is not an auxiliary verb, as *dāsuàn* ("intend") in (10e) illustrates. In (10e), the two-morpheme aspect compound *zài...zhe* is used in order to reflect the more heavily marked present tense-form in Greek. Because the verb *dāsuàn* semantically overlaps with auxiliary verbs such as *xiàngyào, xiàng, or yào*, it does not need an auxiliary verb for expressing volition or contingency. However, in contexts where *dāsuàn* cannot be used for stylistic reasons, auxiliary verbs may be used instead.

### 5.2.2.2. Potential

The potential use of the optative mood often occurs with the particle *ěv*. (11) illustrates:

(11) εὐδέξαιμην ἔν τῷ θεῷ (Acts 26:29)

(a) 我祷告上帝 (LÜ)

Wǒ dāogào Shàngdì.

I pray to God.

(b) 我向神所求的 (UV, WANG, TCV, NCV, CRV)

Wǒ xiàng Shén suǒ qióu de.

What I am asking of God is....

(c) 我求上帝 (PK, JOHN, CLB)

---

55 See, for example, Hong, *Auxiliary*, 5. For discussions of the optative mood in Chinese, see Lü and Zhu, *Syntax*, 79–81; Li and Thompson, *Grammar*, 173.

56 Lü notes that *dāsuàn* can take aspect morphemes such as *-le, -zhe, -guo*, and verb reduplication. Lü 劉叔湘, 800 *Phrases*, 139.

57 This usage accounts for 43% of all occurrences in the New Testament. Porter, *Idioms*, 60. For examples used in papyri, see Mayser, *Grammatik*, vol. 2, part 1, 292; Mandilaras, *Verb*, §§638–47.

58 The CLB adds *dōu* 都 ("also") in front of the verb *qiú*. 

Wǒ qíú Shànghǎi.
I ask God.

(d) 我總是望天主 (SB, CPB)\(^{59}\)
Wǒ zōng qíwàng Tiānzhǔ.
I always pray that God....

(e) 予向天主祈求禱者 (WV)
Yú xiàng Tiānzhǔ xīn-xiāng-dāo-zhù zhē.
I pray earnestly to God....

(f) 余向神實願 (MOR, MAR)\(^{60}\)
Yú xiàng shén shíyuàn.
I pray to God.

(g) 我得以祈望神 (FOLEY)
Wǒ déyǐ qíwàng Shén.
I might pray to God....

The Chinese versions cited in (11a–f) share two features: they do not use auxiliary verbs to render the potential use of the optative mood in Greek, and they use the \(\emptyset\) morpheme for the aorist tense-form. They differ in their choice of words for the Greek verb \(\epsilon\upupsilon\chi\omicron\sigma\iota\alpha\) (“to pray”). (11a) employs the word most commonly used in Chinese Christian contexts, \(dāogào\) (“pray”). It should be noted, however, that the syntax of the expression \(wǒ dāogào Shànghǎi\) does not sound natural to native speakers. It may be rephrased as \(wǒ xiàng Shànghǎi dāogào\), with the additional preposition \(xiàng\) (“toward”)

---

\(^{59}\) The CPB has \(zhī\) \(restriction\) (“only”) instead of \(zōng\).

\(^{60}\) MAR uses the first person singular pronoun \(wú\) \(I\) instead of \(yú\).
as in (11b) and (11e). In the case of qiwàng ("hope earnestly") in (11d), however, the
preposition xiàng is not necessary. Furthermore, the verbs qiwàng and shiyuàn are
synonymous with dàogào, however, the same does not extend to qióu and xīn-xiāng-dào-
zhù. Qióu ("ask") is not preferable for the translation of εὐχομαι since it does not
necessarily express the idea of praying. Also, the addition of the particle de to the end of
qióu in (11b) does not express the contingency of the Greek optative mood. As for xīn-
 xiāng-dào-zhù, it is a four-character set phrase used metaphorically to mean “to long
anxiously” in secular contexts. The problem with this idiomatic expression lies in its
literal meaning, “burn incense and pray [to the gods],” which connotes pagan worship.
The potential use of the Greek aorist optative may be rendered by the auxiliary verb déyi
and the more neutral word qiwàng with the ø morpheme, as (11g) illustrates.

5.3. Infinitives and Participles

5.3.1. Infinitives

5.3.1.1. Substantive Use

The Greek infinitive is often called a verbal substantive or verbal noun (nominal verb
form), similar to the participle (see discussions in 5.4 below). This section discusses the
three main uses of the infinitive: substantive (5.3.1.1–5.3.1.4), modifier (5.3.1.5–5.3.1.6),
and predicate (5.3.1.7). When used as a substantive, the infinitive may appear either with

---

61 See Curtius, Greek Verb, 338; Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar, §2063; Goodwin, Syntax, §§741–42;
Moulton, Prolegomena, 202–03; Gildersleeve, Syntax, §§313–26; Robertson, Grammar, 1051–95; Nunn,
Short Syntax, 12–13; Chamberlain, Exegetical Grammar, 104–09; Smyth and Messing, Greek Grammar,
§358; Dana and Mantey, Manual Grammar, 208, 217–20; Brooks and Winbery, Syntax, 120; Rijksbaron,
Syntax (1st ed.), 97; Porter, Idioms, 194–203; Caragounis, Development, 169. Goodwin and many others
also add that the infinitive was originally the dative (or the locative) of a noun, however, later on it came to
be used for the accusative. Gildersleeve, “Contributions to the History,” 6–9; Gildersleeve, “Articular
Infinitive,” 195–97; Goodwin, Syntax, §742; Burton, Syntax, §361; Moulton, Prolegomena, 202;
Sonnenschein, Syntax, §525.
(articular) or without an article (anarthrous). As (12) illustrates, a substantive infinitive frequently functions as the subject of the sentence:

(12) τὸ ζῆν Χριστός καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κερδός (Phil 1:21)

(a) 活著就是基督，死去也是得著。 (LÜ)

_Huó-zhe_ jiùshì Jīdū, sī-qu yēshì yìngdé.

To live is Christ; to die is gain.

(b) 我若活著，是為基督。我若死了，也與我有益。 (PK)

_Wō ruò huó-zhe_, shiwéi Jīdū. _Wō ruò sī-le_, yē yǔ wǒ yǒuyì.

If I live, I live for Christ. If I die, it is for my benefit.

(c) 我活著就是基督，我死了就有益處。 (UV, WANG, TCV, NCV, CRV, CPB)

_Wō huó-zhe jiùshì Jīdū, wǒ sī-le jiù yǒu yìchù._

I live for Christ; there is benefit when I die.

(d) 我活著是為基督。死也與我有益。 (JOHN)

_Wō huó-zhe_ shiwéi Jīdū. _Sì yē yǔ wǒ yǒuyì._

I live for Christ. Death is beneficial to me.

(e) 生活原是基督，死亡乃是利益。 (SB)

_Shēnghuó_ yuánshì Jīdū, sīwáng nàishi lìyì.

---

62 Most grammarians believe that the anarthrous infinitive does not differ in meaning from the articular infinitive. Jannaris, _Historical Greek Grammar_, §2071; Gildersleeve, _Syntax_, §§327–28; Robertson, _Grammar_, 1063; Dana and Mantey, _Manual Grammar_, 211–14; Turner, _Syntax_, 140; Porter, _Idioms_, 194. Others note the functional distinction between the two infinitives. Winer, for example, observes that the article makes the infinitive more prominent. Winer, _Treatise_, 406. Burton also notes that “the prefixing of the article to the infinitive tends to the *sic* obscuring of its original dative force, while it emphasizes its new substantive character as a noun which can be used in any case.” Burton, _Syntax_, §392. See also Burk, who identifies the article as a function marker. Burke, _Articular Infinitives_, 27–46.

63 For treatment of substantive infinitives as the object of the sentence, see 5.3.1.2–5.3.1.3, pp. 245–50 below.
Life is Christ; death is gain.

(12a–d) render the present infinitive τὸ ζην by huō-zhe with the aspect marker -zhe, which reflects the imperfective aspect of the Greek present tense-form. (12b), however, renders the infinitive construction with a conditional clause indicated by the particle ruò (“if”). This is not preferable because the original Greek does not necessarily warrant such conditional interpretation. The second verbal construction, τὸ ἀποθανεῖν, is translated as sf-qu in (12a) and sf-le in (12b–c). Both are good translations because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect signaled by the Greek aorist infinitive.

Although the φ morpheme in (12d) is an acceptable translation of the aorist tense-form, the two Mandarin verbs, huō-zhe and sf, are asymmetrical and do not render adequately the parallel construction of the two Greek infinitives. (12e), on the other hand, renders both infinitives with the φ morpheme, yet it does not translate the more heavily marked present tense-form of the Greek verb ζάω. In summary, -zhe is the most appropriate translation for the present infinitive, whereas RVCs or -le are the most preferable translation for the aorist infinitive, as (12a) and (12c) illustrate.

5.3.1.2. Complements

The Greek infinitive may occur as the complement of a verb.64 The aorist infinitive in (13), δοκιμάσαι, functions as the completive (or object) of the previous verb, προέμοια:

(13) ζεύγη βοῶν ἡγόρασα πέντε καὶ προέμοια δοκιμάσαι σούτα (Luke 14:19)

(a) 我买了五对牛，要去试试 (LÜ, JOHNM, SB, CLB)65

---

64 Radermacher, Neutestamentliche Grammatik, 183–85; BDF, §392; Mandilaras, Verb, §793; Porter, Idioms, 196–97.

65 SB adds tāmen 牠們 (“them”).
Wǒ mǎi-le wǔ duì niú, yào qu shì-shi.

I bought five yoke of oxen, and I am going to try [them] out.

(b) 要去試一試 (PK, UV, CRV)

...yào qu shì-yī-shi.

...I am going to give them a try.

(c) 剛要去試一試 (TCV)

...gāng yào qu shì-yī-shi.

...I was just about to go and try them out.

(d) 必須去看看 (WANG)

...bǐxū qu kàn-kăn.

...I must go and take a look.

(e) 我先過去試試 (FOLEY)

... Wǒ xiān guòqù shì-shí.

...I am going there to try them out.

All cited Mandarin versions use verb reduplication to express the perfective aspect of the aorist infinitive. As noted in chapter 3, shì-shí (“give a try,” lit. “try-try”) does not differ from shì-yī-shí (lit. “try-one-try”) in meaning. Examples (13a–c) employ an auxiliary verb, yào, to indicate a future event, but not without problem. Yào is also used to convey volition of a locutionary agent and to translate the Greek optative mood. Similarly, the auxiliary verb bǐxū in (13d) is not a preferable translation for the present indicative προπέμψαν. It is, therefore, more appropriate to leave out the auxiliary verb yào in order to avoid possible confusion with the Mandarin translation of the Greek
optative mood. When used as a complement of a verb, the aorist infinitive may be translated by verb reduplication, as (13e) illustrates.

5.3.1.3. Indirect Discourse

The infinitive frequently occurs as the object of a verb of perception to convey indirect speech, as (14) illustrates. 66

(14) πολλάκις προεθέμην ἔλθειν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (Rom 1:13)

(a) 我屡次立志要到你們那裏去 (PK, JOHNM, LÜ, SB, NCV) 67

Wǒ lǚcì lìzhǐ yào dào nǐmen nà lǐ qu.

Several times I am determined to come to you.

(b) 往你們那裏去 (UV, WANG, CLB, CRV, CSB)

....wǎng nǐmen nà lǐ qù.

....to go to you.

(c) 去問你們 (TCV)

....fāngwèn nǐmen.

....to visit you.

(d) 來拜訪你們 (CPB)

....lái bàifǎng nǐmen.

....to come visit you.

(14b) uses the monosyllabic verb qù (“go”) with the ὑ morpheme, which is preferable to the disyllabic verbs used in (14c–d) for the perfective aspect of the aorist infinitive.

---


67 LÜ and SB have yào wǎng nǐmen nà lǐ qù (“I want to go to you”).
The addition of yào in (14a) detracts from the translation since auxiliary verbs are largely reserved for the translation of Greek subjunctive or optative moods into Mandarin. (14d) adds the verb lái (“come”) to the disyllabic verb bàifǎng (“visit”) for ἔλθειν. This translation is also not preferable as such an addition does not reflect the less heavily marked feature of the Greek aorist tense-form.

The perfect infinitive occurring in direct discourse deserves special attention, particularly with respect to its discourse function as a frontgrounding device. (15) illustrates:

(15) δοκῇ τις ἔματι ὑπερηφάνει (Heb 4:1)

(a) 你们中间有人被断为赶上来的。 (LÜ)

Nǐmen zhōngjiān yǒurén bèi duàn wéi gǎn-bù-shàng de.

Perhaps some among you are thought to be those who are unable to catch up.

(b) 似乎是赶不上了。 (UV, WANG, CRV)

…sīhū shí gǎn-bù-shàng le.

…seem not to be catching up.

(c) 似乎是被淘汰了。 (NCV)

…xiāngshí bèi tǎotài le.

…seem to be eliminated.

(d) 被遗留下来了。 (CPB)

…bèi yìliú-xiàlái.

…were left behind.

(e) 被认为是失败了。 (TCV)

…bèi rènwéi shī shībài-le....
...were regarded as if [they] failed....

(f) ...有得不著的人。 (PK, JOHNM)

...yǒu dé-bù-zháo de rén.

...there are people who did not receive.

(g) ...得不到安息 (SB)

...dé-bu-dào ānxí.

...cannot attain rest.

(h) ...失去他的福分。 (CLB)

...shìqù tā de fúfēn.

...he missed out on his blessings.

(i) ...似乎是姗姗来迟了。 (FOLEY)

...sīhū shì shān-shān-lái-chí le.

...seem to be coming too late.

The perfect infinitive, ὑστερηκέναι ("come too late," "fail to reach"), serves as a complement or an object of the verb δοκῇ ("seem"). While (15a) and (15b) both use gàn-bu-shàng ("can not catch up"), the former employs the substantive particle de, whereas the latter uses the sentential-final particle le. The perfective morpheme, namely the RVC shàng in (15a–b), is not preferable because it does not reflect the stative aspect of the Greek. For the same reason, the RVCs used in examples (15d) and (15f–h) as well as the perfective aspect marker -le in (15e) are also less than ideal translations. The passive construction signaled by bèi in (15c) and (15d) does not correspond to the active

---

68 Kittel, Friedrich, and Bromiley, *Theological Dictionary*, vol. 8, 596–97; BDAG, s.v. BDAG notes that δοκῇ in Heb 4:1 is used "as an expression serving to moderate a statement." BDAG, 255.
voice of the Greek, a representation of which is imperative when translating into Mandarin. A four-character set phrase with the φ morpheme, shān-shān-lái-chi, closely corresponds to the stative aspect and discourse role of frontgrounding performed by the Greek perfect infinitive, as (15i) illustrates. 69

5.3.1.4. Catenative Constructions

An example of catenative construction of the infinitive has already been observed in (10), where the present infinitive λέγειν is used as a complement or object of the verb θέλω. 70

5.3.1.5. Appositional/Epexegetical

As Robertson has observed, there exists no essential difference between the so-called appositional and epexegetical uses of the infinitive. 71 Both exemplify the use of the infinitive as a modifier, as Porter states, “specifying or defining the modified element.” 72

(16) illustrates this use of the infinitive with τοῦ: 73

(16) ὁ ψειλέται ἔσσεν οὔ τῇ σαρκί τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζην. (Rom 8:12)

(a) 我們並不是欠肉體的債，去順從肉體活著。 (UV, WANG, CRV)

We are not indebted to the flesh, to live according to the flesh.

(b) • • • 去順著肉體活的。 (LÜ)

---

70 For other examples of catenative constructions, see John 18:32; I Cor 15:25, 51, 53.
73 For an example of the use of the infinitive as modifier of the substantive, see the discussion on John 19:40 in my chapter 6.
...qù shùnzhe ròutì huó de.

...living according to the flesh.

(c) · · · 岂可順從情欲作事 (PK, JOHN)74

...qì kē shùncóng qíngyù zuòshì.

...how could [we] act according to sexual passion?

(d) · · · 以致隨從肉性生活。 (SB)

...yǐzhì gāi suícóng ròu xìng shènghuó.

...so that [we] should live according to the flesh.

(e) · · · 隨著肉體而活。 (NCV, CLB, CSB)75

...suízhe ròutì ér huó.

...to live according to the flesh.

(f) · · · 不要受肉性之慾的控制。 (CPB, TCV)76

...bùyào shòu ròuxìng zhī yù de kòngzhì.

...do not be dictated by lust.

(g) · · · 也就是說，去順從肉體而活著。 (FOLEY)

...yě jiǔshì shūō, qù shùncóng ròutì ér huó-zhe.

...that is to say, to live according to the flesh.

The construction qù...huó-zhe (lit. “go...live”) in (16a) translates the present infinitive, but does not adequately render τοῦ ζητείν as the modifier of the verb ἐσπέρ in the same sentence. (16b) renders the infinitive the same way, except it uses the substantive particle

74 JOHN rearranges the word order to add emphasis to the verb zuòshì: zuòshì qì dāng shùncóng qíngyù zuòshì ("...how could [we] act according to sexual passion?

75 The CLB has yìcóng zuíde běnxìng ér huó ("...to live according to sinful nature").

76 The TCV has déi shòu běnxìng de zhīpèi ("might be governed by natural instinct").
de and the ø morpheme instead of the imperfective aspect marker -zhe. The use of de in (16b) is preferable, for it indicates qù...huó as the modifier of the previous verb. The problem in (16b), as well as in (16c–e), is the ø morpheme, which does not convey the more heavily marked feature of the present infinitive. Other examples are unsuitable for syntactic considerations. (16c) and (16d) are not recommended because the former renders the infinitive with a rhetorical question, whereas the latter renders the infinitive with a result clause. Similarly, (16f) is to be rejected for it inappropriately turns the infinitive construction into a command. All these problems can be solved by adding a clarifying phrase, yé jiùshi shuò (“that is to say”), in order to convey the appositional or epexegetical use of the infinitive. As for the present infinitive, the imperfective aspect marker -zhe should be insisted upon for the verb huó (“live”), and the construction qù...ér should be employed for the sake of style and clarity, (16g) illustrates.

5.3.1.6. Purpose or Result

The Greek infinitive is quite commonly used to express purpose (final) or result in the New Testament. It is frequently, though not always, introduced by ὑοτε, as (17) illustrates:

(17) ὑοτε κατακρημίσαι αὐτόν (Luke 4:29)

(a) 以殺之下來 (MOR, MAR)

Yì tóu zhī-xiàláí.

In order that [they] might throw him down.

(b) 欲殺之 (DV, GO, BCV, GURY, BB, SJ, UVW, WV)⁷⁸

---

Yu tui zhī-xià.
[They] want to throw him down.

(c) 摔倒下來 (GÜ)
Shuāi-dāo xiālái.
[They] caused [him] to fall down.

(d) 要推他下来 (PK, JOHNM)
Yào tui tā xiàqù.
[They] want to throw him down.

(e) 要把他推下 (UV, WANG, LÜ, SB, TCV, CLB, NCV, CRV, CPB)
Yào bā tā tui xiàqù.
[They] want to throw him down.

(f) 用意是把他推下 (FOLEY)
Yòngyì shì bā tā tuī-le xiàqù.
In order that [they] might throw him down.

The distinction between purpose and result expressed by the infinitive is difficult to make.\(^{80}\) While one wonders if such a distinction is necessary, (17) is clearly a purpose clause since the intended result was never realized. The two wenli versions in (17a) closely correspond to the purpose clause expressed by the infinitive. The suffix xiālái must be construed as simply an indication of downward movement as opposed to an IDVC. The same goes for the wenli versions in (17b–c). (17a) and (17b) both employ

---

\(^{78}\) The BCV and UVW have yù tōu zhī xià 欲授之下 ("they wanted to toss him down [the cliff]"); GURY reverses the word order (yù tui xià zhī); WV adds yá 崖 ("cliff") in front of xià.

\(^{79}\) The CPB uses xiàng instead of yào.

\(^{80}\) Burton construes the infinitive in Luke 4:29 as "purpose, i.e. intended result": "that they might throw him down headlong." Burton, Syntax, §371. See also Porter, Idioms, 200.
auxiliary verbs, yet the former is preferable because subjunctive communicates the intention of performing the action whereas expresses volition. For the same reason, (17d) and (17e) are also not preferable since these two examples are Mandarin equivalents of the wenli translation in (17b).\(^{81}\) (17c) differs from the other examples in its use of the RVC dāo, which reflects the perfective aspect conveyed by the aorist infinitive κατακρημίσας. It does not, however, express purpose. The purpose may be made explicit by adding the phrase yòngyì shì ("for the purpose that"), as (17f) illustrates. The perfective aspect marker -le is preferable to the o morpheme because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect signaled by the aorist infinitive.

5.3.1.7. Command

Finally, the infinitive is also used independently to command, though this particular usage occurs less frequently in the New Testament.\(^{82}\) (18) illustrates χαίρειν, a standard word of epistolary greeting in the Hellenistic period:\(^{83}\)

(18) χαίρειν (Jas 1:1)

(a) · · · 安 (SJ)

...ān.

Greetings to....

(b) 請 • • の安 (UV, MOR)\(^{84}\)

Qīng...de ān.

---

\(^{81}\) The expression with bā construction in (17e) is stylistically preferable to the one without it in (17d).


\(^{83}\) Mandilaras notes that, in papyri, χαίρειν often occurs after πλήσσα, πολλά, ἐν κυρίῳ, ἐν θεῷ, or ἐν κυρίῳ θεῷ. Mandilaras, *Verb*, §767.

\(^{84}\) MOR has zhī 之 instead of de.
Wish... best of health.

(c) 茲請安 (GÜ)

Zǐ qǐng‘ān.

Greetings.

(d) 請...安 (DV, GO, BCV, BB, PK, JOHNM, UVW, UVB, WANG)

Qǐng...ān.

Wish... best of health.

(e) 問...安 (GURY)

Wèn...ān.

Greetings to... .

(f) 與...問安 (MAR)

Yù... wèn‘ān.

Greetings to... .

(g) 向...問安 (NCV)

Xiàng... wèn‘ān.

Greetings to... .

(h) 給...請安 (LÜ)

Gěi... qǐng‘ān.

Greetings to... .

(i) 祝...安好 (SB)

Zhù... ānhǎo.

Wish... safe and sound!
With slight variations in form and meaning, (18a–i) share one distinctive feature: each example contains the word ān, which means “peace” or “well-being,” spiritually and physically. While all the examples are acceptable, only zī qīng’ān in (18c) is frequently used in Chinese traditional epistolary greetings. The remaining four examples, (18j–m), are clearly translations of the English “greetings,” and therefore are less preferable renderings of χαίρειν. In this case, where the present infinitive occurs in the stereotyped phrase for a designated purpose, it is not appropriate to add imperfective aspect markers in Mandarin. Therefore, zī qīng’ān with the ə morpheme is the most fitting translation of the Greek infinitive χαίρειν in epistolary greetings.
5.3.2. Participles

The participle plays a key role in the Greek verbal system. It is sometimes called a verbal adjective, analogous to the infinitive that is referred to by grammarians as a verbal noun. However, the participle also frequently functions as a substantive, adverb, and even as a verb. The differences in tense-forms of the participle are explained by aspect.

In translation, it is necessary to discuss the different uses of Greek participles, even though their syntactic nuances can only be expressed by lexical means in Mandarin. This section discusses the two grammatical constructions of the participles (5.3.2.1) and syntactical uses of the participles (5.3.2.2), which includes substantive, modifier of substantive, modifier of verb, commanding, and circumstantial/adverbial uses.

5.3.2.1. Grammatical Constructions of the Participles

a. Genitive Absolute

The participle may function as a finite verb when it occurs in the genitive absolute.

The genitive absolute in Greek is a grammatical construction, formed by participial phrases in the genitive case. “Absolute” refers to its characteristic loose connection to the main verb. In the New Testament (as well as in Greek non-literary papyri), such absolute constructions also occur in the nominative (e.g. δικυνω δησωμα αυτος, Rev 3:21)

---

85 Gildersleeve, Syntax, §329; Schwytzer, Griechische Grammatik, 385; Chamberlain, Exegetical Grammar, 96–97; Porter, Idioms, 181.
86 Porter, Verbal Aspect, 370, 78; Porter, Idioms, 187.
87 Nunn, Short Syntax, §35; Porter, Idioms, 183–84. Rijksbaron notes that the genitive absolute has no relation syntactically to a constituent of the main verb. Rijksbaron, Syntax (3d ed.), 116–17. See also Robertson, Grammar, 512–14, 1131–32; Dana and Mantey, Manual Grammar, 80–81. Chamberlain recognizes the use of the participle as a finite verb but does not include the genitive absolute. Chamberlain, Exegetical Grammar, 103–04. For reviews of previous studies, see Healey and Healey, “Greek Circumstantial Participles,” 182–89; Fuller, “‘Genitive Absolute’,” 146–51.
and accusative (e.g. τυχόν, 1 Cor 16:6) cases. Recently, Fuller presented a discourse analytic approach to the genitive absolute. She argues that the genitive absolute often serves as

a grammatical strategy for bringing an element of background information into prominence as a piece of necessary prior knowledge, and alerting the reader that this information is important for understanding the impact of the rest of the sentence or even the paragraph or discourse.

Fuller does not consider tense-forms of the genitive absolute, however, her argument concerning prominence in discourse is convincing. If one applies the notion of markedness of the Greek tense-forms to Fuller’s thesis, the perfect and present participles in genitive absolute constructions may signal even greater prominence than the aorist participle. (19) illustrates:

(19) σοῦ δὲ ποιοῦντος ἐλεημοσύνην μὴ γνώτω ἢ ἀριστερά σου τί ποιεῖ ἢ δεξιά σου (Matt 6:3)

(a) 你施捨的時候，不要叫左手知道右手所作的。 (UV, WANG, LÜ, NCV, CRV, CPB)

Ni shīshè de shíhòu, bùyào jiǎo zuǒshǒu zhīdào yòushǒu suǒ zuò de.

---

88 Kühner and Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik, 105–07; Robertson, Grammar, 1130; McKay, New Syntax, 64; BDR §§424, 466. Some grammarians recognize only the genitive and accusative absolute constructions. See, for example, Babbitt, Grammar, §§657–48; Stahl, Kritisch-historische Syntax, 714; Smyth and Messing, Greek Grammar, §2059; Duhoux, Verbe grec ancien, 308–10. Mandilaras notes that, in the papyri, the nominative absolute occurs more frequently than the genitive absolute. Mandilaras, Verb, §911. He also notes that the phrase θεοῦ θέλοντος occurred frequently in Christian papyri and pagan compositions. Mandilaras, Verb, §907.

89 Fuller, “‘Genitive Absolute,’” 152. Contra Boyer, who thinks that the genitive absolute is used arbitrarily; the construction “precedes the main clause, thus the word to which the participle refers would not yet be obvious to the hearer or reader.” Boyer, “Classification of Participles,” 170. Young, on the other hand, argues that the genitive absolute has “a discourse function at the beginning of paragraphs (or subparagraphs) to indicate a change in setting.” Young, Intermediate New Testament Greek, 159. Compare Buijs, who claims that in order to secure textual coherence (sic), the genitive absolute may be “inserted at the point where the speaker/narrator wishes to provide a hinge between two parts of his text without articulating a thematic boundary.” Buijs, Clause Combining, 182. Although the two positions can be seen as the two sides of a coin, I find Buijs’ conclusion more convincing than Young’s.

90 WANG and the CRV add dàn 但 (“but”) at the beginning of the clause; CPB has shì 時 instead shìhòu.
When you give alms, do not let your left hand know what your right hand does.

(b) 當你施捨時・・・ (SB)

Dāng nǐ shīshè shí...

When you give alms....

(c) 所以你施捨的時候・・・ (PK, JOHNM)

Suōyí nǐ shīshè de shīhòu...

Therefore, when you give alms....

(d) 當你在施濟布施的時候・・・ (FOLEY)

Dāng nǐ zài cījī-bùshī de shīhòu...

When you give alms....

The first three examples, (20a–c), are very similar. All render the genitive absolute construction with a relative clause, signaled by dāng...de shī(hòu) (“at times when...”). The relative pronoun dāng is not obligatory and is often omitted for stylistic reasons, as in (20a) and (20c). The conjunctive suōyí (“therefore”) in (20c) is unnecessary because it is absent in the Greek. Also, the ø morpheme, used in (20a–c), is a poor translation of the present participle in the genitive absolute construction because it is incapable of marking prominence in Mandarin discourse.

In order to represent the more heavily marked present tense-form in Greek, the imperfective aspect marker zài is needed. However, zài cannot be added to sentences in which the locative zài (zài...de shīhòu, “at the time when...”) is present. To remedy this,

---

91 JOHNM uses similar term shìjì 施濟 (“give alms”) for shīshè.
92 See example (30) in chapter 3.
a four-character phrase may be used to reflect the discourse prominence indicated by the markedness of the present tense-form and by the genitive absolute. As (20d) illustrates, the phrase *ciji-bùshī*, which is formed out of two synonymous expressions of almsgiving, closely resembles the more stereotyped four-character set phrases in their critical function of building frontgrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse. *Ciji-bùshī* is chosen here because *ciji* and *bùshī* are both currently used in religious contexts. *Bùshī*, in particular, appeared in the early seventh century Nestorian document called the *Lord of the Universe's Discourse on Almsgiving*, by Bishop Alopen.93

b. Periphrasis

Periphrastic constructions in Greek are formed grammatically by the copula (the auxiliary verb *εἰμί*) and a participle.94 Grammarians are divided over the meaning and motivation behind the use of participial periphrases. The once popular assertion (although it still persists) of Semitic or Aramaic interference no longer holds true.95 However, most grammarians believe that periphrasis generally does not differ semantically from the monolectic verb form. The question that is pertinent to Bible translation is whether there

---

93 For the Chinese text and an English translation with notes, see Saeki, *Nestorian Documents*, 206–47, Appendix 51–70. See chapter 2 of this dissertation above.

94 Periphrasis should not be confused with catenative constructions (*μέλλω/θέλω* + infinitive; see 5.3.1.4). In addition to *εἰμί*, many Greek grammarians also treat *γίνομαι*, *ἐχω*, and *υπάρχω* as parts of periphrasis. See, for example, Alexander, “Participial Periphrases,” 291–308; Robertson, *Grammar*, 374–76; Cooper and Krüger, *Attic Greek Prose Syntax*, vol. 1, 807–10; Rijksbaron, *Syntax* (3d ed.), 126–31. Caragounis even identifies *διατελέσθω* with the aorist participle in Acts 27:33 as a periphrasis, however, *διατελέσθω* μηθέν *προσλαβόμενοι*. Caragounis, *Development*, 176–78. For extensive treatment of periphrasis, see Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 447–78. For examples in papyri, see Mayser, *Grammatik*, vol. 2, part 1, 223–226.

is a clear distinction between periphrastic constructions and monolectic verb forms. Jannaris notes that Greek periphrasis has arisen from the need for “perspicuity, but partly also in phonopathic causes.” Several other grammarians follow Jannaris and have made similar remarks. However, not all periphrases are construed as emphatic or as mere substitutes for the monolectic verb forms, or, as some have asserted, alternatives to the adjective. As Porter argues, Greek periphrasis may not necessarily draw any attention to the participle and its modifiers. He states,

In those places in the verbal paradigm where simple forms have passed out of use (because of unwieldy morphological bulk, such as reduplication, long connecting vowels, secondary endings, large stems, etc.) the periphrastic could be called a substitute form. It is unmarked, since there is no other formal choice available...although choice of verbal aspect is still meaningful.

In Mandarin, periphrastic constructions do not exist as a grammatical category. However, in order to translate Greek periphrasis into Mandarin, a particular construction formed by the verb “to be” shì and the particle de might provide a good alternative.

Chinese grammarians, such as Lü and Wang, have pointed out that shì is often used in determinative sentences (判斷句) to add emphasis to the verb phrase. This observation has been reworked by Li and Thompson, who argue that the shì...de construction “serves

---

96 Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar, §687.
97 See, for example, Zerwick, who notes that the Greek periphrasis offers “stronger, more picturesque expression.” Zerwick, Biblical Greek, §360; Gonda, “to give more vivid or graphic description,” Gonda, “Remark on ‘Periphrastic’ Constructions,” 112; BDF, “rhetorically more forceful expression,” BDF, §§352–5; Caragounis, “essentially an attempt to emphasize the linearity of the action by using two words, rather than one,” Development, 375. Similarly, Black notes that periphrasis is “often used to highlight verbal aspect.” Black, Intermediate Greek, 109. See also Gildersleeve, Syntax, §287; McKay, New Syntax, 8–9. Contra Kahn, who asserts that the Greek periphrasis is “always formally and syntactically equivalent to monolectic verb form.” Kahn, Verb “Be,” 128.
98 See, for example, Alexander, “Participial Periphrases,” 307–08; Gildersleeve, Syntax, §§191, 285–93; Björck, ΗΝ ΑΙΩΝ, 17–40. For a critique of this position, see Porter, Verbal Aspect, 454.
99 Porter, Verbal Aspect, 453.
to characterize or explain a situation by affirming or denying some supposition, as opposed to simply reporting an event.\textsuperscript{101}

The following examples, (20) and (21), determine whether the shi...de construction would be suitable for rendering the Greek periphrasis. For the primary focus of the current study, only periphrases with \(\varepsilon\iota\mu\iota\) + present and perfect participles are examined. Other periphrases, including \(\varepsilon\iota\mu\iota\) + aorist participle and the future and subjunctive forms of \(\varepsilon\iota\mu\iota\), are not discussed, not only because they are less commonly used in the New Testament but also because their translation into Mandarin does not warrant separate discussions.\textsuperscript{102} There is one exception, namely the imperative form of \(\varepsilon\iota\mu\iota\) in \(\iota\sigma\theta\iota\ \varepsilon\xi\omega\sigma\iota\iota\varepsilon\ \varepsilon\chi\omega\nu\) (Luke 19:17). As Chao has pointed out, the shi...de construction does not occur in commands.\textsuperscript{103} In such cases, the periphrasis is best translated into Mandarin as a command, \textit{qù zhāngquán} (“go have authority”; see 5.1 above).

\textbf{a. Present Participle in Periphrasis}

(20) \(\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\ \delta\ \acute{\alpha}k\omega\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\zeta\varsigma\ \tilde{\eta}\sigma\sigma\nu\ \dot{o}\ \dot{t}\ \dot{i} \ \dot{\delta}i\dot{\iota}\kappa\omega\nu\ \hat{\iota}m\dot{a}\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\ \nu\nu\ \varepsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\dot{e}\zeta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \tilde{t} \ \tilde{t} \ \pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\ \hat{t}\ \nu\nu\ \pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\ \epsilon\pi\omicron\omicron\rho\omicron\theta\epsilon\iota\) (Gal 1:23)

(a) 不過聽說，那從前逼迫我們的，現在傳揚他原先所殺害的真道。 (UV, WANG, LÚ, NCV, CRV)

Bùguò \textbf{tìng shuō}, nà cōngqián bīpò wǒmen de, xiànzài chuányáng tā yuánxiān sǒu cànghài de zhēn dào.

But we hear that he who persecuted us before, now preaching the true gospel, which he had previously tried to destroy.

\textsuperscript{101} Italics are original. Li and Thompson, \textit{Grammar}, 589.
\textsuperscript{102} For other forms of periphrasis in the New Testament, see, for example, Robertson, \textit{Grammar}, 374–376; Porter, \textit{Idioms}, 46–49.
\textsuperscript{103} Chao, \textit{Grammar}, 669.
(b) 但風聞··· (PK)

Dàn fēngwén···

But we hear···

(c) 不過聽見··· (JOHN, TCV, CLB)

Bùguò tīng-jiàn···

But we have heard···

(d) 只是聽說過··· (SB, CPB)

Zhīshì tīngshuō-guò···

Only we have heard···

(e) 只不過是聽來的消息說··· (FOLEY)

Zhī bùguò shì tīng-lái de xiāoxi shuō···

But only there are the news we are hearing saying that···

(20a) and (20b) reflect the imperfective aspect of the present participle ἀκούοντες with the ø morpheme, yet they do not consider the periphrasis in Greek. (20c) and (20d), on the other hand, use perfective morphemes, the RVC jiàn and the perfective -guò, perhaps in an attempt to render the imperfect tense-form of εἰμί. (20e) is the most appropriate translation of (20) because it employs the shī...de construction that captures the added emphasis of the Greek periphrasis and closely reflects the imperfective aspect of ἀκούοντες by using the IDVC lái.

β. Perfect Participle in Periphrasis

(21) οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς ἤν τεθειμένος (John 19:41)

(a) 是從來沒有靠過人的 (PK, UV, WANG, SYD, ZHU, BT, NCV, CRV)

Shì cóngglái méiyǒu rèn zàng-guò rèn de.
It was where no one has ever been buried.

(b) 從來沒有葬過人的 (JOHN, TCV)\(^{104}\)

Cónglái méiyǒu zàng-guò rén de.

No one has ever been buried (there).

(c) 裏面沒有埋葬過人 (CNT, HSC, HS, SB, CLB, CPB)\(^{105}\)

Li miàn méiyǒu máizàng-guò rén.

No one has ever been buried inside.

(d) 從未安放過人 (IG, CSB)\(^{106}\)

Cóngwèi ānfàng-guò rén.

No one has ever been laid (there).

(e) 廚面沒有人安放過 (LÜ)

Li miàn méiyǒu rén ānfàng-guò.

No one has been laid inside.

(f) 是從未有人安葬入殮的 (FOLEY)

Shì cóngwèi yòurén ān-zàng-rù-liàn de.

It was where no one has ever been buried.

(21a) renders the Greek periphrasis with the shi...de construction, but its use of the perfective aspect marker -guò does not reflect the stative aspect of the perfect passive participle ἔθειμένος. (21b–e) follow the majority of Mandarin versions by using the same perfective -guò, but without the shi...de construction. It seems that (21b) might be

---

\(^{104}\) The TCV has li miàn yòu yīge méiyǒu zàng guòrén de xīn mìxié 裏面有一個沒有葬過人的新墓穴 ("inside there was a new tomb in which no one has ever buried").

\(^{105}\) Instead of máizàng, other verbs are used: tīngzàng 安葬 (HSC), zàng 葬 (HS), ānzàng 安葬 (SB, CLB, CPB).

\(^{106}\) The CSB uses méiyǒu instead of cóngwèi.
considered acceptable because, as Lü has noted, the particle *shi* in the *shi...de* construction is sometimes omitted. However, Lü also notes that when *shi* is omitted in determinative sentences, the added emphasis of the verb phrase is no longer present. Hence, (21) is best translated into Mandarin by employing the *shi...de* construction, with the four-character set phrase to express the stative aspect of the Greek perfect participle, as (21f) illustrates.

5.3.2.2. Syntactical Uses of the Participles

a. Substantive

The participle is sometimes used in place of a noun or substantive. Some grammarians treat this as the attributive use of the participle. Substantival use of the participle may appear with (articular) or without (anarthrous) an article. (22) illustrates the substantival use of the anarthrous participle:

(22) φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἔρημῳ (Mark 1:3)

(a) 有聲音在野地裡呼喊著說 (LÜ)

Yǒushēngyīn zài yědì lǐ hūhǎn-zhe shuō.

A voice in the wild country is calling out, saying....

(b) 在曠野有人聲喊叫說 (PK, JOHN, WANG)

Zài kuàngyě yŏurén shēng hānjìào shuō.

In the wilderness, someone’s voice crying out, saying....

---

107 Lü 吕叔湘, 800 Phrases, 499.
109 Robertson, Grammar, 1105–06; Rijksbaron, Syntax (3d ed.), 131–33.
110 For examples of the substantival use of articular participles, see, John 18:2, 14 in my chapter 6.
In the wilderness, someone’s voice crying out, saying...

Zài kuàngyě yǒurén shēng hăn-zhe shuō.

In the wilderness, there is a voice of a caller.

Zài kuàngyě zhōng yǒu hūhào zhě de shēngyīn.

In the wilderness, there is a voice calling.

Zài kuàngyě yǒurén hūhăn.

In the wilderness, someone called out.

He called out loudly in the deserted field.

The present participle ἁράντος functions here as a noun meaning “herald.” All cited Mandarin versions, with the exception of (22d), translate it as a finite verb. While the notion of remoteness signaled by Mandarin aspect morphemes is irrelevant to the participle, it is still important to consider the discourse functions of the aspect morphemes. The aspect marker -zhe used in (22a) and (22c) is more fitting than the ø morpheme in (22b) and (22e–g) because it better corresponds to the more heavily marked Greek

111 The CRV omits shuō at the end of the clause.
112 The NCV has Zài kuàngyě yǒu hūhăn zhě de shēngyīn 在曠野有呼喚者的聲音 (“In the desert there is a voice of a caller”).
113 Turner, Syntax, 151; Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 100.
present tense-form. Since the colon ( : ) introduces a direct quotation, the verb *shuō* ("say") used in (22a–c) is redundant. While (22a) and (22c) are acceptable translations, they do not translate the substantival use of the participle. Hence, it is preferable to render βοῶντος with a noun, *hūhào zē* ("caller"), as (22d) illustrates.

**b. Modifier of Substantive**

The participle may be used as a modifier of substantives. Grammarians refer to this type as adjectival, substantive, or restrictive use of the participle.\(^{114}\) (23) illustrates:

(23) τὸν κοπτόντα γεωργὸν (2 Tim 2:6)

(a) 努農夫者 (GÜ)

*Láò nóngfū zhē.*

Hardworking farmers....

(b) 勤勞之農 (BCV, UVW)

*Qínláo zhī nóng.*

Hardworking farmers.

(c) 勤力的農夫 (UV, WANG, NCV, CRV)

*Láoli de nóngfū.*

Hardworking farmers.

---

\(^{114}\) Jannaris, *Historical Greek Grammar*, §§2103–05; Mandilaras, *Verb*, §886; Moule, *Idiom Book*, 104; Porter, *Idioms*, 186. Dana and Mantey differentiates two kinds of adjectival participles: ascriptive and restrictive uses. The former "ascribes some fact, quality, or characteristic directly to the substantive, or denotes the substantive as belonging to a general class," whereas the latter "denotes an affirmation that distinguishes the noun which it qualifies as in some way specially defined, or marked out in its particular identity." See Dana and Mantey, *Manual Grammar*, 224–25. As they themselves note, there is not much difference between the two types except the one is an "extension in use" of the other. This distinction, therefore, is unnecessary.
(d) 努力的農夫 (PK, JOHN, BB, SB)

Láokū de nóngfū.

Hardworking farmers.

(e) 是努力的農夫 (LÜ)

Shi láoli de nóngfū.

It is the hardworking farmers who....

(f) 在田裡辛勞的農人 (CPB, TCV)\textsuperscript{115}

Zài tián lì xīnláo de nóngrén.

Hardworking farmers in the field.

(g) 耕者必先勞 (MAR, DV, GURY, GO)\textsuperscript{116}

Gēng zhě bì xiān láo.

Farmers must first toil.

The first five examples, (23a–e), translate κοπτόντας as a modifier and differ only in their choice of expression for “hardworking” in Chinese. (23f) and (23g), on the other hand, both translate the present participle as a verb with the ø morpheme. (23a–e) are preferable because they could also be construed as, “hardworking farmers in the field.” To make this interpretation explicit, (23f) could be revised by moving the particle de in front of xīnláo (Zài tián lì de xīnláo nóngrén, “Hardworking farmers in the field”). The auxiliary verb bì in (23g) is not preferable because it indicates that the translators have taken the participle as a finite verb instead of the modifier of γεωργόν.

\textsuperscript{115} The TCV has Xīnqín gēngzuò de nóngrén 辛勤耕作的農夫 (“Farmer who labors hard [in the field]”).

\textsuperscript{116} GO has Nóng bì xiān láo 農必先勞; the DV has Nóng bì xiān lì sè 農必先力稼 (lit. “Farmers must first gather in the harvest”); GURY follows closely to the DV and uses the synonym jiù 稼 (“sow grain,” “agricultural work”). The term jiăse 稼稼 refers to “agriculture.” Mathews, Dictionary, s.v.
c. Modifier of Verb

The participle may also be used to modify verbs. Grammarians refer to this usage as adverbial, and some even treat it as the circumstantial use of the participle.\(^{117}\) As Healey points out, circumstantial participles are always anarthrous.\(^{118}\) (24) illustrates:

(24) \(\pi\varepsilon\rho\iota\pi\iota\pi\tau\omicron\omicron\nu\ \delta\varepsilon\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \theta\varepsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \Gamma\alpha\lambda\iota\lambda\alpha\iota\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\ \varepsilon\iota\delta\varepsilon\ \delta\nu\ \omega\omicron\delta\epsilon\lambda\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\) (Matt 4:18)

(a) 耶穌在加利利海邊走走，看見弟兄二人 (LÜ)

Jesus trolls [along] the seafront of Galilee, and sees two brothers.

(b) 耶穌在加利利海邊行走・・・ (UV, WANG, CRV)

Jesus walks [along] the seafront of Galilee....

(c) 耶穌沿加利利湖邊走著・・・ (TCV, CPB)

Jesus is walking along the lakeshore of Galilee....

(d) 耶穌在加利利海邊行走的時候・・・ (NCV, SB)\(^{119}\)

As Jesus was walking along the seafront of Galilee....

---


\(^{118}\) Healey and Healey, “Greek Circumstantial Participles,” 179.

\(^{119}\) SB has 耶穌在加利利海邊走走時・・・ (“As Jesus was walking along the seafront of Galilee...”).
(24a) is a less preferable translation because the reduplicated verb zōu-zōu ("take a walk") does not reflect the imperfective aspect of the present participle περιπτατῶν. The marker -zhe used in (24c) is preferable to the ὁ morpheme in (24b) and (24d), because it formally reflects the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form. However, (24d) is a better translation because the construction, zài...de shihōu ("at the time when..."), translates the participle περιπτατῶν as a modifier of the main verb εἴδει.

d. Commanding

The use of the participle in the context of commands in the New Testament is still a matter of scholarly contention. Differences in interpretation of the so-called "imperatival participle" rest upon differing explanations of its usage. Daube, for example, argues for Semitic interference, while Moulton concludes from contemporary non-literary papyri that the specific function of the participle for commands had already been established during the Hellenistic period. Still others, led by Winer, attribute it to anacoluthon. Naturally, grammarians are divided over the question that emerges from these three positions, that is, whether it is possible that the participle has in fact become a

---

120 For a concise but helpful summary of major interpretations, see Porter, Idioms, 185–86.
122 Winer, Treatise, 440–2. Winer's position is followed by a few others. See Mayser, Grammatik, vol. 2, part 1, 196–97; 340f; Boyer, "Classification of Participles," 173–74. Similarly, Mandalaras notes that the use of the participle in imperative sentences occurs only in stereotyped phrases and therefore it cannot be a substitute for the imperative. See Mandalaras, Verb, §§922–24.
substitute for the imperative. Those who follow Moulton favor the independent use of the participle, in this case, as an imperative. (25) illustrates:

(25) ὀμοίως [α] γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν (1 Peter 3:1)

(a) 你们作妇人的、应当顺从自己的丈夫 (PK, JOHNM, TCV)\textsuperscript{123}

Nimen zuò fùrén de, yīngdāng shùncóng zìjī de zhàngfù.

Being a (married) women, you should submit to your own husband.

(b) • • • 应当顺从自己的丈夫 (SB, CPB)\textsuperscript{124}

...yīngdāng fúcóng zìjī de zhàngfù.

...should obey your own husband.

(c) • • • 妻顺从自己的丈夫 (UV, WANG, LÜ, NCV, CRV)\textsuperscript{125}

...yào shùnfū zìjī de zhàngfù.

...should submit to your own husband.

The present participle ὑποτασσόμεναι may be translated by a disyllabic verb, such as shùncóng, fúcóng, or shùnfū, with the ὀ morpheme, as in (25a−c). Auxiliary verbs such as yīngdāng, yào, gāi or yí are preferable additions to express commands in Mandarin.

e. Circumstantial or Adverbial Uses

a. Concessive

The so-called circumstantial or adverbial use of the participle (cf. 5.3.2.2.c) is widely treated by grammarians. Circumstantial participles may be classified in terms of concessive, causal, purpose/result, instrumental, and conditional.\textsuperscript{126} When translating into

\textsuperscript{123} The TCV uses yīnggāi instead of yīngdāng.
\textsuperscript{124} The CPB uses yīng instead of yīngdāng.
\textsuperscript{125} WANG and CRV use fúcóng ("obey") instead of shùnfū. LÜ has nimen de ("yours") instead of zìjī de.
\textsuperscript{126} See, for example, Bornemann and Risch, Griechische Grammatik, 252–53; Hoffmann and von Siebenthal, Griechische Grammatik, §§231–32; Black, Intermediate Greek, 123; Duhoux, Verbe grec ancien, 305–07.
Mandarin, nuances between the different uses of the circumstantial participle must be reflected explicitly by morphology (as opposed to implicitly by implication). (26)

illustrates a concessive use of the participle: 127

(26) εἰ δὲν υμεῖς πονηροὶ ὠντές οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις υμῶν

(Matt 7:11)

(a) 你們雖然不好，尚且知道拿好東西給兒女 (PK, JOHMN, UV, WANG, LÜ, CRV) 128

Nimen suǐrán bù hǎo, shàngqìè zhīdào ná hǎo dōngxi gěi ér-nǚ.

Although you are not good, yet you know to give good things to (your own) children.

(b) 你們雖然都惡，尚且・・・ (NCV, TCV)

Nimen suǐrán xié'è, shàngqìè….

Although you are evil, yet….

(c) 你們縱然不好，尚且・・・ (SB, CPB) 129

Nimen zòngrán bùshàn, shàngqìè….

Although you are not good….

Concessive use of the participle can sometimes be identified with particles such as καίτοι (Heb 5:8), καί γε (Acts 17:27), or καίτερ (Heb 4:3), however, most of the time it occurs without them. 130 (26a–c) translate the concessive sense of the participle ὠντες by


128 JOHMN has shān instead of hāo.

129 The CPB has hǎo instead of shān.

employing the construction suǐrán...shàngqiě and zòngrán...shàngqiě. Other expressions, such as guǐrán...dànshì 固然... 但是, are also preferable for this particular use of the participle.\textsuperscript{131}

\textbf{β. Causal}

(27) illustrates the causal use of the participle:\textsuperscript{132}

(27) ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέρας ὄντες νήφομεν (1 Thess 5:8)

(a) 我們既然屬乎白晝，就應當謹守 (PK, TCV)\textsuperscript{133}

Wōmen jì shūhū báizhòu, jiù yīngdāng jīnshōu.

Since we belong to the day, we should guard with care.

(b) 但我們既然屬乎白晝，就... (UV, JOHN, WANG, NCV, CRV)\textsuperscript{134}

Dàn wōmen jìrán shūhū báizhòu, jiù... 

Since we belong to the day....

(c) 但我們呢，我們既然屬乎白晝的，就... (LÜ)

Dàn wōmen ne, wōmen jíshí shūyú báizhòu de, jiù... 

But as for us, since we who belong to the day....

(d) 但我們屬乎白晝... (CPB)

Dàn wōmen shūyú báizhòu....

---

\textsuperscript{131} See Lü 呂叔湘, Grammar, 436–54; Chao, Grammar, 115; Li and Thompson, Grammar, 635–40.

\textsuperscript{132} Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar, §§2150–52; Mayser, Grammatik, vol. 2, part 1, 351; Stahl, Kritisich-historische Syntax, 686–878; Robertson, Grammar, 1128; Chamberlain, Exegetical Grammar, 102; Smyth and Messing, Greek Grammar, §2064; Mandilaras, Verb, §904; Bornemann and Risch, Griechische Grammatik, 252; Brooks and Winbery, Syntax, 133–34; Porter, Idioms, 191; Duhoux, Verbe grec ancien, 305–06; Rijksbaron, Syntax (3d ed.), 123–24. For another example of the causal use of the participle, see 1 Cor 15:58 in my chapter 7.

\textsuperscript{133} The TCV has jìrán wōmen shūyú báizhòu ("since we belong to the day").

\textsuperscript{134} The NCV and CRV have shūyú instead of shūhū.
But we belong to the day....

d( ) 但是我們做日之子的... (SB)

Đànshi wǒmen zuò bái rì zhī zǐ de....

But we who are sons of the day light....

(27a–c) use the construction ji...jiù and jirán...jiù to render the causal use of the participle. In Mandarin, one can also use the causal conjunctives yínwèi (“because”) or the construction yínwèi...de yuánghù 因為...的緣故 (“due to the fact that”) to express cause and effect.\^ {135} (27d) and (27e) do not contain such causal conjunctives, therefore, they are not preferable.

\gamma. Purpose or Result

The purpose (telic/final) or result use of the participle is sometimes introduced by ως, however, it usually occurs without it.\^ {136} (28) illustrates:

(28) νομικός τις ἁνέστη ἐκπείραζων αὐτόν (Luke 10:25)

(a) 有一个教法师、来试探耶稣 (PK, JOHN, JOHN, BB, UV, WANG, SB, TCV, NCV, CRV, CPB)\^ {137}

You yīge jiàofāshī, lái shìtàn Yēsū.

There was a lawyer, came to test Jesus.

(b) ・・・故意试探耶稣 (LÜ, CLB)\^ {138}

---

\[^ {135}\] Lü 萧叔湘, Grammar, 394–97, 406–09. Lü treats jí jírán 既/既然 as a cause-effect relative pronoun (因果關係詞). Other conjunctives such as wèi-le/wèi-zhe 爲了/為着 or yóuyú 由於 are also appropriate. See also Chao, Grammar, 115–16; Li and Thompson, Grammar, 635–38.

\[^ {136}\] Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar, §§2157–59; Babbitt, Grammar, §653; Nunn, Short Syntax, §203; Chamberlain, Exegetical Grammar, 99; Dana and Mantey, Manual Grammar, 226; Zerwick, Biblical Greek, §282; Bornemann and Risch, Griechische Grammatik, 253; Mandilaras, Verb, §899; Brooks and Winbery, Syntax, 133; Greenlee, Concise Exegetical Grammar, 64; Porter, Idioms, 192.

\[^ {137}\] BB has shì 試 (“try,” “test”) instead of shìtàn. Instead of lái, many Mandarin versions use qǐlái 起來 (“get up,” JOHNN, JOHN, UV, WANG, SB, NCV), zhàn-qǐlái 站起來 (“stand up,” CRV), qiánlái 前來 (“come before,” TCV) or guòlái 過來 (“come over,” CPB).
...gùyì shìtàn Yēsū.

to test Jesus intentionally.

In Mandarin, purpose or result clauses may be expressed in various ways, including using participles, such as lài 来 or qù 去.139 In (28a), lài (or qǐlái 起来, “get up,” guòlái 過来, “come over,” qiánlái 前來, “come before”) may have been used to express purpose (or result), or it may be interpreted as a verb to translate ἀνέστη. This will give the translation “...came in order to test Jesus.” Another way to convey purpose or result is to use a different set of particles, such as hǎo 好 (“so that”), yībiàn 以便 (“so that,” “in order to”), yǐzhì 以致 (“with the result that”), or simply yǐ 以 (“so as to”).140 The addition of gùyì (“purposely”) in (28b) also clearly expresses the sense of purpose. The disyllabic verb shìtàn (“test”) with the ὀ morpheme is preferable for the present participle, as (28a–b) illustrate.

δ. Instrumental

(29) illustrates the instrumental use of the participle:141

(29) ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, ἐν ὅμοιωσεν ἄνθρωπῶν γενόμενος (Phil 2:7)

(a) 反倒自己，取了奴仆的形像，成為人的樣式 (UV, Wang, Lü, NCV, CRV, CPB, UVW, UVB)142

---

138 The CLB has gùyì wén nán Yēsū 故意問難耶穌 (“intentionally ask Jesus a hard question”).
139 Chao, Grammar, 479–80.
141 Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar, §§2160–63; Smyth and Messing, Greek Grammar, §2063; Dana and Mantey, Manual Grammar, 228; Brooks and Winbery, Syntax, 135–36; Porter, Idioms, 192; Cooper and Krüger, Attic Greek Prose Syntax, vol. 1, 851.
142 The CRV has xíngzhùàng 形狀 (“shape”) instead of xíngxiàng. The CPB has qù le nàpú de xíngtǐ, chéngwèi rén bìng zài rén zhōngjiān 取了奴僕的形體，成為人在人中間 (“taking body of a slave, also
Instead, (he) emptied himself, having taken the form of a slave, turning into the form of a human.

(b) 有奴僕的樣式，形狀成為世人 (PK, JOHM, BB)

...有奴僕的形狀，形狀成為世人 (PK, JOHM, BB)

...having a form of a slave, the shape turned into a human.

(c) 取了奴僕的形體，與人相似 (SB)

...奴僕的形體，與人相似 (SB)

...having taken the body of a slave, in human likeness.

(d) 成人之狀、高任僕之貌 (BCV, GO)

...成人之狀，高任僕之貌 (BCV, GO)

...turning into the shape of a human, and assuming the appearance of a slave.

(e) 跋降為人、以僕自處 (DV, WV)

...跋降為人，以僕自處 (DV, WV)

...descending as a human, finding himself as a slave.

(f) 且以人之態度而生為僕之樣 (MAR)

...且以人之態度而生為僕之樣 (MAR)

...still being born in the form of a slave in the manner of human.

(g) 藉僕之狀， 成如人樣 (GÜ, GURY)

...藉僕之狀， 成如人樣 (GÜ, GURY)

---

becoming a man among people”). The UVW and UVB phrase it in wenli style: qū pú zhī zhuàng, chéng rén zhī xíng 藉僕之狀， 成如人樣.

143 JOHM has chéngwéi rén de xíngxiàng 成僕的形狀 (“turning into the shape of a human”). BB phrases it in wenli: qū nú pú zhi zhuàng, xíngmào chéngwéi shirén 藉僕之狀， 形貌成為世人。

144 GO has qū pú zhī mào 藉僕之貌 (“taking the appearance of a slave”) instead of ér rén pú zhī mào.

145 The WV reverses the word order gàn zì wéi pú, ér jiàng shēng wéi rén 甘自為僕，而降生為人 ("willing to become a slave and to be born [from above] as a human").
...jiè pú zhī zhuàng, chéng rú rényaìng.

...assuming the form of a slave, becoming like a human.

(h) 藉取奴僕的形像，以人的樣式而降生，而反倒虛己 (FOLEY)

 Jiè qū núpú de xíngxiàng, yì rén de yàngshi ěr jiàngshēng, ěr fǎndào xūjī.

Instead, by taking the form of a slave, being born in the human likeness, he emptied himself.

All of the above examples translate the two participles as modifiers of or in adverbial relation to the main verb ἐκέντρωσεν. While the ὀ morpheme is acceptable, the perfective aspect marker -le in (29a) and (29c) is a better choice for the translation because it morphologically reflects the aspect expressed by the aorist participle λαβόντος. As for the aorist passive participle γενόμενος, dànjìàng or jiàngshēng in (29e) and (29h) are more fitting than chéngwéi or chéng, especially in the context of the Incarnation of Jesus. ¹⁴⁷

The instrumental use of the Greek participle may be reflected in Mandarin by utilizing verbs such as yòng 用 ("use"), yǐ 以 ("take"), jiè/jièzhe 藉/藉著 ("use"), kào/kàozhe/ yǐkào 靠/靠著/依靠 ("rely on"), píng/píngzhe 憑/憑著 ("on the basis of"), etc. ¹⁴⁸ Also, as (29h) illustrates, the word order of the Greek must be rearranged since Mandarin syntax requires that the predicate be placed before the main clause.

¹⁴⁶ GURY has jiè pú xiàng zì chā ěr wéi rén 藉僕像自處而為人 ("assuming the form of a slave, and becoming human").
¹⁴⁷ See, also, the commentary on γεγένητο (John 18:37) in my chapter 6, pp. 353–54 below.
¹⁴⁸ Chinese grammarians do not discuss at length the instrumental use of verbs. In fact, most of them do not treat it at all. For comments on the instrumental use of yòng, see Lü 呂叔湘, 800 Phrases, 626–27; Li and Thompson, Grammar, 367; for yǐ, see Dragunov, Studies, 197.
Conditional

Conditional clauses in Greek are usually introduced by particles such as ἐι or ἐὰν (and also ἢν, ἐπεί, or ἐπεάν in classical Greek) in the protasis. As Cooper and Krüger have noted, since the conditional participle is not specifically marked by the usual conditional particles (i.e. "if" words), "it is arbitrary to insist that the participle represents a conditional subordinate and protasis rather than a temporal or some other kind of subordinate." Nevertheless, it is not uncommon to see a participle clearly being used as a conditional in the New Testament. (30) illustrates:

(30) τῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα τηλικάτης ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίος; (Heb 2:3)

(a) 那么我們若輕看這樣救人的大道、怎能逃罪呢。 (PK, JOHN, CPB)

Name wōmen ruò qīngkàn zhèyàng jiùrén de dàdào, zěnnénɡ táozi ne.

How then can we escape sin if we despise this great saving truth?

(b) 我們若忽略···· (UV, WANG, TCV)

Wōmen ruò hūlūè....

If we ignore....

(c) 我們若輕忽了···· (LÜ, NCV, CRV)

---


152 The CPB uses qīngshí 輕視 ("despise") instead of qīngkàn.

153 The TCV uses rúguó 侮辱 instead of ruò.

154 The NCV and CRV have hūlūè-le; the NCV uses rúguó instead of ruò.
Women ruò qīnhū-le....

If we have neglected....

(d) 如果我們置若罔聞，漫不经心... (CLB)

Rúguō wōmen zhí-ruò-wǎng-wén, màn-bù-jīng-xīn....

If we pay no heed to it and completely careless....

(e) 我們這些忽視... (SB)

Wōmen zhèxiē hūshì....

We who ignore....

The modal auxiliaries or particles ruò and rúguō employed in (30a–d) translate the conditional participle ὅμελήσκεινς in the protasis with various degrees of success.155 (30a) and (30b) use the ϕ morpheme, which is an acceptable translation for the aorist participle. (30c), on the other hand, uses -le, which is preferable to the ϕ morpheme because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the Greek. Also, -le is preferable because, as Wang Li has pointed out, it is frequently used in contexts that include subordinate clauses and the protasis of conditional sentences.156

The four-character set phrases in (30d), on the other hand, are not preferable, for, as I have argued in previous chapters, they convey the stative aspect and have the unique feature of frontgrounding in Mandarin discourse. Finally, (30e) is not preferable because it takes ὅμελήσκεινς not as a conditional but substantive or adjectival participle. With an adequate rendering of aspect and its role in discourse, the conditional use of the Greek participle may be translated as a conditional clause in Mandarin, as illustrated in (30a–c).

155 Heb 2:3 is an example of the first class conditional. See Boyer, “First Class Conditions,” 109. See 5.4 below for discussions on the conditional clauses.

156 Wang, Grammar, vol. 1, 335–36; Chao, Grammar, 116. See 3.2.5.2.c.a, p. 124 above.
5.4. Conditional Clauses

5.4.1. Introduction

This section treats conditional clauses in the Greek New Testament with the intention of developing a consistent system of accurately translating the original into Mandarin. With this goal in mind, and for the sake of convenience, the discussion follows the Porter's five-part classifications of Greek conditional clauses according to protases.157

Before discussing the different types of Greek conditionals, it is necessary to mention some of the particularities regarding conditional constructions in Mandarin. First, similar to the conditional participles discussed in the previous section, particles ei or ècov in the protasis that introduce New Testament Greek conditional constructions may be represented by a number of different “if” words in Mandarin, including ruòshì (ruò, ruòshì) 若是 (若, 若使), jiànrú (jiànrù, jiànsì, bìrù) 假如 (假若, 假使, 比如), tàngruò 倘若, yàoshì (yào) 要是 (要), and rúguò (guò, guò shì, gǒu, chéng) 如果 (果, 果使, 荀, 誠).158 Unlike Greek (and English), these words are generally not obligatory in Mandarin. Second, unlike Greek, verbal aspect plays no part in grammaticalizing various types of conditionals in Mandarin.159 In other words, translating the nuances between different

---


158 See, for example, Summers, Handbook, 167–68; Li (黎錫熙), Grammar, 218–19; Li (呂叔湘), Grammar, 413–35; Chao, Grammar, 116; Li and Thompson, Grammar, 646–51; Paris, “Subordination adverbiale,” 34–39. For a treatment of the use of ruò and rì in classical Chinese conditionals, see Dobson, Dictionary, 571, 566–57.

159 See Li and Thompson, Grammar, 647. Li and Thompson discuss three different types of conditionals: reality, imaginative hypothetical, imaginative counterfactual, all of which are possible interpretations for the Mandarin conditionals. Therefore, only context determines the proper reading.
classes of Greek conditional sentences into Mandarin is only possible by lexical means. Therefore, this section will limit its focus to translations into Mandarin of the aspectual meanings of the Greek verb forms in the five classes of conditionals.

5.4.2. First Class Conditional

The first class conditional, as Porter puts it, “makes an assertion for the sake of argument.”

This type of conditional occurs most frequently, appearing over 300 times in the New Testament. It is normally introduced by εἰ + indicative in the protasis, although almost any verb form can be used in the apodosis. (31) illustrates:

(31) εἰ γὰρ νεκρὸι οὐκ ἐγέρονται, οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγέρεται.

(a) If the dead do not come back to life, then neither did Christ come back to life.

(b) If the dead do not come back to life, that means Christ also did not come back to life.

(c) If the dead do not come back to life, that means Christ also did not come back to life.

162 For other examples of the first class conditional, see John 18:8, 23; 19:11; 1 Cor 15:2, 12, 13–17, 19, 29, 32, 44 in my chapters 6–7 below.
163 ZHU has Sírén ruò bù fūshēng, Jídū yějù méiyǒu fūshēng le. 死人若不復生，基督也就沒有復活了 (“If the dead were not raised, Christ was not raised”).
If the dead do not come back to life, that is to say, Christ did not come back to life.

(d) 如果死人沒有復活，基督也沒有復活。 (CPB)

Rúguó sǐrén méi fūhuó, Jídū yē méi fūhuó.

If the dead do not come back to life, neither did Christ come back to life.

(e) 因為死者都不復活，基督也就沒有復活了。 (CNT)

Yīnwèi sǐzhè dōu bù fūhuó, Jídū yějiù méiyǒu fūhuó.

Because (if) the dead do not come back to life, neither did Christ come back to life.

(f) 因為死人若不復活，基督也就沒有復活了。 (UV, WANG, BT, HSC, SB, NCV, CRV)\(^{164}\)

Yīnwèi sǐrén ruò bù fūhuó, Jídū yějiù méiyǒu fūhuó le.

This is due to the fact that if the dead do not come back to life, neither did Christ come back to life.

(g) 死人如果不能得復活起來，基督也就沒有得復活起來了 (LÜ)

Sǐrén rúguó bùnénghéng dé sūhuó-qǐlai, Jídū yějiù méiyǒu dé sūhuó-qǐlai le.

If the dead cannot get to come back to life, neither (can) Christ get to come back to life.

(h) 盖死者若不復活，則基督也未曾被救起 (HS)

Gài sǐzhè ruò bù fūhuó, zé Jídū yě wèicéng bèi fú-qǐ.

\(^{164}\) BT and HSC omit the sentential-final particle le. SB has yīnwèi rúguó sǐrén bù fūhuó, Jídū yějiù méiyǒu fūhuó 因为如果死人不復活，基督也就沒有復活 (“Because if the dead do not come back to life, neither did Christ come back to life”). The NCV has yīnwèi rúguó sǐrén méiyǒu fūhuó, Jídū yějiù méiyǒu fūhuó 因为如果死人没有復活，基督也就沒有復活 (“Because if the dead do not come back to life, neither did Christ come back to life”).
Therefore if the dead did not come back to life, then neither Christ had ever been raised.

(i) 死人若不復活，基督也就沒有死而復活了。 (FOLEY)

Sírén ruò bù fúhuó, Jídū yějiù méiyǒu sǐ-ér-fū-sū le.

If the dead do not come back to life, then Christ has not come back to life from the dead.

The two passive verbs in (31) present a difficult challenge to the translator. The first passive verb in the protasis is a present tense-form, whereas the second one in the apodosis is a perfect tense-form. The majority of Chinese versions represented in (31a-f) use the 0 morpheme for both verbs. While the 0 morpheme is acceptable for rendering the imperfective aspect signaled by εγείρονται in the protasis, it is not preferable for the stative aspect signaled by εγείρεται in the apodosis. These examples, with the exception of (31e), introduce the conditional protasis with particles such as ruò and rúguǒ. As mentioned above, the conditional particles used here do not necessarily differentiate the nuances of different types of Greek conditionals. Also, these conditional particles may be omitted, especially with particles such as zé 则 and jiù 就 (or biàn 便), which one would expect to find in the apodosis of a conditional in Mandarin.¹⁶⁵ For the sake of clarity, however, it is better to use a conditional particle in the protasis.

(31g) and (31h) deserve special notice. In (31g), Lù uses the auxiliary verb nēng in the protasis and another auxiliary verb dé in both the protasis and apodosis. He also uses the same IDVC qīlái, for both clauses. It would seem that Lù wanted to maintain the symmetry of the sentence by repeating the same verb and aspect morpheme. In doing so,

¹⁶⁵ See Lù 吕叔湘, Grammar, 416f.
he not only contributed to the awkwardness of the sentence because of the obvious
tautology, but also translated the indicative (ὡς ἔριονται) with a subjunctive verb, and the
stative aspect with the imperfective aspect morpheme. In (31h), Hsiao uses the ø
morpheme for both verb forms and employs the passive construction formed by the
particle bèi. Here, bèi is required because there is an implied agent of the transitive verb
fù ("help"). Nonetheless, one cannot simply add bèi to the intransitive verb fùhuó in the
rest of the examples to transform them into the passive. Indeed, even without bèi, these
elements could be construed as passive constructions.

The preferable translation of (31) in Mandarin, therefore, is to use the conditional
particle ruò to introduce the protasis and jiù in the apodosis. The verb sùhuó used in (31g)
is not preferable because it is not a common expression in Mandarin. A preferable
translation of the verbs in this example would be to use the disyllabic verb fùhuó with the
ø morpheme to represent the imperfective aspect of ὡς ἔριονται, and the four-character
set phrase sì-ér-fù-sù to represent the stative aspect of ἰσαφιζέρται, as (31i) illustrates.

5.4.3. Second Class Conditional

The second class conditional is formed by εἰ + indicative in the protasis, and with ἄν
in the apodosis (imperfect or aorist, and to a lesser extent, pluperfect tense-forms). The
imperfect tense-form in the apodosis is an example of the non-past (conative) use of the
imperfective (see 4.2.3.2 above). The second class conditional asserts a hypothetical
statement that is contrary to fact. The differences between tense-forms in this

---

166 Goodwin, Syntax, §§172, 402, 410; Burton, Syntax, §§248–49; Robertson, Grammar, 1012–16; Nunn,
167 Moule calls this "past or present conditions, only hypothetical." Moule, Idiom Book, 148–49. Porter
calls it "assertion to the contrary" and "non-factive statement used contra-factively." See Porter, Verbal
Aspect, 304–06; Idioms, 261.
conditional are best explained by verbal aspect. The traditional view that differentiates the imperfect and aorist by their reference to either present or past must be dismissed since Greek tense-forms grammaticalize not temporal reference but aspect.\(^{168}\) (32) illustrates an example of the second class conditional:\(^{169}\)

(32) \(\varepsilon\iota\,\mu\eta\,\acute{\iota}\nu\,\acute{o}\tau\omicron\varsigma\,\kappa\acute{a}k\acute{o}n\,\pi\rho\omicron\iota\omicron\nu\), \(\acute{\omicron}\,\kappa\nu\kappa\acute{a}\nu\,\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\omicron\acute{\omega}\kappa\acute{a}m\nu\,\alpha\upomicron\tilde{t}\eta\omicron\nu\). (John 18:30)

(a) 这人若不是犯罪的，我們就不將他解到你這裏来 (PK)

Zhè rén \(\varepsilon\iota\mu\eta\,\acute{\iota}\nu\,\acute{o}\tau\omicron\varsigma\,\kappa\acute{a}k\acute{o}n\,\pi\rho\omicron\iota\omicron\nu\) \(\acute{\omicron}\,\kappa\nu\kappa\acute{a}\nu\,\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\omicron\acute{\omega}\kappa\acute{a}m\nu\,\alpha\upomicron\tilde{t}\eta\omicron\nu\).

If this man were not someone who commits crime, we would not have sent him under guard to you here.

(b) 這個人若不是作惡的，我們就不把他交給你。 (UV, WANG, BT, LÜ, SB, CRV, CSB)\(^{170}\)

Zhè gê rén \(\varepsilon\iota\mu\eta\,\acute{\iota}\nu\,\acute{o}\tau\omicron\varsigma\,\kappa\acute{a}k\acute{o}n\,\pi\rho\omicron\iota\omicron\nu\) \(\acute{\omicron}\,\kappa\nu\kappa\acute{a}\nu\,\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\omicron\acute{\omega}\kappa\acute{a}m\nu\,\alpha\upomicron\tilde{t}\eta\omicron\nu\).

If this man were not someone who does evil, we would not have sent him to you.

(c) 这人若不是罪人，我們決不送給你。 (CNT)

Zhè rén \(\varepsilon\iota\mu\eta\,\acute{\iota}\nu\,\acute{o}\tau\omicron\varsigma\,\kappa\acute{a}k\acute{o}n\,\pi\rho\omicron\iota\omicron\nu\) \(\acute{\omicron}\,\kappa\nu\kappa\acute{a}\nu\,\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\omicron\acute{\omega}\kappa\acute{a}m\nu\,\alpha\upomicron\tilde{t}\eta\omicron\nu\).

If this man were not a criminal, we would never have sent (him) under guard to you.

(d) 這個人若不是罪犯，我們不把他交付(sic)你。 (HSC)

Zhè gê rén \(\varepsilon\iota\mu\eta\,\acute{\iota}\nu\,\acute{o}\tau\omicron\varsigma\,\kappa\acute{a}k\acute{o}n\,\pi\rho\omicron\iota\omicron\nu\) \(\acute{\omicron}\,\kappa\nu\kappa\acute{a}\nu\,\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\omicron\acute{\omega}\kappa\acute{a}m\nu\,\alpha\upomicron\tilde{t}\eta\omicron\nu\).

---

\(^{168}\) See, for example, Green, Handbook, 319; Moulton, Introduction, 135; Robertson, Grammar, 887; Chamberlain, Exegetical Grammar, 196–97; Dana and Mantey, Manual Grammar, 289–90; Boyer, “Second Class Conditions,” 81–88.

\(^{169}\) For other examples of the second class conditional, see the discussion on John 18:36 (cf. John 19:11) in chapter 6 below.

\(^{170}\) LÜ has sōngjiāo 送交 (“deliver to”) instead of jià. SB uses rúguò instead of ruò and biàn bù huí bā 便不會把 instead of jǐù bù bā. The CRV has bù huí bā instead of bù bā.
If this man is not a criminal, we do not send him to you.

(e) 此人若非歹徒，我們斷不把祂交給你。 (HS)

Círén ruò fēi dǎitú, wǒmen duàn bù bā Tā jiāogěi nǐ.

If this man were not a criminal, we would never send Him to you.

(f) 他若不是壞人，我們就不會把他來你這裡了。 (CPB)

Tā ruò bù shì huàirén, wǒmen jiù bù hui dài tā lái nǐ zhèr le.

If he were not a bad guy, we would not have taken him to you here.

(g) 這人若沒有犯案、就不會到你這裏來 (JOHN)

Zhè rén ruò měiyǒu fànzuì, jiù bù jiě dào nǐ zhè lí lái.

If this man did not commit crime, (he) would not have been sent to you here under guard.

(h) 如果這個人沒有作惡，我們就不會把他交你。 (NCV, TCV)

Rúguǒ zhè gé rén méiyǒu zuò'é, wǒmen jiù bù jìe dào nǐ zhè lí lái.

If this man did not do evil, we would not have sent him to you.

(i) 假設他不是作惡的，我們就絕對不把他交給你了。 (FOLEY)

Jiàshè tā bù shì zuò'é de, wǒmen jiù juéduì bù bā tā jiāogěi-le nǐ le.

If this he were not someone who does evil, we would certainly not have sent him to you.

(32a) and (32b) both render the periphrasis with the *shi...de* construction in the protasis. The *∅* morpheme is also appropriate for the imperfective aspect of the present participle τροιόν. (32a–g) all use the *∅* morphemes in the apodosis. (32c–f) differ

171 The TCV has *rúguǒ tā méiyǒu zuò huáishì, wǒmen bù huí bā tā dàidào zhè hì lái* 如果他沒有做壞事，我們不會把他帶到這裏來 (“if he did not do evil, we would not have taken him here”).
significantly from the rest of the examples in their translation of the protasis. These four examples translate the periphrasis with a substantive, whereas (32g) and (32h) translate it with a finite verb.

As mentioned above, verbal aspect plays no part in grammaticalizing Mandarin conditional sentences. In translation, nuances of Greek conditionals can only be expressed in Mandarin by means of lexis, which provides a number of options. For example, instead of *rúguō* or *ruò*, one may employ *jiāshê*, which is commonly used in making hypothetical statements. In addition, adverbs such as *juébù*, *duànbù*, and *juéduì* used in (32c, e, i), as well as the sentence-final modal participle *le* in (32f) and (32i), add emphasis in the assertion to the contrary.172 Auxiliary verbs such as *hui* in (32f) and (32h), however, are not preferable for rendering the indicative verb in the apodosis. (32i) illustrates the preferable rendering of (32).

5.4.4. Third Class Conditional

The third class conditional is formed by ἐκάντω + subjunctive in the protasis, with virtually every verb form in the apodosis.173 Grammarians refer to this type of conditional as “future more vivid” (in contrast to the “future less vivid” or fourth class conditional with the optative) or simply future conditional.174 This type of conditional occurs only slightly less frequently than the first class conditional in the New Testament. Here, the

---

172 For discussions on the modal particle *le* and its relations to the perfective -le, see 3.2.4 and 3.2.5.2.c.α, pp. 112–14, 124–26 above.
subjunctive mood together with ἐάν expresses projection in a form of hypothetical statement. The nuances of the tense-forms are determined by verbal aspect, and must be translated accordingly into Mandarin. (33) illustrates: 175


(a) 你們若善待你們的人，有甚麼可酬謝的呢？···你們若借給人，指望從他收回，有甚麼可酬謝的呢？ (UV, PK, JOHNM, WANG, LÜ, CRV) 176

Nimen ruò shàn dài nà shàn dài nímen de rén, yǒu shénme kě chóuxì de ne?...Nimen ruò jiè gěi rén, zhíwang cóng tā shōuhuí, yǒu shénme kě chóuxì de ne?

If you show kindness to those who show kindness to you, what is worthy of reward?...if you lend to someone, expecting a return from him, what is worthy of reward?

(b) 你們若善待那些對你們好的人，你們有什麼功德？···如果你們只肯把東西借給那些會償還你們的人，你們有什麼功德？ (CPB, NCV) 177

Rúguò nímen zhī shàn dài nàxiē dui nímen hǎo de rén, nímen yǒu shénme gōngdé?...Rúguò nímen zhī kěn bā dōngxī jiè gěi nàxiē huí chánghuán nímen de rén, nímen yǒu shénme gōngdé?

175 For other examples of the third class conditional, see John 19:12 in chapter 6 below.
176 Instead of chóuxìe, other disyllabic verbs shängci 賜 (“bestow,” PK, JOHNM) and gànxìe 感謝 (“be grateful,” WANG) are used.
177 The NCV has hǎochù 好處 (“benefits”) instead of gōngdé.
If you only show kindness to those who are kind to you, what merits do you have?...if you are willing to lead things to those who is able to return to you, what merits do you have?

(c) 假如你們只善待那些善待你們的人，有甚麼功德呢？...假如你們只
借錢給有希望償還的人，又有甚麼功德呢？ (TCV)

Jiārú nǐmen zhī shàn dài nà xì shàn dài nǐmen de rén, yǒu shénme gōngdé 
ne?...jiārú nǐmen zhī jiè qián gěi yǒu xīwàng chǎnghuán de rén, yǒu yǒu 
shénme gōngdé ne?

If you only show kindness to those who show kindness to you, what merits do you have?...if you lend money only to those whom you hope will return, what merits do you have?

(d) 你們善待那善待你們的，為你們還算甚麼功德？...你們若借錢給那些
有希望償還的，為你們還算甚麼功德？ (SB)

Nǐmen shàn dài nà shàn dài nǐmen de, wèi nǐmen hǎi suàn shénme 
gōngdé?...nǐmen ruò jiè gěi nà xì yǒu xīwàng chǎnghuán de, wèi 
nǐmen hǎi suàn shénme gōngdé?

(If) you show kindness to those who show kindness to you, what merits do you have?...if you lend to those whom you wish to return, what merits do you have?

(e) 只善待那些善待你們的人，有甚麼稀奇呢？...你們只借錢給有力償 
還的人，有甚麼值得誇耀的呢？ (CLB)

Zhī shàn dài nà xì shàn dài nǐmen de rén, yǒu shénme xīqí ne?...nǐmen zhī 
jiè qián gěi yǒuli chǎng huán de rén, yǒu shénme zhīde kuāyào de ne?
(If) you only show kindness to those who show kindness to you, what is the big deal?...(if) you lend money only to those who are able to return, what is worthy of praise?

(FOLEY)

Nimen ruò zhī yuàn shàndài-zhe nà shàndài nimen de rén, suàn shénme gōngdé ne?...nimen ruò zhī kēn jiè gěi yǒu nénglí chángkuán de rén,

suàn shénme gōngdé ne?

If you are willing to extend kindness only to those who show kindness to you, what merits do you have?...if you are willing to lend only to those who are able to return, what merits do you have?

(33a–e) render the two Greek conditionals very similarly. All except (33d) and (33e) introduce the protases with conditional particles in both sentences. More important is that (33a–e) all employ the φ morpheme to translate the two subjunctives, regardless of their tense-forms. (33b) is the only example that uses the auxiliary kēn to express hypothetical projection of the subjunctive δαισίητε. The Greek subjunctive mood, as discussed in 5.2.1. above, may be represented by an auxililary verb in Mandarin. Therefore, in order to fully convey the sense of the third class conditional in (33), auxiliary verbs, such as yuàn and kēn, must be present in front of the verbs. In regards to the verb forms of the subjunctive, -zhe is preferable to the φ morpheme because it is morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect expressed by the present tense-form ἀγαθοποιήτε, as (33f) illustrates. The monosyllabic verb jiè with the φ morpheme is a satisfactory translation of
δενίσησε because it reflects the aspect and less heavily marked aorist tense-form in
Greek.

5.4.5. Fourth class conditional

Traditional grammarians refer to the fourth class conditional as the “future less vivid”
conditional because they believe that it expresses less vividness of futurity than the
“future more vivid” (i.e. third class) conditional. It is formed by εἰ + optative verb in
the protasis and ἔστω with an optative verb or imperfect in the apodosis. Only partial
forms of this type of conditional occur in the New Testament. The optative mood, as
noted in 5.2.2. above, grammaticalizes projection and contingency. (34) illustrates.

(34) ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρείναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν εἰ τι ἔχοιεν πρὸς ἐμέ (Acts 24:19)

(a) 他們若有告我的事，就應當到你面前來告我。 (UV, PK, WANG, CRV)

Tāmen ruò yòu gào wò de shì, jiù yīngdāng dào nǐ miànqián lái gào wò.

If they have something to accuse me, (they) should come before you to

178 Goodwin, “‘Shall’,” 87–107; Goodwin, Greek Grammar, §§1418–22, 1447; Burton, Syntax, §259;
Babitt, Grammar, §605; Smyth and Messing, Greek Grammar, §2566.
179 Chamberlain, Exegetical Grammar, 198–99; Moule, Idiom Book, 150; BDF, §§385–86; Boyer,
“Classification of Optatives,” 135–36; Porter, Verbal Aspect, 311–12; Porter, Idioms, 263–65; Rijksbaron,
Syntax (3d ed.), 71–72. Greenlee calls it a “hesitant condition.” See Greenlee, Concise Exegetical Grammar,
62.
180 Grammarians are divided about the fourth class conditional in the New Testament. Boyer, for example,
thinks that there is not an example of it in the New Testament, while many others identify various passages
(including Acts 17:27, 24:19, 27:39, 1 Cor 14:10, 15:37, and 1 Pet 3:14, 3:17) as at least partially fourth
class conditionals. See Robertson, Grammar, 1022; Chamberlain, Exegetical Grammar, 198–99; Dana and
Mantey, Manual Grammar, 290; Moule, Idiom Book, 150; BDF, §385; Turner, Syntax, 125–28; Brooks and
Winbery, Syntax, 114–15, 65; Boyer, “Third (and Fourth) Class Conditions,” 164 n. 3, 70–71; Porter,
Idioms, 263–64.
181 Compare Sewall, who asserts that the optative functions as a “supposition of conceived fact.” Sewall,
“Distinction,” Similarly, Jelf, Grammar, vol. 2, §855. Compare also Green, who notes that the optative in
this conditional expresses “entire uncertainty—a supposed case.” See Green, Handbook, 318.
See also Jelf, Grammar, vol. 2, §855.
182 1 Cor 15:37 contains an example of a partial (only the protasis) fourth class conditional εἰ τύχοι. See my
chapter 7.
183 The PK has ruò yòu gào wò de huà ruò yòu gào wò de shì ("if they have words to say against me") instead of
ruò yòu gào wò de shì.
accuse me.

(b) 他們若有告我的事，他們應該到你面前控告。 (SB, TCV)

Tāmen ruò yōu gào wǒ de shì, tāmen yīnggāi dào nǐ miànqián kǒnggào.

If they have something to accuse me, they should come before you to bring charges.

c) 他們若有甚麼事可以告我，就應當到這裡，在你面前告我 (JOHN M)

Tāmen ruò yōu shénme shì kěyǐ gào wǒ, jiù yīngdāng dào zhè lǐ, zài nǐ miànqián gào wǒ.

If they have something they might accuse me, (they) should come here, and accuse me before you.

d) 萬一他們巴不得有事要告我，是有必要到您面前來。 (FOLEY)

Wàn yī tāmen bā bù dé yǒu shì yào gào wǒ, shì yǒu biyào dào nǐn miànqián lái.

If they really had something to accuse me, it was necessary to come before you.

In (34), the optative in the protasis clearly belongs to the fourth class conditional, whereas the imperfect in the apodosis seems to belong to either the first or the second class conditionals. In translation, however, sorting out which type of conditional the apodosis belongs to should be left open to the reader.

Unlike the Greek conditional clause, the protasis of a Mandarin conditional must be placed before the apodosis, as seen in (34a–d). The translations in (34a–c) are almost

---

184 The TCV has kǒnggào 拦告 (“charge”) instead of gào in the protasis, and kōngsù 控訴 (“accuse”) instead of kǒnggào in the apodosis.

185 Porter, Idioms, 264. Boyer, for example, is undetermined regarding the exact interpretation of the apodosis. He notes that while the second class conditional is possible, the imperfect could also be a “normal tense structure of the relative clause.” See Boyer, “Other Conditional Elements,” 174. See also Zerwick, Biblical Greek, §319. Compare Rijksbaron, who asserts that the optative in the protasis is an “iterative use of the optative,” whereas the imperfect in the apodosis suggests that the conditional denotes “habitual states of affairs in the past...repeatedly fulfilled in the past.” Rijksbaron, Syntax (3d ed.), 72–73.
identical. All three use ruò to introduce the protasis, and the ø morpheme to render the verbs ἔστιν and ἔχοιεῖν, irrespective of their difference in mood or tense-form. In order to express fully the contingency of the optative ἔχοιεῖν in the protasis, the auxiliary bābude ("earnestly wish") needs to be added before the verb yǒu, as (34d) illustrates. Also, since yīngdāng and yīnggāi are both auxiliary verbs in Mandarin, they are not suitable for translating an indicative verb. A better option would be using the verb phrase shì yǒu biyào with the ø morpheme to convey the imperfective aspect of ἔστιν.

5.4.6. Future Conditional

This type of conditional statement is formed by ei + future in the protasis with various verb forms in the apodosis. Many grammarians discuss this conditional under the first class conditional because they treat the future as an indicative form. Goodwin (followed by Gildersleeve, Smyth, Burton and many others) argues that the future conveys a "strong likelihood of fulfillment, especially in appeals to the feelings and in threats and warnings." If this is the case, the future evidently conveys a special modal sense. As Porter has argued, the future form is used to grammaticalize expectation. In Mandarin, notions of expectation may be represented by auxiliary verbs. (35) illustrates:

---

186 See 5.2.2.1, p. 237 above.
187 See, for example, Morris, "On Some Forms," 44–53; Gildersleeve, "On ei with the Future Indicative," 5–23; Goodwin, Greek Grammar, §1401; Smyth and Messing, Greek Grammar, §2563; Zerwick, Biblical Greek, §305.
189 Gildersleeve, "Ei with the Future Indicative," 10; Sonnenschein, Syntax, §354; Wakker, Conditions, 167–76.
190 Porter, Verbal Aspect, 312–16; Porter, Idioms, 264–65. See also BDF §375. The future is closely related to the subjunctive mood and is often used in place of a subjunctive in conditional statements. See Winer,
(35) ei πάντες σκάνδαλισθήσονται εν σοί, ἐγώ οὐδέποτε σκάνδαλισθήσομαι.

(Matt 26:33)

(a) 眾人雖然為你的緣故跌倒，我卻永不跌倒。 (UV)

Zhòngrén suīrán wèi nǐ de yuāngù diē-dǎo, wǒ què yōngbù diē-dǎo.

Although people stumble on account of you, I will never stumble.

(b) 眾人雖然棄絕你，我永不棄絕你。 (PK, JOHNM) 191

Zhòngrén suīrán qījué nǐ, wǒ yōngbù qījué nǐ.

Although people abandon you, I will never abandon you.

(c) 眾人雖會因著你而綽跌，我總不綽跌。 (LÜ)

Zhòngrén suī hui yīnzhē nǐ ér bāndìé, wǒ zōngbù bāndìé.

“Although people will stumble because of you, I will never stumble.”

(d) 即使眾人因你跌倒，我卻永不跌倒！ (WANG, SB, TCV, CRV, CPB) 192

Jīshì zhòngrén yīn nǐ diē-dǎo, wǒ què yōngbù diē-dǎo!

Even if people stumble because of you, I will never stumble!

(e) 就算所有的人都因你的緣故後退，我卻永不後退。 (NCV, CLB) 193

Jiùsuàn sōuyǒu de rén dōu yīn nǐ de yuāngù hòutuí, wǒ què yōngbù hòutuí.

Even if all fall away on account of you, I will never fall away.

(f) 就算人人全都為了你而免不了綽跌，我絕對永不綽跌！ (FOLEY)

Jiùsuàn rénrén quándōu wèile nǐ ér miānbùliǎo bāndìé, wǒ juéduì yōng bù

191 JOHNM has yòngqì 耕棄 (“foresake”) instead of qījué.
192 The TCV uses lái 起 (“abandon”) instead of diē-dǎo; the CRV has bāndìé 弃跌 with the θ morpheme instead of diē-dǎo.
193 The CLB has béipàn 背叛 (“betray”) instead of hòutuí.
**hui bàndìē.**

Even if all fall inevitably on account of you, I shall never fall!

The conditional particles, *jìshì* and *jiùsuàn* in (35d–e), are preferable to the concessive conjunctive *suīrán* (“although”) used in (35a–c). Regarding the verb forms, (35b, c, d) translate the two future forms σκανδαλισθῆσονται and σκανδαλισθήσομαι with the ø morpheme. LÜ in (35c) uses the auxiliary verb *hui* for the future in the protasis, but not in the apodosis. The auxiliary verb *hui* is considered appropriate because it expresses the expectation of the speaker. (35a) and (35d), on the other hand, use the RVC *dāo* (“fall”), which does not reflect the future forms of the original. In order to convey fully the sense of expectation signaled by the future form, auxiliary verbs *miānbùliāo* and *hui* must accompany the verbs in both clauses of the conditional. Also, the ø morpheme is the preferable translation of the Greek future form, as (35f) illustrates.

**5.5. Conclusion**

This chapter continues the effort begun in the previous chapter to conduct a thorough investigation of the New Testament Greek aspect in the non-indicative moods, with the objective of devising an applicable system of translating Greek aspect into Mandarin aspect. The results provide the translator with a powerful linguistic system of translating biblical passages, which will be applied and tested in the next two chapters.
CHAPTER 6 THE PASSION NARRATIVE OF JOHN 18–19

6.1. Introduction

6.1.1. Aim of the Chapter

The aim of the current and following chapters is to apply the proposed translation theory outlined in chapters 2–5 to two selected New Testament passages, the Passion narrative of John’s Gospel (John 18–19) and Paul’s exposition on the resurrection of the body in I Corinthians (1 Corinthians 15). The translation provided here was written according to the principles of systematic rendering of the Greek verbal aspect into Mandarin verbal aspect developed in this dissertation. Over sixty Chinese (including twenty-two Mandarin) Bible versions are critically evaluated, along with several key Nestorian, Manichaean, and Catholic writings before the modern period. Although primary attention is given to the grammatical translation of Greek aspect into Mandarin aspect in the New Testament, other linguistic issues pertaining to Bible translation will also be addressed.

6.1.2. Discourse Structure of John 18–19

The Passion narrative of John (John 18–19) is divided into seven discourse units: the arrest of Jesus (18:1–14), Peter’s first denial (18:15–18), the trial before Annas (18:19–24), Peter’s denial of Jesus again (18:25–27), the trial before Pilate (18:28–19:16a), the crucifixion of Jesus (19:16b–37), and the burial of Jesus (19:38–42). Discourse

---

1 Five Japanese versions (Catholic and Protestant), RAGUET, the TRNT, CBT, JCV, and JRV, are consulted here specifically for non-verbal terms and expressions (e.g. ἀρχίπρεπον, χαρίς) because the Japanese writing system employs Chinese characters, and, more importantly, because the tradition of biblical translation in Japan has its roots in China. For introductory comments on the Japanese Bible and its relation to the history of Bible translation in China, see Clement, “Japanese Bible,” 296–306; Harrington, “Bible in Japan,” 66–75; Gulick, “Bible in Japan,” 380–86.
boundaries are determined by shifts in tense-form and grammatical person. For example, the shift in tense-form from the aorist (18:27) to the present (18:28) marks the beginning of a new pericope of the trial before Pilate (18:28–19:16a). The shift from the first person (17:4–26) to the third person (18:1) also signals the beginning of a new discourse unit, namely, the Passion narrative of Christ. Smaller discourse boundaries are marked by conjunctives, such as καί (18:38b–40), δέ (18:2–11), οὖν (18:12–14, 33–38a; 19:1–7, 8–16a, 23–24, 25–27, 31–37), or μετὰ τοῦτο (19:28–30).

The three verbal aspects in Greek (i.e. perfective, imperfective, stative) are characterized by their performance of specific functions in each of the discourse units. The perfective aspect is grammaticalized by the aorist tense-forms and is used 186 times (62% of total verbs) in the Passion narrative of John. The perfective aspect in Greek is generally used to provide background information to the narrative. In the first discourse unit (18:1–14), for example, the author of the narrative uses three aorist tense-forms (ἐίπον, ἐξῆλθεν, ἐστήλθεν) in v. 1 to depict the thematic backdrop to the narrative of Jesus' arrest. Because it is less heavily marked, the aorist does not emphasize the action in narrative discourse unless certain distinctive syntactic or pragmatic features, such as repetition (of the exact verb form; see 19:6, 15), warrant the marking of prominence.

---

4 There are a total of 300 verbs in the Passion narrative of John. The future form, although discussed in chapters 6–7, is not included in the statistics presented here. Also, verbs such as εἰμί (including its derivatives, e.g. ἔχεσιν) and φημί are aspectually vague (i.e. lacking a perfective/imperfective opposition) and therefore are not counted here. In addition, verbs enclosed with square brackets (e.g. John 19:24) are also not counted. For a discussion of aspectually vague verbs found in the Greek New Testament, see Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 441–47.
5 See Porter and O'Donnell, *Discourse Analysis*, chap. 4; Porter, *Idioms*, 302–04; Westfall, *Discourse Analysis*, 74–75. There are other syntactic and pragmatic means to convey prominence in discourse (e.g.
such cases, two-morpheme aspect compounds (e.g. -guò-le or RVC-le) may be used to reflect the discourse prominence expressed in the Greek. Apart from these exceptions, two-morpheme aspect compounds are not used in translating the aorist tense-form in Greek into Mandarin.

The imperfective and stative aspects, on the other hand, are utilized to convey prominence in Greek discourse because they are more heavily marked. The imperfective aspect in Greek is grammaticalized by the present and imperfect tense-forms, accounting for a total of 80 occurrences (27% of total verbs) in the Passion narrative of John. The imperfective aspect in Greek provides cohesion and also marks foregrounded prominence in discourse.

For example, in both 18:17 and 18:26, the author of the narrative intentionally uses the same present indicative λέγει to introduce direct quotations, thereby providing cohesion to these two separate discourse units concerning Peter’s denials of Jesus (18:15–18; 25–27). Here, textual cohesion is especially pertinent because these two episodes of Peter’s denials are separated by the pericope of Jesus’ trial before Annas (18:19–24). The translator has the option of using a two-morpheme aspect compound (e.g. -le-IDVC) or a disyllabic verb with the ø morpheme. The former is preferable not only because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect that is signaled by the present tense-form in Greek, but also because it corresponds closely to the discourse function of the Greek as a foregrounding device, as well as providing textual cohesion to these two pericopes.

clause structure, redundant pronouns), however, the current dissertation will focus on the discourse function of verbal aspect in Greek.

6 The present tense-form accounts for 68 occurrences in John 18–19, whereas the imperfect has only 12.

7 See further comments on λέγει (18:4), pp. 310–11 below.
The stative aspect is grammaticalized by the perfect and pluperfect tense-forms, which occur 34 times (11% of total verbs) in the Passion narrative of John.\(^8\) It is the most heavily marked aspect in Greek, and is generally used to foreground narrative discourse. The pericope of Jesus' crucifixion (19:16b–37), which accounts for 13 occurrences of the stative aspect, is the most prominent among the other discourse units of the Passion narrative of John. In order to reflect the discourse function of the Greek stative aspect in Mandarin, a four-character set phrase with the \(\varnothing\) morpheme, in general, is most suitable. For example, in the pericope of Jesus' burial (19:38–42), the two perfect participles, \(\kappa\varepsilon\kappa\rho\upsilon\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\varsigma\) (19:38) and \(\tau\varepsilon\theta\varepsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\varsigma\) (19:41), highlight the importance of Jesus burial in the brand new tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, who had secretly followed him. The perfect tense-forms are translated into Mandarin by two four-character set phrases with the \(\varnothing\) morpheme.

Other pragmatic and syntactic considerations, however, necessitate that in some instances the Greek perfect or pluperfect tense-forms may be better translated into Mandarin by the stative aspect morpheme \(-zhe\) rather than by a four-character set phrase with the \(\varnothing\) morpheme. For example, \(\text{wei}-zhe\) ("surround") is stylistically a more preferable translation of the pluperfect tense-form \(\varepsilon\iota\sigma\tau\eta\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota\sigma\varsigma\nu\) (18:18) than a four-character set phrase with the \(\varnothing\) morpheme, which is also used to translate the perfect participle (of the same verb) \(\varepsilon\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma\) in the same verse.

### 6.1.3. Nestorian Records of the Passion Narrative of Christ

Having outlined the discourse structure of John 18–19, the following examines the earliest known Chinese texts concerning the Passion narrative of Christ: the Jesus-
*Messiah Sutra* (also called the *Hsü-T'ing Messiah Sutra*) and the *Lord of the Universe's Discourse on Almsgiving*, both of which were Nestorian documents dated in the early seventh century. The *Jesus-Messiah Sutra* contains a brief harmonized account of the Passion narrative, reporting details such as Jesus being “over thirty-two years old” (v. 190), being falsely accused by “followers of the wicked cause of existence,” being tried by Pilate (*Pīluódūsī* 呂都思, vv. 190–97; John 18:28–19:16a), and being “bound upon the tree” (*mù shàng fǔ-zhe* 木上縛著, vv. 203–204) between “two highway men” (*liǎngge jièdào rén* 兩箇劫道人, v. 202) at Golgotha (*Qìjū* 赤句, v. 201; John 19:17) at the fifth hour on the Sabbath (*liùrì zhāi* 六日齋, “six-day-feast,” v. 203). Other events are also reported by the *Sūtra*, including Pilate washing his hands (*suō shuǐ xǐshǒu* 索水洗手 v. 196; Matt 27:24–25) to declare his innocence in the death of Jesus, the shaking of the earth, and the rising of the dead from their graves: “...there was black darkness on every side, and the earth quaked and the mountains were rent, and all the gates of graves in the world were opened and the men got life” (*Sīfāng àn hēi. Dì zhàn shān bēng. Shítān suǒyǒu mù mén bīng kāi. Suǒyǒu sīrén bīng xī dé huó* 四方闇黑。地戰山崩。世間所有墓門並開。所有死人並悉得活。 v. 204; Matt 27:51–54).9

The *Discourse on Almsgiving* provides interesting additional details to the *Sūtra* concerning the one who betrays and the one who buries Jesus. It describes Judas Iscariot as “a Jew” (*Shīhū rén* 石忽人) and “at first a follower; but, afterward he raised his hand against (his Master)... three days before He met His death, this man had already made an agreement (of betrayal)” (*Chū cóng qīshòu xiàng. Sì yuè qián sān rì. Zào yuē shù jīng* 初

---

Furthermore, the *Discourse* reports that Joseph of Arimathea (姚曦 *Yáoxí*), described as a “man, observing the law of the country,” “went to the house (of Pilate) and begged (the body of Jesus). (Joseph) wrapped the body (of Jesus) in a new clean cloth, and buried Him in a new graveyard, where there was a new tomb, which had recently been hewn out on the side of the broken-off hill” (*Zhi zhuò fā cōng jiā suō. Xiǎng xīn liǎng bù lǐ guǒ. Yí yù xīn mìtián lǐ. Yǒu xīn chuān chú shān pī bōliè* 計坐佛從家索。向新縫布裏裏。亦於新墓田裏。有新穿處山批擘裂。 vv. 115–117; John 19:38–42).  

6.2. Chinese Translation of John 18–19

The Chinese translation provided in this section was written according to the principles of systematic rendering of the Greek verbal aspect into Mandarin verbal aspect developed in chapters 2–5 of this dissertation. The format of each section begins with a presentation of the Greek text, followed by my Chinese translation, a transliteration of the Chinese, an English rendering of the Chinese, and, finally, an in-depth treatment of selected verbs and key words. The Greek text, including word divisions and punctuation marks (but not paragraph breaks), follows Nestle-Aland’s *Novum Testamentum Graece*.

---

10 For the Chinese text, see Saeki, *Nestorian Documents*, 51–70; see also 206–247 for an English translation with notes. The *Discourse on Almsgiving* also records narratives of events following the burial of Jesus, including eyewitness accounts of the empty tomb, the resurrection, post-resurrection appearances, the Great Commission, the promise of the coming of the Holy Spirit, and the ascension to heaven (vv. 118–51).

11 The English translation is provided by Saeki in Saeki, *Nestorian Documents*, 216. The rarely used character 縛 is not found in any of the standard Chinese lexicons (e.g. *Emperor Kangxi’s Lexicon*《康熙字典》, *Shuo wen jie zi zhu*《說文解字注》, *Gile’s Dictionary*, or *Contemporary Chinese Dictionary*). Although its precise meaning is unclear, Saeki gives the translation “clean,” which probably stems from his assumption that 縛 is derived from liǎng 糧, which denotes “to dry in the sun,” a step in the process of making cloth.

12 The discussions in this chapter (and throughout this dissertation) do not include vague verbs (see p. 297 n. 4 above).
(27th ed.). The English translation is provided for the convenience of readers with limited or no knowledge of Chinese. The English translation was written following the translation principles outlined in chapter 2 of this dissertation, and has special emphasis on reflecting the verbal aspect of the Chinese.

6.2.1. Jesus Arrested (John 18:1-14) 耶穌被捕

This pericope may be divided into three sub-sections (18:1, 2-11, 12-14). The discourse boundaries of these sub-sections, as noted in 6.1.2, are marked by the conjunctives δὲ (18:2) and οὖν (18:12), as well as shifts in tense-form (18:2, 12). The aorist tense-forms are used to set the scene (v. 1), carry the movement of the narrative (vv. 3-13), and conclude the discourse unit (v. 14). The present tense-forms are employed to introduce the confrontation between Jesus and the arresting party (vv. 3-5) and draw special attention to a number of key events: the speeches of Jesus (vv. 4, 7-8) and Caiaphas (v. 14). The perfect and pluperfect tense-forms are reserved to mark frontgrounded prominence in the narrative. The perfect tense-forms are utilized to highlight Jesus’ premonitions of what will soon transpire (v. 4) and God’s gracious gifts (vv. 9, 11), while the pluperfect tense-forms are used to highlight Judas’ role in betraying Jesus (vv. 2, 5).

Ταύτα εἶπὼν Ἰησοῦς ἐξῆλθεν σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου τοῦ Κεδρόν ὀποῦ ἦν κῆπος, εἰς δὲ εἰσῆλθεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. (18:1)

耶稣说完这些话之后，遂同他的门徒出門，越過汲淪溪谷。在那裏有一個圈子，他就跟他的門徒一同進了去。

---

13 Aland et al., Novum Testamentum Graece.
Yesu shuo-wan zhixie huazihou, sui tong ta de mentsu chumem, yuugu JLun xig.
Zai naili you yige yuanzi, ta jiu gen ta de mentsu yitong jin-le qu.

After Jesus has finished saying these, he went out with his disciples, and crossed the Kidron Valley. There was a garden, and then Jesus entered it with his disciples.

εἰπών (cf. v. 38b) Most wenli versions use the RVC bi (“conclude,” MOR, GÜ, DV, GO, BB, SJ, WV; also one Mandarin version, HS) or jing 竫 (“complete,” GURY, UVW, UVB) to denote the perfective aspect of εἰπών. In Mandarin, the aorist participle may be translated by shuo-wan with the RVC wán (“complete,” CPB). The ø morpheme (MAR, BCV, CSV, JOHN, TCV) is another option; however, it is not preferable here because it allows for the interpretation of aspects other than the perfective in Mandarin. Several Mandarin versions (SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, IG, HSC, LÜ, CRV, RCUV, CSB) use the perfective -le, which also reflects the aspect of the aorist tense-form and may be used interchangeably with RVCs. However, the two-morpheme aspect compound wán-le (RVC-le) used in some versions (MSV, PK, JOHN, CNT, SB, DCT) is not preferable because it expresses foregrounded prominence that is absent in the Greek.

Ἰσοῦ Yesu, in its current and most common transliterated form, first appeared in Catholic writings before the sixteenth century. Ricci used the expression Yēsū jì wèi Jiuzhù ye 耶稣既谓救主也 (“Jesus means ‘savior’”) in the Tien-chu Shih-i and was followed by Basset, Morrison, and Marshman.14 The alternative form 耶稣 (same pronunciation) sometimes appears in the phrase Yēsū Jīlism dú wòdēng Zhū 耶稣基督是 吾等主 (“Jesus Christ our Lord”).15 The Russian Orthodox translation of the New Testament in Chinese instead has Yiysu伊耶稣 (see discussion in 2.2.4.4). Ἰσοῦς

14 Ricci, T'ien-chu Shih-i, 448, line 580.
15 Ortiz, Commentary, 4.
was transcribed into Chinese at least three different ways in the Nestorian and
Manichaean documents dated between the seventh and tenth centuries: Yishū 移鼠 (['ie ʂi wɔ] lit. “moving rat”) from the Syriac ܝܫܘܥ in the Jesus-Messiah Sūtra (vv. 156, 160), Yishū 義數 (['iei ʂiu'] lit. “screen-number”) in the Discourse on Almsgiving (v. 220), and Yishū 夷數 (['iu ʂiu'] in the Incomplete Religious Scripture of a Persian Religion.16 Following the conventions of modern Chinese versions, 耶穌 is not
underlined throughout the New Testament.

εἰςηλθεν (see also 18:29, 19:34) The ο morpheme (e.g. PK, JOHN, UV, WANG, IG, HSC, LÜ, TCV, NCV, CPB, CSB) and the perfective aspect marker -le (CLB) are both
good translations, although the former better reflects the less heavily marked aorist tense-
form. Also, since there is no shift in tense-form here, the ο morpheme is preferable.

εἰσηλθεν Most Mandarin versions use either jǐngù (“go into,” SYD, WANG, CNT, HS, LÜ, TCV, CPB) with the ο morpheme, or the same verb form with the modal particle
le (PK, JOHN, UV, ZHU, BT, IG, HSC, SB, CRV, NCV, RCUV, CSB) and the ο
morpheme. The perfective aspect marker -le (CLB) is preferable to the ο morpheme
because it formally reflects the aspect of the Greek and marks the contrasts between the
two aorists, εἰςηλθεν (“went out”) and εἰσηλθεν (“went in”). However, as argued in

16 Pronunciations of ancient Chinese in square brackets are given by Karlgren. See Karlgren, Analytic
Dictionary, s.v. For comments on Yishū 移鼠 and Yishū 義數, see Saeki, Nestorian Documents, 120–21,
157, 246; Zetzsche, “Indigenizing,” 144; Haneda, “Remarks on the Jesus-Messiah Sūtra,” 262. For
comments on Yishū 夷數, see Bryder, Chinese Transformation of Manichaeism, 48, 114; Zetzsche,
“Indigenizing,” 150. See also Haneda, “Remarks on the Jesus-Messiah Sūtra,” 262. Haneda and others
identify the term Xūting (or Hsu-t'ing) 序聽, which appears in the Chinese title of the Jesus-Messiah Sūtra,
as a possible transliteration of Jesus. I have found their conclusion on the basis of the phonetic connection
between the ancient Chinese pronunciation of 序聽 ([zi wo, c'ieŋ]) according to Karlgren and the Syriac
ܐܝܫܘܥ, to be problematic. Also, it is difficult to reconcile why Bishop Alopen would use a different
Chinese term for Jesus when he has already used Yishū 移鼠 in the text. See Haneda, “Remarks on the
Jesus-Messiah Sūtra,” 262–63; Moule, Christians in China, 59; Saeki, Nestorian Documents, 147; Kung,
Christian Religion, 53.
chapter 3, the use of a single morphologically expressed perfective morpheme does not 
add emphasis in Mandarin discourse.

'Ἡδεὶ δὲ καὶ Ἰουδᾶς ὁ παραδίδοντος αὐτὸν τὸν τόπον, ὅτι πολλάκις συνήχθη Ἰησοῦς ἑκεῖ μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. (18:2)

他的徒猶大也早對此地瞭若指掌，因為耶穌屢次同他的門徒在那兒聚集。

Tā de pàntú Yǒudà yè zāo dui cǐdì liǎo-ruò-zhī-zhǎng, yǐnwèi Yēsū lúcì tóng tāde mèntú zài nàér jūjí.

Judas his traitor also knew the place well beforehand, because Jesus and his disciples 
often gathered there.

According to the four-character set phrase with the φ morpheme liǎo-ruò-zhī-zhǎng ("know a 
place like the back of one’s hand") is used to translate the stative aspect of the pluperfect 
tense-form in Greek. In order to distinguish between the pluperfect and perfect tense-
forms, zāo ("beforehand," "in advance") may be added here. This addition is necessary to 
convey the conceptual distance ([+remote]) that is grammaticalized by the Greek 
pluperfect tense-form.17 By default, four-character set phrases that occur without such 
additions express the immediate ([−remote]) stative aspect. Table 6.1 below lists the 
adverbs and DVCs most commonly used to convey conceptual distance in Mandarin:

---

17 The additional words presented in Table 6.1 are also used to render the conceptual distance ([+remote]) 
that is grammaticalized by the Greek imperfect tense-form. See the discussion on John 18:15 below.
Table 6.1. Adverbs and DVCs commonly used to express conceptual distance in Mandarin

Almost all existing Chinese versions use \textit{zhídào} 知道 ("know" UV, ZHU, WANG, CNT, IG, BT, HSC, HS, LÜ, SB, TCV, CRV, CPB, RCUV, CSB) with the \textit{\textdegree} morpheme to translate \textit{i\textdegree}1. Neither \textit{rèn-dé} 認得 (MSV, PK, JOHNM) nor \textit{xíao-dé} 講得 (SYD) are preferable because the RVC \textit{dé} expresses perfectivity.

Several different methods of transliteration are used in wenli versions: \textit{Rúdá} 儒達 (SL-MOR), \textit{Rúdàshi} 如大士 (MOR, MAR), \textit{Yóudàshi} 猶大士 (GÜ), \textit{Yíwùdá} 伊屋達 (GURY), and \textit{Yóudà} 猶大 (DV, GO). Catholic versions had used \textit{Rúdáslí} 茹答斯 (WV) and \textit{Jiádáslí} 茹達斯 (IG) before adopting the standardized form \textit{Yóudáslí} 猶達斯 (CNT, HSC, SB, CPB). Most Protestant Chinese versions (PK, JOHNM, SJ, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, HS, LÜ, TCV, CLB, CRV, NCV, RCUV, CSB) follow the conventional form \textit{Yóudà} 猶大 first used by the DV. Like other biblical names, the conventional form \textit{Yóudà} 猶大 for \textit{Yoûdaç} is preferable to other alternative forms.
The expression ὁ παραδίδους αὐτὸν, which literally means, “the one who betrays him,” may be translated as τὰ δὲ πάντω (“his betrayer”). Only HS and CLB recognize this as a substantive use of the participle.

Then Judas led a company of soldiers, chief priests, and Pharisees’ servants, and they were coming there with lanterns and torches in their hands.

Several versions have ἔλεγεν (“take,” MSV, UV, WANG, CNT, IG, BT, LÜ, SB, CRV, CPB, RCUV) for the aorist participle. Like εἰσήλθεν in v. 1, -le is preferable to the φ morpheme because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form. The aspect marker -zhe (PK, JOHNM, SYD, ZHU, HSC, HS, DCT) is not preferable because it does not reflect the perfective aspect of the Greek.

Here is an example of a Greek word that may be translated by several different Chinese words. In v. 3, as well as 18:35, 19:6, 15, 21, ἀρχιερέων is meant as the “chief priests” as opposed to the “high priest” (ἀρχιερεύς) in 18:10, 13, 15–16, 19, 22, 24, 26. When it refers to the chief priests, jisīzhǎng is the most fitting translation, as found in the majority of Mandarin as well as Japanese versions (PK, JOHNM, BB, UV,}

---

18 See, for example, Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 339; Zerwick, Biblical Greek, §371; Porter, Idioms, 182–83. See the discussion in 5.3.2.2.a, pp. 265–67 above.
WANG, BT, HS, LÜ, TCV, CLB, NCV, CRV, RCUV, CSB, JRV, JCV, CBT; cf. KJV, TEV, NRSV, TNIV, ESV). In the wenli versions, several phrases are used: duódé 銳德 (“priest,” SL-MOR), jìzhē shōubèi 祭者首筆 (“head worshippers,” MOR, MAR, also v. 35), jìzhū 祭主 (“head worshipper,” GÚ), jìsī zhūzhāng 祭司諸長 (“chief priests,” DV, GO, BCV, SJ, UVW, UVB, UVE), and sījī shǒu 司祭首 (“head priest,” GURY). The Catholic versions use sījìzhāng 司祭長 (“chief priest,” IG, CNT, HSC, WV, SB, CPB).

When ἁρχιερέων refers to the High Priest, dàjìsī is used (“chief priest,” see v. 10). Certain versions, however, consistently use the same lexeme for all occurrences of ἁρχιερέων in the New Testament. These include four wenli versions (DV, GO, BCV, GURY) and three Mandarin versions (MSV, jìsī tóumù 祭司頭目, “head priest”; SYD, dàjìsī, “chief priest”; ZHU, jìzhū 祭主, “head worshipper”).

ὐπηρέτας The addition of the plural suffix men 們 to the noun chāiyì (“servant,” CSB) is unnecessary. See also vv. 12, 18.

ἐρχεῖται (cf. ἐρχόμενα, v. 4) The shift from the aorist (λοφέων) to the present tense-form would justify the use of a more heavily marked two-morpheme aspect compound. The problem here is that zài...-zhe, while grammatical acceptable, is not preferable in this context because of the apparent tautology. However, the translator may use the single aspect morpheme -zhe instead to reflect the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form in Greek. Most Mandarin versions use lái-dào (“arrive,” e.g. PK, UV, SB, LÜ, NCV, CRV, CPB, RCUV), which is not preferable because the RVC dào expresses the perfective aspect.
Then Jesus, having understood everything that he was soon facing, went out to tell them, "For whom are you looking?"

εἰδὼς As in v. 2, almost all Chinese versions translate the perfect participle by zhīdào ("know") with the ø morpheme (e.g. UV, WANG, CNT, IG, BT, HSC, HS, LÜ, CRV, RCUV). ZHU, on the other hand, adds yǐjīng ("already") to the front of zhīdào, perhaps under the misconception that the perfect tense-form is used to grammaticalize past-time reference. The four-character set phrase dòng-chá-qi-jǐǎn ("understand thoroughly") with the ø morpheme is the ideal translation here because it reflects the Greek perfect tense-form as a frontgrounding device.

ἐρχόμενα (cf. ἔρχεται, v. 3) Most Mandarin versions have lín-dào 至到 ("come upon," PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, IG, LÜ, SB, CLB, CRV, NCV, RCUV) with auxiliary verbs such as jiāng, jiāngyào, or yào, which are not suitable translations of the indicative mood in Greek. For reasons pointed out above in 4.2.2.2, these auxiliary verbs express not only futurity but also expectation.20 Therefore, expressions such as jiāngyào (jiāng) jiāng, jiāngyào 將要 (即將)发生 ("will happen," TCV, CPB), yào zāoyù 要遭遇 ("will meet

---

19 See also example (1) in 2.2.4.2, pp. 54–55 above.
20 See 4.2.2.2, pp. 185–87 above.
with,” ZHU, CNT), yào xíngjiāng dào-lái 要行將到來 (“is going to arrive,” HS), or jíngyào lái-dào 將要來到 (“will arrive,” HSC) are not preferable.

The translator can now choose between the ø morpheme and the formally expressed imperfective morphemes. Here, the latter is preferable, because it better reflects the imperfective aspect signaled by the Greek present tense-form. However, it is best to use the single aspect marker -zhe as opposed to a two-morpheme aspect compound because zài mìànlín-zhe makes the sentence rather heavy or even tautologous, especially with a four-character set phrase right in front of it.

The shift in tense-form from to the present (ἐξῆλθεν) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme (in this case, -le).

The more heavily marked present tense-form is used in the first verbal exchange between Jesus and the arresting party (see also v. 5). The disyllabic verb gào-su (“tell,” “say”) is preferable to monosyllabic verbs, such as wèn (“ask,” “say,” PK, SYD, ZHU, CNT, LÜ, SB, TCV, CPB) or shuō (“say,” e.g. UV, BT, IG, NCV, RCUV, CSB), because it is more heavily marked in Mandarin narrative discourse. The aspect marker zài, which is generally used to translate the Greek present tense-form, cannot be added here because the expressions zài wèn or zài shuō in this context are regarded as unacceptable in Mandarin. For this reason, the ø morpheme better reflects the imperfective aspect of the Greek.

With the exception of 19:35, in which the author inserted his personal comment regarding the credibility of the narrative, λέγει is utilized frequently throughout the Passion narrative of John to introduce direct quotations of statements and questions (18:4–5, 17, 26, 38; 19:4–6, 9–10, 14–15, 26–28, 37). In most contexts where λέγει
occurs, the translator does not have an option to choose between the ø and formally expressed imperfective aspect morphemes, because expressions such as zài shuō-zhe ("saying"), while grammatically acceptable, is not preferable because of the apparent tautology. The translator does have the option to choose between disyllabic verbs and monosyllabic ones. For each occurrence of λέγει, a disyllabic verb is employed with the ø morpheme to reflect the more heavily marked present tense-form in Greek as well as provide textual cohesion to the pericopes or smaller units of the narrative. However, as noted in 6.1.2 above, there are two exceptions (18:17, 26) where the two-morpheme aspect compound -le-IDVC is used (see comments below).

ζητεῖτε (see also vv. 7, 8) Several Mandarin versions have “Nimen zhāo shéi?” (e.g. SYD, UV, BT, IG, LÜ, SB, RCUV), using the ø morpheme for the verb zhāo ("find"). The aspect marker zài is preferable to the ø morpheme because it formally reflects the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form in Greek.

άπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ: Ἡσυχὸν τὸν Ναζωραῖον. λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἐγώ εἰμι· εἰστήκει δὲ καὶ Ὑιοῦς ὁ παραδίδος αὐτὸν μετ’ αὐτῶν. ὡς οὖν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἐγώ εἰμι, ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὅπισω καὶ ἔπεσαν χαμαί. (18:5–6)

他們對他答說：「拿撒勒人耶穌。」他告訴他們說：「我就是。」那時他的疲乏猶大也在他們旁邊比肩而立。當他對他們說出：「我就是」，他們就向後退下又佇倒在地上。

They answered him, “Jesus the Nazarene.” He said to them, “I am he.” Judas the traitor was also standing among them. When Jesus said to them, “I am he,” they withdrew and fell to the ground.

This aorist tense-form occurs 13 times in the narrative to introduce direct quotations of the participants. Most Mandarin versions (e.g. MSV, PK, UV, ZHU, CNT, SB, LÜ, TCV, NCV, CPB, CSB) use verbs such as huida ("reply"), dafu ("respond"), da ("answer"), shuo ("tell"), or wen ("ask") with the ō morpheme for all of these occurrences. Formally expressed perfective aspect morphemes, while grammatically acceptable, are not preferable here. The solution may be found by using the monosyllabic verb da with ō morpheme (and with shuo to introduce direct quotations) for all 13 occurrences of the aorist. This provides textual cohesion to other pericopes where the verb form is used (cf. ἀπεκρίθησαν, v. 22).

As in v. 4, the verb gāosù ("speak," "tell") with the ō morpheme is again used to translate the Greek. This provides textual cohesion to the pericope (18:1–14). Some versions use the ō morpheme zhàn ("stand," PK) or simply zhàn ("stand," UV, SYD, ZHU, RCUV) for the pluperfect tense-form, while others use -zhe (MSV, JOHNM, LÜ). Although both are acceptable, the four-character set phrase bǐ-jīăn-ér-li ("stand shoulder to shoulder") with the ō morpheme is better because it closely reflects the stative aspect and the frontgrounding device signaled by the Greek. In order to convey the remoteness of the pluperfect tense-form, nāshi ("then," "at that point") may be added (see also v. 16).

21 Most commentators fail to note this significant use of λέγει.
παραδιδοὺς  See v. 2.
εἰπεν (v. 6; cf. vv. 7–9)  Some versions add 以习近平 or 作为 (“as soon as,” “at once”) to the front of the verb 说话 (“speak”) (e.g. MSV, ZHU, IG, HS, RCUV), which is acceptable but not absolutely necessary here because the adverb is absent in the Greek. The RVC 乒乓 (e.g. HS) is preferable to the o morpheme because it better reflects the perfective aspect of the Greek. Also, the shift in tense-form from the present (παραδιδοὺς, v. 5) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. In addition, the RVC provides a better contrast to the imperfective aspect that is signaled by the present tense-form λέγει in v. 5.

ἀπήλθον…ἔπεσαν  The perfective aspect signaled by the two aorist tense-forms may be morphologically reflected by the RVCs 下 and 到. Here, RVCs are preferable to the o morpheme because they leave no ambiguity regarding the aspect in question.

πάλιν οὖν ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς· τίνα ζητεῖτε; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον. ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι ἔγω εἰμί. εἰ οὖν ἐμὲ ζητεῖτε, ἀφεῖτε τούτος ὑπάγειν· ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν ὅτι οὐς δέδωκάς μοι οὐκ ἀπώλεσα εξ αὐτῶν οὐδένα. (18:7–9)

於是耶稣再次問他們說：「你們在我那一位？」他們說：「拿撒勒人耶稣。」耶稣答說：「我已經跟你們說過『我就是』；你們要是在找我，就容這些人離開吧。」〈這要應驗他所說過的話：「你所隱藏賞賜的，我一個也沒有失落。」〉

Again Jesus asked them, “For whom are you looking?” They said, “Jesus the Nazarene.” Jesus replied, “I already told you, “I am he”; if you are looking for me, let these people go.” (This was to fulfill what he said before: “What you have graciously given, I have not lost one”).

ἐπηρώτησεν (v. 7) The monosyllabic verb ὠρω (“ask,” e.g. UV, SB, NCV, CRV) with the ο μορφήme better reflects the less heavily marked aorist tense-form in Greek.

ζητεῖτε (vv. 7, 8) See v. 4.

ἐἶπαν (v. 7) As in v. 6, this aorist tense-form of λέγω is again used to introduce a direct quotation, so it may also be translated by a monosyllabic verb such as shuo (“say,” e.g. UV, SB, NCV) with the ο μορφήme. Likewise, ἀπεκρίθη (v. 8), which is used to introduce another direct quotation of Jesus, may be translated the same way.

ἀπεκρίθη (v. 8) See v. 5.

ἐἴπον (cf. v. 9) In contrast to ἐἶπαν in v. 7, the aorist is used here within the quoted speech of Jesus, which justifies the use of a morphologically expressed perfective morpheme (cf. ἀπείρεσσα, v. 9). The majority of Mandarin versions employ the ο μορφήme for the aorist: gàosù (“tell,” MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, CNT, LÜ, TCV, CRV, NCV, CPB, RCUV, CSB) and shuo (“say,” CLB). Other versions, predominantly Catholic, have shuo-le (IG, HSC, SB) and gàosù-le (HS) with the perfective aspect marker -le. SYD and ZHU, on the other hand, use the aspect marker -guò. The perfective markers -le and -guò may be used interchangeably, and both are preferable to the ο μορφήme because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form.
Almost all Chinese versions use the φ morpheme for both tense-forms: ràng...zǒu (ba) 讓...走（吧）（“let...go,” CNT, IG, HS, NCV, TCV, CLB, CRV, CPB, RCUV, CSB), fàng...zǒu 放...走 (“release...go,” LÜ) and ràng...qù 讓...去 (“let...go away,” UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, SB). Auxiliary verbs such as yào (HSC) or kē/kēyì (PK, JOHNM) are unnecessary additions since they are used to convey volition or contingency in Mandarin. Therefore, the monosyllabic verb róng (“allow”) with the φ morpheme is suitable for the rendering of the aorist imperative, while the disyllabic likāi (“leave”) is preferable for the present infinitive in Greek.

The auxiliary verb yào (JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, BT, LÜ, CRV, RCUV, CSB) adequately renders the sense of projection expressed by the Greek aorist subjunctive. Some versions use conjunctives such as wèi 為 (“for the sake of,” HSC, SB) or wèile 為了 (CNT), which express a similar idea.

While the aspect marker -le (PK, HS, TCV, NCV, CPB) and the φ morpheme (e.g. MSV, JOHNM, UV, SYD, CRV) are both acceptable, the latter is preferable because it helps to establish textual cohesion in the Mandarin translation. Therefore, in the other three occurrences (v. 32; 19:24, 36), πληροθῇ is consistently translated by the disyllabic verb yīngyàn with the φ morpheme.

Here, -guò is preferable to the φ morpheme because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect signaled by the aorist tense-form in Greek. Also, it is preferable because the aorist occurs in a direct quotation.

---

22 For discussions on the subjunctive mood in Greek and its translation into Mandarin, see 5.2.1.
23 Lü and Zhu argue that aspect morphemes such as -zhe and -le cannot be used when auxiliary verbs such as nèng, kē, huì, and yīnggāi are present. This assertion must be dismissed. As Wang Li notes, expressions such as Zhè bù gǎi tōu-le qù 這不該偷著去 (“You should not steal this”) or Yè kē shēng-le nǎxiǎ huārjiǔng 也不靠著那些花兒匠 (“We can also avoid having to hire a gardener”) are common in Mandarin. See Lü and Zhu, Syntax, 79–80; Wang 力, Grammar, vol. 1, 139–141, 319; Wang 力, Outline, 112.
Most versions use *cīgēi* 賜給 ("give") with the オ morpheme (e.g. PK, JOHM, UV, SB). The CNT has the disyllabic verb *tūōfū* 托付 ("entrust") with the オ morpheme, which adds a slight emphasis to the verb form, though not enough to convey the heavily marked perfect tense-form in Greek. Therefore, the four-character set phrase *ēn-chōng-shāng-ci* ("bestow upon graciously") works best here because its heavily marked feature corresponds to the perfect tense-form used as a frontgrounding device.

Similar to *eitpov* in v. 8, the aorist is used within the quoted speech of Jesus, which justifies the use of a morphologically expressed perfective morpheme, in this case, the RVC *diao*.

此时西門彼得帶著一把刀，拔力砍了大祭司的僕人，又斬掉他的右耳。那僕人的名字叫做馬勒古。於是耶穌對彼得說：「拔刀入鞘吧！父親恩寵賞賜我的杯，難道說我不喝下它嗎？'

Simon Peter, who was carrying a sword, drew it and struck the high priest’s servant, and then cut off his right ear. That servant’s name was Malchus. Then Jesus said to Peter, “Put the sword into its sheath! The cup which Father has graciously given me, should I not drink it?”
Simon Peter was first transcribed as Cénwên sēngjiā (from the Syriac ܣܝܢܘܢ ܣܝܓܝܐ) in the early eighth century Nestorian document the Sūtra Aiming at Mysterious Rest and Joy (vv. 5f). Haneda identifies sēngjiā with the Sogdian sang, which means “stone.” However, Saeki asserts convincingly that since sēngjiā represents samgha (i.e. sangha), Cénwên sēngjiā means “Simon, the chief of priesthood” or “Deva of Priesthood.” Various transliterations are also found: Simān Bōdūoluō 西滿伯多羅 (SL-MOR), Simēn Biduoluō 西門彼多羅 (MOR, MAR), Simēn Bidēluō 西門彼得羅 (GU), and Xīmēng Sātēr 西孟撒特爾 (GURY). Catholic versions have Simān Bōdūolu 他的聖徒多羅 (e.g. CNT, HSC, SB). Protestant versions in Mandarin now use Simēn Bīdē 西門彼得 (or 西門 · 彼得; e.g. RCUV), following the DV and other early wenli versions (BCV, GO).

The aspect marker -zhe (dāi-zhe, PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, ZHU, RCUV) is preferable to the ō morpheme (yōu, “have,” SB) because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form in Greek.

Bā dāo kān-le (“draw the sword [and] strike”) works best here. The aspect marker -le (e.g. UV, ZHU, LÙ) is preferable to the ō morpheme (e.g. PK, JOHNM, IG, HSC) because it formally reflects the perfective aspect signaled by the two aorists.

RVCs such as diào (gē-diào 割掉, “cut off,” MSV; xiāo-diào 削掉, “slice off,” PK, UV, CRV; kān-diào 砍掉, “chop off,” LÙ), qū (xiāo-qū 削去, “cut off,” JOHN, SYD, ZHU), or xià (kān-xià 砍下, MOR, MAR) are preferable to the ō.
morpheme used in most wenli versions (e.g. SL-MOR, GÜ, DV, GO, BCV, GURY, JOHN, CSV, SJ, UVW, WV) because they closely reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form. However, the combination of RVCs and -le in some versions is not preferable because the two-morpheme aspect compounds employed in xiāo-xiā-le (“sliced off,” IG, SB), xiāo-diāo-le (“sliced off,” RCUV), and xiāo-qù-le (“sliced off,” HSC) foreground the discourse, a result that is clearly absent in the original.

The term dājīsī (“high priest”; see also vv. 13, 15-16, 19, 22, 24, 26) used in the majority of Chinese versions (JOHNM, SJ, UV, UVW, UVB, UVE, WANG, ZHU, IG, HS, WV, SB, CPB, JRV, CSB, JCV, CBT) serves here to differentiate it from the closely related term jīsìzhāng, which designates “chief priests” (see vv. 3, 35; 19:6, 15, 21). Basset uses jiàoshōu 教首 (“head of religion,” SL-MOR), whereas GÜ uses jīsì yuánkuí 祭司元魁 (“head priest”). Morrison and Marshman are inconsistent with such distinctions: for example, here in v. 10, jiâshēshōu 祭者首 (“head worshipper”) is used, whereas chōngjīshōu 崇祭首 (“head of chief priests,” v. 13) and chōngjīzhē 崇祭者 (“chief priest,” vv. 15–16, 19, 22, 24, 26) are also used to refer to the high priest. Besides MOR and MAR, other versions, such as PK and BB, use jīsìzhāng 祭司長 (“head priest”) here in v. 10, but use another term, dājīsī (“chief priest”) for vv. 13, 15–16, 19, 22, 24, 26 to refer to the high priest.

The Ø morpheme is used here because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

Several versions use the monosyllabic verb shōu (“put back”) with the Ø morpheme (e.g. UV, ZHU, BT, HS, LÜ, RCUV), which is an excellent choice because it

---

27 This distinction is supported by Graves. See Graves, “Uniform Names,” 120.
reflects the less heavily marked aorist tense-form in Greek. Also, there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

δέδωκέν  See v. 9.

πίω  Similar to εἰπον and ἀπώλεσα in vv. 8–9, the aorist is used here within the quoted statement of Jesus, which justifies the use of a morphologically expressed perfective morpheme, in this case, the RVC xià. In addition, the shift in tense-form from the perfect (δέδωκέν) to aorist also justifies its use.

In addition, the shift in tense-form from the perfect (δέδωκέν) to aorist also justifies its use.

Then a company of soldiers, the captain, and servants of the Jews arrested Jesus. They tied him and took him before Annas. This was because Annas was the father-in-law of Caiaphas, the high priest that year. Caiaphas happened to be the person who advised the Jews that, "It is good for one person to die on behalf of all people."
Ἰουδαίων (v. 12) Jews were first referred to in Chinese as Shihūrēn 石忽人 in the early seventh century Nestorian document, the Discourse on Almsgiving (vv. 119, 123). 石忽 might be pronounced [ʒjäk .gwo], as Karlgren suggests, which is somewhat close to the Syriac original ܫܫܡܘܢܐ.²⁸ Three different names are used in the Chinese Bible: Rūdārēn 如達人 (SL-MOR), Yīwūdiéyàrēn 伊屋垂亞人 (GURY), and Yóutàiērēn 猶太人 (GÜ, DV, GO).

χιλίαρχος Qiānfǔ zhāng (lit. "thousand-man chief") is the most common term for χιλίαρχος (GO, BCV, GURY, DV, JOHN, JOHNM, BB, SJ, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, LÜ, SB, NCV, RCUV, CSB, Stuart).²⁹ Several other terms are also used, including dā duìzhāng 大隊長 ("chief commander," HS), duìzhāng 隊長 ("leader," TCV, CLB, CPB), jiāng 將 ("general," SL-MOR), guān 官 ("official," MOR, MAR), qiānzōng 千總 (lit. "thousand-(man) commander," GÜ, WV, MSV), bīngguān 兵官 ("captain," HSC), and guānzhāng 官長 ("officer," CNT). Qiānfǔ zhāng is adopted here because it better represents the Greek original, and because it has been used in most Chinese versions, not only the Protestant but also the Catholic and the Orthodox.

συνέλαβον (cf. 18:3, 31; 19:1, 6, 16b, 23, 27, 30, 40) Some versions use the RVC zhù (e.g. zhuō-zhù 捉住, "capture," MSV, HS; ná-zhù 拿住, "seize," UV, WANG, BT, RCUV), but do not render the prefix συν-. The CNT has zhuōná-le 捕拿了 ("arrested") with -le, which may be used interchangeably with RVCS or the ø morpheme, although the ø morpheme is preferable here because it better reflects the less heavily marked aorist tense-form. Also, there is no shift in tense-form in justify the use of a formally marked perfective aspect morpheme.

²⁸ Karlgren, Analytic Dictionary, s.v. See also Sacki, Nestorian Documents, 238–41.
²⁹ See also Stuart, Greek-Chinese-English Dictionary, s.v.
The perfective aspect morphemes -le (PK, JOHNM, UV, BT, RCUV) and RVCs, such as zhù (LÜ) or qīlái (MSV, WANG, HSC, HS, SB, CLB, NCV, DCT, CSB), are both preferable to the φ morpheme (SYD, ZHU, CNT, IG) because they formally reflect the aspect of the aorist. Also, monosyllabic verbs such as kūn ("tie") or bāng ("bind") is not normally used without an aspect morpheme in this context. On the other hand, the two-morpheme aspect compound qīlái-le (RVC-le) found in the TCV and CPB is not preferable because it does not reflect the less marked aorist tense-form in Greek.

Monosyllabic verbs such as dāi ("lead," UV, WANG, BT, LÜ, CRV, NCV, CPB, RCUV), lālā ("drag," MSV, PK, JOHNM) or sòng xiè ("send," SYD, ZHU) with the φ morpheme is preferable to those with RVCs (e.g. zōu, HS), since there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally marked perfective aspect morpheme.

Some Mandarin versions use the perfective aspect marker -guō (e.g. SB, LÜ, CLB, CRV, CPB), which is preferable to the φ morpheme (e.g. UV, CSB) because it formally expresses the perfective aspect signaled by the aorist participle. Also, the aspect marker is justified because the aorist is used here to introduce a direct quotation of Caiaphas.

Formally expressed morphemes are not an option for both verb forms. Most Mandarin versions use shì yōuyì (li) de 有益 (利) 的 ("it is profitable," PK, JOHNM, UV, ZHU, IG, HSC, SB, LÜ, CRV, RCUV) or shì hésuànde 是合算的 ("it is reasonable," CPB) with the φ morpheme for συμφέρει and stí ("die") with the φ morpheme (PK, JOHNM, UV, ZHU, CNT, IG, SB, LÜ, CRV, CPB, RCUV).
for ἀποθανεῖν. The perfective aspect marker -le (MSV, HSC), while grammatically acceptable, is not preferable here for the aorist infinitive.

6.2.2. Peter’s First Denial (John 18:15-18) 彼得首次不認耶穌

As in the previous pericope, the aorist tense-forms are used here to set the scene (v. 15b) and carry the movement of this narrative (vv. 16b). In addition to setting the scene, the imperfect tense-forms are employed to heighten Peter’s activities, namely, following Jesus (v. 15) and warming himself (v. 18). The present tense-forms are used in the introduction of the verbal exchange between the female gatekeeper and Peter (v. 17), and the description of Peter warming himself (v. 18). The perfect and pluperfect tense-forms are reserved to highlight a number of key events. The perfect is used to describe the making of the charcoal fire and Peter who stood near it (v. 18). The pluperfect is used to emphasize that Peter stood among the servants and assistants (vv. 16, 18).

Ἡκολούθησε δὲ τῷ Ἰσσοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ ἄλλος μαθητής. ὁ δὲ μαθητής ἐκεῖνος ἦν γνωστὸς τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, καὶ συνεισῆλθεν τῷ Ἰσσοῦ εἰς τὴν αὐλήν τοῦ ἀρχιερείου. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ ἐξω. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητής ὁ ἄλλος ὁ γνωστὸς τοῦ ἀρχιερείου καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θυρωρῷ καὶ εἰσῆλθαν τὸν Πέτρον. (18:15-16)

那時西門彼得跟著耶穌，還有另一個門徒也在後跟著。這位門徒是跟大祭司相識的，所以他跟耶穌一同進去大祭司的內庭。彼得卻在那門外比肩而立。另有一個跟大祭司熟識的門徒，就走了出去，並向女僕打個招呼，就帶彼得進去。

Nàshì Xīmén Bìdé gēn-zhe Yēsū, háiyōu ling yīge měntú yě zài hòu gēn-zhe. Zhè wèi měntú shì gēn dàjisī xiāngshì de, suǒyí tā gēn Yēsū yītóng jīnqū dàjisī de nèitíng. Bìdé

30 HSC has shì yǒu yīchù de 是有益處的 ("it is good").
Simon Peter was following Jesus, so was another disciple. This disciple knew of the high priest, therefore he and Jesus entered the inner court of the high priest. Peter was standing outside. Another disciple who knew the high priest went out and greeted the female gatekeeper, and then took Peter inside.

The imperfective marker -zhe (UV, SYD, IG, LÜ, RCUV) is the preferable morpheme for the imperfect tense-form because it closely reflects the imperfective aspect in Greek. The disyllabic verbs gēncóng 跟從 (“follow,” MSV) or gēnsui 跟隨 (“follow,” JOHMN) may be acceptable, but only if the ø morpheme is used instead of -le (CNT), since -le conveys the perfective aspect in Mandarin.

In order to distinguish between the imperfect and present tense-forms, nāshí (“then,” “at that point”) may be added here. This addition is necessary to convey the conceptual distance ([+remote]) that is grammaticalized by the Greek imperfect tense-form.31 By default, gēn-zhe without such additions expresses the immediate ([−remote]) imperfective aspect.

Here, notions of remoteness grammaticalized by the pluperfect tense-form may be conveyed by the addition of nà (“that,” “there”) to the specified location where Peter stood.

The aspect marker -le is preferable here because the shift in tense-form from the pluperfect (eιστήκει) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

31 See Table 6.1, p. 306 above for a list of the adverbs and DVCs commonly used to express conceptual distance in Mandarin.
There are several ways to refer to τῇ θυρωρῷ in Chinese, all of which denote “the (slave)girl/woman who guards the gate” or “female gatekeeper”: ḫǎnmén de shinǔ 看門的侍女 (SB); ḫǎnmén de bǐnǔ 看門的婢女 (NCV); ḫǎnmén de nūháizi 看門的女孩子 (TCV); ḫǎnmén de shinǔ 看門的使女 (UV, WANG, BT, IG, HSC, CRV, RCUV); ḫǎnmén de nūrén 看門的女人 (LÜ); shōuménfǔ 守門婦 (HS); kǎn(shōu)mén de nǔpú 看(守)門的女僕 (CPB, CNT, CSB); nǔsīmén 女司門 (DV); and měnbi 門婢 (SL-MOR). PK and JOHNM have simply shōuménde 守門的 (“gatekeeper”). However, nūhūn is the most fitting here because the character hūn 門 contains the radical 門 (“door”; cf. sīhūn nǚ 司閼女, GURY). 32 Nū suggests that the gatekeeper is female.

eἰτὶνεῦ The ὅ morpheme and -le are both acceptable here, although the former is preferable because there is no shift in tense-form in the Greek to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. The expression shuō-le yī shēng 說了一聲 (“spoke briefly,” PK, UV, WANG, SYD, ZHU, BT, IG, SB, TCV, NCV, CRV, CPB, DCT, RCUV, CSB; cf. shuō yī shēng, LÜ) is not preferable, since Greek verb forms express not the duration of an action (i.e. Aktionsart) but aspect. On the other hand, shuō-le-shuō (verb reduplication + -le, CNT), is not preferable because two-morpheme aspect compounds indicate prominence in discourse and do not correspond to the aorist, which is used as a backgrounding device in Greek discourse.

eἰστῆγαγεν The ὅ morpheme is preferable here since there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally marked perfective aspect morpheme.

32 Stuart, Greek-Chinese-English Dictionary, s.v.
وَجَدَهُ نَارًا مَرْبَعًا، وَخَلَقَ فِيهَا نَارًا لِلْمَلَائِكَةِ، وَخَلَقَ فِيهَا نَارًا لِلْمُجَدِّدِينَ.

A.Eyet (v. 17; cf. vv. 4–5) Most Mandarin versions use *shuo* (“speak,” “say”) with the ø morpheme (e.g. UV, SYD, CNT, LÜ, IG) for the present tense-form. As noted in 6.1.2 above, the -le-IDVC *kāi-qí-le kǒu* is an ideal translation not only because it better reflects the aspect of the Greek, but also because it closely corresponds to the discourse function of the Greek present tense-form as a foregrounding device. In addition, it provides textual cohesion to the second episode of Peter’s denial of Jesus (vv. 25–27).

See v. 16. Compare *kànmén de yāhuán* 看門的丫鬟 (PK), *shōumén de shīnǚ* 守門的使女 (JOHN), and *shōumén de nǚpú* 守門的女僕 (CNT), all of which denote “the servant girl who guards the gate.”
Normally, when μη is present in interrogative statements, the answer "no" is expected. \(33\) This interpretation is reflected in the MSV and WANG: \(nǐ yě shì\) ("are you also"). However, as Brown argues, since it is clear that the third question addressed to Peter (v. 26) expects a positive answer, it may be best to translate the first two questions (vv. 17, 25) as also expecting a positive answer, especially since μη may have lost its original force in John’s Gospel. \(34\) Brown’s claim is supported by Goodwin, who cites several examples from classical authors (e.g. Plato and Xenophon) in which μη is used to introduce a question that expects an affirmative answer. \(35\) Most Mandarin versions have \(nǐ bù yě shì\) ("are you not also," UV, SYD, ZHU, BT, CNT, SB, LÜ, HS, TCV, NCV, CRV, CPB, DCT, RCUV, CSB), \(36\) \(nǐ qi bù shì\) 你豈不是 ("are you not," PK), or \(nǐ bù shì\) ("are you not," JOHNM, IG, CLB), which all translate the question as expecting a positive answer. It should be noted that two of the three examples cited above, \(nǐ qi bù shì\) and \(nǐ bù shì\), are not preferable because καὶ should be rendered as \(yě\) ("also"). \(37\)

εἰστηκέον (v. 18; see also 19:25; cf. v. 5)  The stative aspect of the pluperfect form is translated by the \(ο\) morpheme (PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT) and -\(zhe\) (MSV, SYD, ZHU, IG, HSC, HS, LÜ, CRV, CNT). While both morphemes are possible, the latter is a better choice because -\(zhe\) morphologically marks the stative aspect in Mandarin.

---

\(33\) See, for example, Burton, Syntax, §467; BDF, §440; Turner, Syntax, 283; Porter, Idioms, 277–78.
Zerwick and Grosvenor note that this is how the interrogative is understood here. Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 339. See also Morris, Gospel, 667.


\(35\) For these examples from classical literature, see Goodwin, Greek Grammar, §293.

\(36\) HS adds the emphatic particle \(qi\), which is often used in rhetorical questions or interrogatives in Chinese. See, for example, Wang 力, Grammar, vol. 1, 351–54; Lü 吳敟洲, Grammar, 292; Contemporary Chinese Dictionary, s.v.

\(37\) Keener, Commentary, 1191.
Another option is using a four-character set phrase with the ø morpheme, which closely reflects the heavily marked pluperfect tense-form. However, -zhe is used here instead to avoid redundancy due to the presence of the closely related form (but more marked because of the periphrasis) ἔστοις in the same verse (see also 6.1.3 above). Finally, in order to convey the remoteness of the pluperfect tense-form, nāshí (“then,” “at that point”) may be added to the beginning of the sentence.

ἀνθρακίαν πεποικότες Some versions use the ø morpheme (shāotàn 烧炭, “burn charcoal,” PK; chitàn 燃炭, “burn charcoal,” DV, SJ), while others use -le (shēng-le tānhuō 生了炭火, “burned charcoal fire,” UV, SYD, ZHU, WANG, IG, BT, LÜ, TCV, CRV, RCUV; shēng-le huō 生了火, “made a fire,” CPB; bèi-le tānhuō 備了炭火, “prepared a charcoal fire,” HS). The MSV, on the other hand, uses the IDVC qǐlái, which is not preferable because it conveys the imperfective aspect in Mandarin. The four-character phrase shēng-huō-chi-tān (with the ø morpheme) works best here because it marks frontgrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse and also reflects the stative aspect realized by the Greek perfect participle. HSC does not translate this verb phrase.

ἔθερμαινοντο/θερμαινόμενος Most versions use one phrase with the ø morpheme to cover the two verb forms: kāohuō 烤火 (“warm oneself by the fire,” PK, UV, SYD, ZHU, BT, HSC, LÜ), xiànghuō 向火 (“face the fire,” JOHN), qūnuān 取暖 (“keep warm,” WANG, CNT, CPB, WV, RCUV), and kāo-huō-qū-nuān 烤火取暖 (“keep oneself warm by the fire,” IG, CLB). There is only one exception: HS has zài qūnuān for ἔθερμαινοντο and qūnuān for θερμαινόμενος. The marker -zhe expresses the imperfective aspect and therefore is a suitable Mandarin translation of the present participle θερμαινόμενος. In order to differentiate the imperfect (ἔθερμαινοντο) from
the present (θερμαίνομενος) tense-forms in Mandarin translation, *zài nàr* ("there") may
be added to the former.

*ν...ἔστως* (see also v. 25) Most Mandarin versions have -zhe (PK, JOHNM, UV, 
SYD, WANG, IG, HSC, BT, LÜ, TCV, CLB, CRV, RCUV) for the perfect participle.

Although -zhe reflects the stative aspect of ἐστὶν, the four-character phrase *bí-jìàn-ér-lì*
(“stand shoulder to shoulder”) with the φ morpheme is a better option because it
frontgrounds the discourse. *Shì...de* construction is utilized to represent the Greek
periphrastic construction in Mandarin. In this case, *de* is preferably represented by the
adverbial 地 as opposed to 的 because *bí-jìàn-ér-lì* is used here to modify the verb
phrase *nuán-zhe shēn* (“warming the body”).38

6.2.3. Trial before Annas (John 18:19-24) 耶穌在大祭司前受審

As in the previous pericopes, the aorist tense-forms are used to set the scene (v. 19),
carry the movement of this narrative (vv. 20–23), and conclude the discourse unit (v. 24).
The present tense-forms are used to describe the content of verbal exchanges between
Jesus and Annas (vv. 20–21), as well as between Jesus and Annas’ assistant (v. 22–23).
The perfect tense-forms are reserved to highlight four key items: Jesus’ comments
regarding his speaking in public (v. 20), the extensive knowledge of those who heard him
(reinforced by the emphatic discourse marker ἵδε; v. 21), the assistants who stood nearby
(v. 22), and the condition under which Jesus was sent to Caiaphas (v. 24).

38 Older Mandarin literature (pre-1949) did not use the character 地 to formally distinguish between the
The high priest then asked Jesus about his disciples and his teachings. Jesus answered him, saying, “I spoke to people publicly without hindrance; I always taught in the Jewish gathering synagogues and the temple; I did not say anything in secret. Why are you asking me? Ask those who have listened attentively to what I said to them. Pay attention! These people know very well what I said.

ἀρχιερεύς (v. 19)  See v. 10.

ἡρώτησεν  The CLB adds zhèng kāishi (“now began”) before the verb shènxùn 審訊 (“interrogate”) to indicate the ingressive Aktionsart. Normally, it is better to simply use wèn (“ask,” e.g. SL-MOR, MOR, MAR, GO, BCV) with the ø morpheme, as opposed to pánwèn 盤問 (“cross-examine,” PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, TCV, CRV, RCUV, CSB), shènwèn 審問 (“interrogate,” GÜ, IG, CNT, SB), chàwèn 查問
("interrogate," NCV, CPB), or xùnwèn 詢問 ("inquire," HS), because, in Mandarin narrative discourse, monosyllabic verbs reflect the unmarked feature of the aorist better than disyllabic verbs. However, the shift in tense-form from the present (θερμανόμενος) to aorist, which is employed here to mark discourse boundaries, justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme (in this case, -le).

δίδαξης Several Mandarin versions use jiàoxùn 教訓 ("teachings," JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, LÜ, NCV, CRV). Stuart suggests that δίδαξης can mean Jesus' "teaching methods" (jiàoshòu zhī diào 教授之道), as in dàolì 理 ("truth," PK, IG) or the "act of teaching," as in jiàngdào shǐjiào de shì 講道施教的事 (CPB). Two Catholic versions have jiàoyì 教義 ("religious doctrine," CNT, SB). However, jiào ("teachings") would be sufficient here.

ἀπεκρίθη (v. 20) See v. 5.

παρρησία The adverbial phrase guāng-míng-zhèng-dà ("just and honorable," lit. "bright and upright") works best here because it is a good contrast to àndì lǐ ("in the dark" or "secretly").

λελάληκα Several expressions to denote the idea of speaking are used, all of which use the ο morpheme and differ only in word choice: fàyán 發言 ("make a statement," HS), shuō ("say," JOHNM), jiānghuà 講話 ("talk," IG, LÜ, SB, TCV, NCV, RCUV, CSB), and shuōhuà 說話 ("speak," UV, SYD, WANG, BT, CRV). PK has jiāngdào 講道 ("preach"). The MSV, on the other hand, has zhīdiǎn-chūlái 指點出來 ("point out") with the RVC chūlái, which is not preferable because it conveys the perfective aspect in

---

The four-character set phrase *zhí-yán-bù-huì* ("speak frankly") works best here because it marks frontgrounded prominence in Mandarin, and the ø morpheme better reflects the stative aspect of the Greek perfect tense-form. This word is left untranslated in the CPB.

Most versions use disyllabic verbs with the ø morpheme: *shíjiào* 施教 ("instruct," HS, SB, CRV), *jiàoǒün* 教訓 ("lecture," MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, HSC, LÜ), *jìáodāo* 教導 ("teach," NCV, RCUV, CSB), *xùnhuì* 訓誟 ("instruct," CNT), *shíǒün* 施訓 ("lecture," IG), and *jiāngdāo* 講道 ("preach," CLB, CPB). SYD and its revision ZHU are the only two Mandarin versions that use the perfective -*guò* (*jiàoǒün-guò rén, "have lectured people"). However, the ø morpheme is stylistically preferable to -*guò*, and better reflects the less marked aorist tense-form in Greek.

Morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes, while grammatically acceptable, are not preferable in this context. Most versions use the disyllabic verb *jǔjǐ* ("congregate") with the ø morpheme (e.g. MSV, UV, IG, LÜ, SB, CRV), which reflects the aspect as well as the more heavily marked feature of the Greek present tense-form.

Most Mandarin versions use the ø morpheme: *jiǎng* ("speak," LÜ, TCV, NCV, RCUV), *shuō* ("say," PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, CRV, CPB), *shuǒhuà* ("speak," ZHU, HS, DCT), *tánliùn* 談論 ("discuss," CLB), and *sǐhuà* 私話 ("speak privately," MSV) for the first occurrence of *ëλάληςα*, while a few others use -*guò* (*jiǎng-guò*, "have spoken," CNT, IG, HSC, SB, CSB). For the second occurrence of the verb in v. 21, several versions use the perfective aspect markers -*guò* (CNT, LÜ, CPB)

---

40 Compare Brown, who argues that the perfect tense-form here functions in an aoristic sense ("I have spoken openly") because the subsequent verbs are aorists. See Brown, *Gospel*, 825.
or -le (IG, HS, SB, CSB), while others use the ø morpheme (PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, CLB, TCV, NCV, DCT). The aspect markers -guo and -le are both preferable to the ø morpheme because they formally reflect the perfective aspect of the two aorists. In this context, however, -guo works better for both occurrences of ελάλησα. In v. 20, this use of -guo is justified by the shift in tense-form from the present (συνέρχονται, v. 20) to aorist. For second occurrence, it is justified by another shift in tense-form, from the perfect (άκηκοότας, v. 21) to aorist.

έρωτμας (v. 21) The aspect marker zài is preferable to the ø morpheme used in most Mandarin versions (e.g. PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, ZHU, BT, CNT, IG, HSC, LŪ, SB, TCV, CRV, NCV, RCUV, CSB) because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form in Greek. The CPB adds the auxiliary verb yào to the verb shénwen 客問 ("interrogate"), which is not suitable for the translation of the indicative verb because yào expresses volition and futurity.

έρωτησον The reduplicated verb wèn-wèn expresses the perfective aspect of the aorist imperative, and fits well with the context (NCV). LŪ adds the auxiliary kěyī to the reduplicated verb, which is unnecessary. More often kěyī or kě is added to the verb wèn ("ask") with the ø morpheme (MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, CNT, CRV). Other auxiliary verbs are also used: yǐngdāng (HS) and yào (SYD, ZHU), both of which denote "should" or "must." It is true that, in some contexts, Mandarin imperative sentences may be expressed by adding the verb qù ă ("go") to the front of the verb, as in qù wèn-wèn (CPB) or qù wèn (TCV, RCUV). It is not necessary in this context. The two Catholic versions, IG and SB, simply have nǐ wèn ("you ask"). The expression kěyī qù wèn ("you can go ask," CSB) is simply redundant.
Most Mandarin versions use the perfective morphemes -guό (IG, HS, SB, CLB, TCV, NCV, DCT, RCUV, CSB) and RVCs, such as jiàn (MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, HSC, LÜ, CRV), which are not suitable because they do not reflect the stative aspect signaled by the perfect participle. A few others use the ø morpheme (SYD, ZHU, CPB), which is acceptable insofar as it renders the stative aspect in Greek, but not in its discourse function as the frontgrounding device. Therefore, in order to mark frontgrounded prominence in Mandarin, the heavily marked four-character set phrase xi-'ér-gōng-tings (“listen attentively”) may be used here instead of the monosyllabic verb tǐng (“hear”).

_ios (also 19:4, 14, 26, 27; cf. _iō ou 19:5, 1 Cor 15:51) Two aorist imperative forms, _iō e and _iō ou, are used as discourse markers to draw the attention of the listener or reader.41 Most Greek grammarians and biblical commentators recognize them as interjective or exclamatory particles.42 While most Mandarin versions (MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, CNT, IG, HSC, SB, TCV, NCV, CPB, RCUV) do not translate _iō e, a few render it formally as ni kan (“you look!” LÜ, CSB), kàn na (“look!” BT, CRV), or qiáo ba (“look!” HS). The CLB has yǐnwèi (“because,” CLB), which is not preferable here. The expression tǐng-hǎo, which denotes “Listen up!” or “Pay attention!” is preferable to kàn or qiáo with the ø morpheme for two reasons: first, the RVC hǎo

---

41 Nida and Louw call them “prompters of attention” (along with _γε). Nida and Louw, Greek-English Lexicon, vol. 1, 812. See also Newman and Nida, Handbook, 576; BDAG, s.v. Van Otterloo argues that the translator should translate both meaning and impact of _iō ou/ té, which, according to him, serves two major functions in discourse: first, to focus special attention on a major thematic participant, and second, to call something to the hearer/reader’s special attention (because it is contrary to their expectation, etc). Van Otterloo, “Towards an Understanding,” 34–64.

42 See, for example, Winer, Treatise, 229 n.3; Robertson, Grammar, 302; Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 339. Some point to the influence of the Hebrew demonstrative particle הַת. See, for example, Moulton, Prolegomena, 11; Robertson, Grammar, 1193; BDF, §128; Schnackenburg, Gospel, 256.
(“good”) morphologically expresses the perfective aspect in Mandarin; second, it highlights the statement that follows.\(^{43}\)

οἴδασιν (cf. vv. 2, 4; 19:35) Regardless of its verb form, οἴδα is almost always translated by zhīdào (“know”) with the ο morpheme in Mandarin versions (e.g. UV, SYD, IG, LÜ, SB). Here, a four-character set phrase such as ěr-shōu-néng-xiāng (lit. “be able to make a detailed explanation of what is frequently heard”)\(^ {44}\) or ěr-rú-mù-ràn (be unconsciously influenced by what one frequently hears and sees”) with the ο morpheme may be used to reflect the stative aspect of the perfect tense-form in Greek, and to correspond to its discourse function as a frontgrounding device.

εἴπον (see also vv. 8, 9, 32; 19:21) The most common translation is shuō (“say,” MSV, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, HS, LÜ, SB, CLB, CRV, RCUV, CSB) or jiāng (“speak,” PK, NCV) with the ο morpheme. Other versions formally express aspect morphemes such as -le (IG, CPB, CNT, DCT) or -guō (TCV), both of which are preferable to the ο morpheme. This is because, as noted in v. 8 above, εἴπον is used within the quoted speech of Jesus in the narrative, which justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective morpheme. In addition, the shift in tense-form from the perfect (οἴδασιν) to aorist also justifies its use.

taúta δὲ αὐτοῦ εἴπόντος εἰς παρεσπηκός τῶν ὑπηρετῶν ἐδώκεν ῥάπτισμα τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἴπων· οὕτως ἀποκρίνη τῷ ἀρχιερεὶ; ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ἰησοῦς· εἶ κακῶς ἑλάλησα, μαρτύρησον περὶ τοῦ κακοῦ· εἶ δὲ καλῶς, τί με δέρεις; ἀπέστειλεν οὖν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἀννας δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα. (18:22-24)

---

\(^{43}\) Newman and Nida note that “listen” works better than “look.” See Newman and Nida, Handbook, 576. Here, “listen” communicates the intention of the author (which is to draw attention to the statement that follows) better than “look” in Mandarin. See also the discussion on 1 Cor 15:51 in my chapter 7.

\(^{44}\) See example (22) in my chapter 4, pp. 213–14 above.
他一說這些話，其中在旁站著的一個差役，就責了耶穌一記耳光。他說：「你這樣在回答著大祭司嗎？」耶穌答說：「如果我說錯了，請指出哪裏錯。但我要是說的對，你憑什麼毆打我呢？」亞那然後就把他捆綁著送到大祭司該法那裏。

As soon as he finished saying these, an assistant who was standing nearby, slapped Jesus in the face. He said, "Are you answering the high priest in this manner?" Jesus replied, "If in any case I said it wrong, please produce evidence about what went wrong. But if what I said is right, for what reason are you striking me?" Annas then sent him bound to the high priest Caiaphas.

εἰπόντος (v. 22) Some versions use the aspect marker -le (e.g. UV, SYD, LÜ, IG, RCUV) or the ο morpheme (yī shuō, "as soon as one said," CNT). While RVCs, -le, and the ο morpheme may be used interchangeably here, the ο morpheme is preferable because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed aspect morpheme.

παρεστήκως (cf. παρεστήτα 19:26) The stative aspect marker -zhe (pāngbiān zhān-zhe 旁邊站著, "standing nearby," MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, ZHU, LÜ, RCUV, or shili-zhe 侍立著, "waiting upon," IG) closely reflects the stative aspect signaled by the perfect participle in Greek. The CPB uses the ο morpheme (zhàn, "stand"), whereas the TCV leaves it untranslated. A four-character set phrase such as bǐ-jiān-ér-lǐ (18:5, 16, 18, 25) with the ο morpheme, is also acceptable. For stylistic reasons, however, -zhe is a better choice here (see comments on εἰστήκειον in v. 18 above).
The perfective aspect of the aorist is translated by the \( \theta \) morpheme: \( \text{dā 打交} \) ("strike," PK, JOHNM), \( \text{yòng shǒuzhǎng dā 用手掌打交} \) ("strike with a hand," UV, SYD, CRV; see also 19:3), \( \text{zhǎngjí 扌擊} \) ("strike with the palm of the hand," IG), or \( \text{gěi...yīge érguā́zī 綻...一個耳刮子} \) ("give one a slap in the face," LÜ). A few versions use -le (\( \text{dā-le...yī bāzhǎng/érguā́nɡ 打了...一巴掌/耳光} \), "slapped in the face," HSC, TCV, CPB, RCUV), which is preferable to the \( \theta \) morpheme because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist. Also, the shift in tense-form from the perfect (\( \piəρεστηκό́ς \)) to aorist justifies the use of a morphologically expressed aspect morpheme.

\( \dot{α}ποκρίνη \) (cf. v. 5) Most Mandarin versions have \( \text{huídá 回答} \) (PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, HS, LÜ, CRV, CPB, DCT, RCUV, CSB), \( \text{duídá 對答} \) (IG), or \( \text{dáfù 答覆} \) (SB) with \( \theta \) morpheme, all of which denote "answer." Three versions (TCV, CLB, NCV) add the auxiliary verb \( \text{gān} \), which is not preferable for rendering the Greek indicative. On the other hand, the two-morpheme aspect compound \( \text{zài...-zhe} \) is preferable to the \( \theta \) morpheme because it indicates foregrounded prominence in Mandarin and better reflects the imperfective aspect that is signaled by the present tense-form. It also provides a better contrast to the aorist (\( \dot{α}πεκρίθη \)) that follows.

\( \dot{α}πεκρίθη \) (v. 23) See v. 5.

\( \dot{ε}λάλησα \) (cf. 20–21) The aspect marker -le (e.g. NCV, CPB) is preferable to other perfective aspect morphemes or the \( \theta \) morpheme (e.g. MSV, JOHNM, UV, ZHU, BT, IG, HSC, SB, LÜ, CRV, RCUV) because it better reflects the aspect of the Greek. Also, -le is
suitable here because it is generally used in the protasis of Mandarin conditional sentences.45

**μαρτύρησον** The aorist imperative (see 5.1.1 above) is rendered by several earlier Mandarin versions with *zhízhèng* 指證 (“testify,” PK, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, IG, SB, LÜ, RCUV) or *zhèngmíng* 證明 (“testify,” HSC) with the ø morpheme. RVCSs, such as *chūlái* (“out,” CNT) and *chū* (“out,” HS, TCV, CLB, CPB, CSB), are preferable to the ø morpheme because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the Greek. Some versions add auxiliary verbs such as *kèyī* (PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, CNT, HS, LÜ, CLB, CRV, CSB) to indicate command (cf. v. 21), which, as pointed out in the previous chapter, are not ideal for translating the imperative mood in Greek.46

**δέρεις** The disyllabic verb *oudā* with the ø morpheme is preferable to less marked monosyllabic verbs such as *dā* 打 (MSV, PK, JOHMN, UV, SYD, ZHU, LÜ, IG, RCUV), *gūo* (HS), and *jī* 擊 (IG), all of which denote “strike.” The perfective -*le* (CNT) is not preferable because it does not reflect the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form in Greek. Although grammatically acceptable, stylistic considerations exclude the use of imperfective morphemes such as *zài* or -*zhe*.

**δεδεμένον** (v. 24) The stative aspect may be represented in Mandarin by either -*zhe* (PK, JOHNN, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, LÜ, TCV, CPB, RCUV) or the ø morpheme (using a four-character phrase such as *kūn-bāng-shù-fū* 捆绑束缚, “bind and shackle”). Here, the two morphemes may be used interchangeably. The former is preferable because it morphologically marks the stative aspect. The latter is also preferable because it better

---

45 See 3.2.5.2.c.a and 5.3.2.2.e.e, pp. 124–26, 278–79 above. For a treatment of the first class conditional sentences, see 5.4.2, pp. 281–84.

46 See 5.1.2, pp. 219–22 above.
reflects the discourse function of the Greek perfect tense-form as a frontgrounding device. However, the final choice was made to employ -zhe because the four-character set phrase makes the sentence heavier than necessary.

The MSV, on other hand, has yǐjīng bèi rén kūn-qīlái-le ("already been tied up"), using the heavily marked two-morpheme aspect compound qīlái-le (RVC-le). The expression is not preferable because the compound does not reflect the stative aspect that is signaled by the Greek perfect participle.

6.2.4. Peter Denies Jesus Again (John 18:25-27) 彼得又矢口否认耶稣

This pericope continues from Peter’s first denial of Jesus (vv. 15-18). The aorist tense-forms are used to move the narrative forward (vv. 25-26) and conclude the discourse unit (v. 27). The present tense-forms are used to describe Peter warming himself (v. 25; the same verb form used in v. 18) and to introduce the question addressed to Peter by the servant of the high priest (v. 26). The perfect tense-form is used to highlight Peter as he stood by the charcoal fire (v. 25), a repetition of the periphrastic construction that appeared in v. 18.

"Hv dē Sīmōn Pētroso ἐστῶς καὶ θερμαίνομενος. ἐπισον οὖν αὐτῷ· μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶ; ἤρνησατο ἐκεῖνος καὶ ἐπισεμ· οὐκ εἶμι. λέγει ἐς ἐκ τῶν δούλων τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, συγγενῆς ὅν οὐ ἀπέκοψεν Πέτρος τὸ ὦτίον· οὐκ ἐγώ σε εἰδον ἐν τῷ κήπῳ μετ' αὐτοῦ; πάλιν οὖν ἤρνησατο Πέτρος, καὶ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. (18:25-27)

此刻西門彼得仍是比肩而立地暖著身。有人開了口對他說：「你不也是他的門徒嗎？」他卻否認說：「我不是。」某一個大祭司的僕人，恰好是彼得削掉了耳朵
那人親屬，就開口說：「我不是看見你同他在園子裏嗎？」彼得又否認。隨即雞就啼了。


Meanwhile, Simon Peter was standing and warming himself. Someone said to him, “Are you not his disciple?” But he denied, saying, “I am not.” A certain servant of the high priest, who happened to be the relative of the man whose ear Peter had chopped off, said, “Did I see you with him in the garden?” Again Peter denied. At that moment the rooster crowed.

Those who look at the Greek text of John 18:25-27 may complain that the translator used say in the narrative rather than the aorist θέρμανομένος, for which the present monosyllabic verb shuō is used. The former tense-form is more appropriate, however, for θέρμανομένος. For shuō, le is preferable to the zero morpheme because of the shift in tense-form from the present (θέρμανομένος) to the aorist. On the other hand, the zero morpheme is preferable for θέρμανομένος since there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

The monosyllabic verb shuō (“say”) with the zero morpheme is used in most Chinese translations (e.g. JOHNM, UV, CNT, LÜ, SB, NCV, RCUV, CSB) for both θέρμανομένος and θέρμανομένος. However, for shuō, -le is preferable to the zero morpheme because of the shift in tense-form from the present (θέρμανομένος) to the aorist. On the other hand, the zero morpheme is preferable for θέρμανομένος since there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

As noted in chapter 3 above, the translator may not have the choice between using either monosyllabic or disyllabic verbs in Mandarin. As noted in chapter 3 above, the translator may not have the choice between using either monosyllabic or disyllabic verbs in Mandarin.

As noted in chapter 3 above, the translator may not have the choice between using either monosyllabic or disyllabic verbs in Mandarin. As noted in chapter 3 above, the translator may not have the choice between using either monosyllabic or disyllabic verbs in Mandarin.
NCV, CPB, CSB), as presented in my translation. Here, the disyllabic verb is no more heavily marked than monosyllabic ones. However, the translator does have the option between using either the θ morpheme or formally expressed perfective aspect morphemes (e.g. -le, RVCs). The former is preferable for both occurrences of the verb because it better reflects the less marked aorist tense-form in Greek. Also, there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

λέγει (v. 26; see also v. 17. As noted in 6.1.2 above, the same verb kāikōu with the two-morpheme aspect compound -le-IDVC is repeated here to provide textual cohesion to the previous episode of Peter’s denial (vv. 15–18).

ἀπέκοψεν See v. 10.

ἐδον Most Mandarin versions use kàn-jìàn (“see,” e.g. MSV, PK, UV, ZHU, CNT, IG, HSC, LÜ, SB, NCV, TCV, CLB, CRV, CPB, RCUV, CSB) with the RVC jìàn, which is suitable because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form.

ἐφώνησεν (v. 27; cf. v. 33) Most Mandarin versions use the monosyllabic verb jiào/tí le ᾱ/تعليق (“crow,” MSV, PK, UV, SYD, CNT, IG, HSC, SB, LÜ, TCV, CLB, NCV, CRV, CPB, RCUV, CSB) with the θ morpheme. Because le is placed at the end of the sentence, it is used as a modal particle, as opposed to a perfective aspect marker. At the same time, one does not have the option to use the aspect marker -le here, since jiào-le le would be considered ungrammatical. However, the translator does have the option of using a monosyllabic or disyllabic verb—either with the θ morpheme or an RVC. Utilizing the monosyllabic verb with the θ morpheme is preferable because it better reflects the less heavily marked Greek aorist tense-form in Greek, which is used here to

48 See the discussion of le in 3.2.5.2.c.a, pp.124–26 above.
conclude the episode (vv. 25–27). In addition, the ω morpheme is preferable because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

6.2.5. Trial before Pilate (18:28–19:16a) 耶穌在彼拉多前受審

This pericope may be divided into six sub-sections (18:28–32, 33–38a, 38b–40; 19:1–5, 6–7, 8–16a). Smaller discourse boundaries, as noted in 6.1.2, are marked by the conjunctives οὐ (19:33–38a; 19:1–7, 8–16a) or καί (18:38b–40). The aorist tense-forms are used to set the scene for each sub-section (18:28b, 33, 38b; 19:1, 6, 8), move the narrative forward (19:29–37, 39–40, 19:2, 4–5, 7, 9, 11–13, 15), and conclude the entire pericope (19:16a). The imperfect tense-forms are used to depict the following: Jesus’ attitude toward his own death (18:32), the disciples’ intention to prevent Jesus’ arrest (18:36), the soldiers’ violence against Jesus (19:3), Jesus’ comment regarding Pilate’s earthly power (19:11), and Pilate’s effort to release Jesus (19:12).

The present tense-forms are used extensively in this pericope to draw special attention to the following key items: the opening of the new pericope (18:28), the verbal exchanges between Pilate and Jesus’ accusers (18:29–31, 38–39; 19:4, 6–7, 12, 15) as well as between Pilate and Jesus (18:34, 37; 19:10–11), Jesus’ prediction of his own death (18:32), the introduction of Pilate’s speeches (18:38a, 38b; 19:4–5, 9–10, 14–15), the soldiers’ mock greetings to Jesus (19:3), the crown of thorns and purple robe that Jesus was wearing (19:5), the introduction of the direct statements made by Jesus’ accusers (19:6, 12), and the location of Pilate’s judgment seat (19:13). In addition, two discourse markers, ἵσε/ἵσσο (19:4–5; cf. 18:21), reinforce the significance of Pilate’s statements at the presentation of Jesus to his accusers.
The perfect tense-forms are reserved to highlight three key items: Jesus’ response to Pilate regarding his kingship (18:37), Pilate’s disapproval at Jesus’ refusal to answer his question (19:10), and Jesus’ comments in response to Pilate’s claim of power (19:11).

Ἀγωνίσαν ὁͪν τόν Ἰησοῦν ἀπό τοῦ Καϊάφα εἰς τὸ πραιτόριον ἦν δὲ πρῳ· καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐισῆλθον εἰς τὸ πραιτόριον, ἕνα μὴ μιανθῶσιν ἄλλα φάγωσιν τὸ πάσχα. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλάτος ἔξω πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ φησίν· τίνα κατηγορίαν φέρετε [κατὰ] τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου; ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· εἰ μὴ ἤν οὗτος κακὸν ποιῶν, οὐκ ἔν σοι παρεδώκαμεν αὐτόν. (18:28–30)

They brought Jesus from Caiaphas’ place to the governor’s headquarters. It was still early. They themselves did not enter the headquarters for fear that they might be defiled, so they could not enjoy the Passover meal. Pilate then went outside and spoke to them, “What charges are you bringing against this man?” They answered him, “If he is not someone who does evil, we would certainly not have sent him to you here.”
The shift in tense-form from the aorist to present marks the beginning of a new pericope. Here, most Mandarin versions use the φ morpheme for the present tense-form (UV, SYD, ZHU, CNT, IG, HSC, BT, SB, LÜ, CLB, TCV, CRV, NCV, CPB, DCT, CSB), with only a few exceptions. HS has jìng-chū 出 ("lead out") using the RVC chū, which is not preferable because it expresses the perfective aspect in Mandarin. A few earlier versions have lā-zhe ("bringing," lit. "dragging," MSV, PK, JOHNM) and dài-zhe 帶著 ("carrying") with -zhe, which is preferable to the φ morpheme because it morphologically expresses the imperfective aspect of the Greek present tense-form.

The φ morpheme is used here because the translator does not have the option to use -le due to the restriction that -le cannot occur in negative sentences that are signaled by adverbs bú ("not") or méiyǒu ("have not") in non-interrogative sentences. Other perfective aspect morphemes such as RVCs or -guó, while grammatically acceptable, are not suitable in this context.

The governor's headquarters (or praetorium) is translated into Chinese in no less than a dozen different ways. Some terms, such as gōngtáng 公堂 ("court," MOR, MAR, JOHN, JOHNM, BB), gōngxiè 公廨 ("government agency," DV, GURY, BCV, UVW, UVB, SJ), yámén 衙門 ("yamen," GÜ, PK, UV, WANG, BT), fāngbó yámén 方伯衙門 ("provincial official's yamen," SYD, ZHU), dìyuán 督轄 ("governor's yamen," WV), huángshēng zhāngfǔ/gōngguǎn 皇省長府/公館 ("imperial governor's residence"/"residence," LÜ), dūshū 督署 ("office of a viceroy," SL-MOR), dìyuàn 督院 ("governor's court," HSC), and guānshū 官署 ("government office," GO), are no longer current in modern Chinese. Other terms, such

---

49 See 3.2.5.2.c.a, p. 126 above.
as zongdu guandi ("governor general’s official residence," JRV, CBT, NCV), guandi ("official residence," JCV, TRNT), zongdu fu 总督府 ("governor general’s mansion," IG, CNT, SB, TCV, CLB, CRV, CPB, RCUV, CSB), and caipanzuo 裁判所 ("tribunal," HS), are preferable because they are still widely used today.

The aspect marker -le (e.g. MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, SB, CRV, NCV, RCUV) is preferable to the ∅ morpheme because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form. Here, the passive construction formed by the particle shou is suitable for the translation of the passive voice in Greek. 50

The RVC dao (IG) is preferable to the ∅ morpheme (PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, LÜ, SB, TCV, CRV, NCV, DCT, RCUV, CSB) because it morphologically expresses the perfective aspect of the aorist. Auxiliary verbs, such as neng (MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, ZHU, IG, SB, CRV, NCV, CPB, RCUV, CSB), yao (TCV), yuan yao ("wish," "want," BT), or hao (CNT, HSC, LÜ), are necessary additions to the verb chi ("eat") in order to convey the projection signaled by the subjunctive mood in Greek. 51

(v. 29; see also v.1) As in v. 1, the ∅ morpheme is preferable here since there is no shift in tense-form in the Greek to justify the use of a formally marked perfective aspect morpheme.

As mentioned in the introduction, Pilate was transcribed as Piluodusi 理羅都思 in the Jesus-Messiah Sutra (v. 190f), a close representation of the Syriac ḫalā.
Catholic missionaries use 伯多禄 (Ortiz, SL-MOR, WV), 伯多禄 (IG), and 伯多禄 (CNT, HSC, SB, CPB). The Orthodox Chinese New Testament has 批特 (GURY). Now Pilate is most commonly referred to as 伯多禄 (MOR, MAR, GÜ, DV, GO, BCV, MSV, PK, JOHN, JOHNM, CSV, BB, SJ, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, LÜ, TCV, NCV, RCUV), a closer phonetic representation of the Greek that has been adopted by most Protestant Chinese versions since the early nineteenth century.

κατηγορίαν φέρετε The majority of Mandarin versions use 告 (“accuse,” e.g. MSV, PK, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, RCUV) or 拿 (“bring,” LÜ, TCV, CRV) with the φ morpheme, which is acceptable but not as good as the imperfective morphemes, namely, 在 and RVCs (e.g. chū, SB, CSB). 在 is preferable to RVCs because it reflects the imperfective aspect signaled by the present tense-form in Greek.

See v. 5.

εἰ μὴ ἤν οὐτός...αὐτόν This is a contrary to fact conditional statement; see the discussion of example (32) in 5.4.3.

颔...κακόν τοιοῦ (see also 5.3.2.1.b., 5.4.3 above) Some versions (including those in wenli) treat the periphrasis as a finite verb with the φ morpheme, for example, fènzuì (MAR, GÜ, BCV), zuò è (NCV, RCUV), and zuò huàishi (TCV), all of which denote “commit crime” or “do evil (matters).” Although his New Testament version was written in wenli, Morrison uses the Mandarin perfective aspect marker -le, which does not reflect the imperfective aspect of the present participle. Others render it as a substantive, such as

52 Ortiz, Commentary. Catholic translation of the Apostle’s Creed reads: 信主耶稣基督，並且信耶穌基督為神子，生於童女馬利亞，為我們死，並且為我們復活。 (I believe that he suffered under Pontius Pilate, and was crucified). See also comments on ἐστιν ὁ θεοτόκος in 19:20.


"Evildoer." Some take it as an adjective, such as wūzúi 無罪 ("innocent," DV). Still others (SYD, ZHU, LÜ, SB) employ the construction shì...de, which is preferable for translating Greek periphrastic constructions into Mandarin.

παρεδόκαμεν (see also v. 35; 19:16a, 30) The aspect marker -le is preferable here mainly because it is used in the apodosis of a conditional sentence and in a direct quotation.

εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Πλάτων· λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς, καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν κρίνατε αὐτὸν. εἶπον αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα· ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πληρωθῇ ὁν εἶπεν σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνῄσκειν.

(18:31–32)

彼拉多反而對他們說：「你們自行把他帶走吧！按照你們的律法審他。」猶太人對他說：「我們無權殺死人。」（這乃是為了要應驗耶穌所說過的話，也就是自己將要在什麼情況下而逝世。）


Pilate, however, said to them, “Take him away yourself! Judge him according to your law.” The Jews responded, “We have no right to kill anyone.” (This was to fulfill what Jesus has said: that is, under which condition he was going to die).

εἶπεν (vv. 31–32) See v. 25.
λόββετε (v. 31; cf. 19:1, 6, 16b) The RVC ζοῦ (TCV, CLB, CPB) is preferable to the ο morpheme (MSV, UV, SYD, LÜ, SB, NCV, CRV) because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the Greek. Also, the aorist is used in a direct quotation of Pilate’s speech.

κρίνατε Most Mandarin versions employ the ο morpheme to reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist imperative, for example shēnwèn 审问 (“interrogate,” MSV, UV, SYD, NCV), shēnpān 审判 (“try [a legal case],” LÜ), and chūzhì 處置 (“dispose of,” CPB). The CLB adds qù (qù chūlí 去處理, “go deal with”), which is an acceptable way to indicate commands in Mandarin (see comments on ἐρώτησον in v. 21). Here, monosyllabic verbs such as shēn (“judge”) are preferable to disyllabic ones, because they better reflect the least heavily marked aorist tense-form in Greek. The ο morpheme is also preferable because there is no shift in tense-form here to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme (cf. 19:1, 6).

ἀποκτείνατε The RVC σǐ (“die,” chūsǐ 處死, “sentence to death,” BT, SB, CPB, CSB) is preferable to the ο morpheme (e.g. MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, LÜ, CLB, TCV, NCV) because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist infinitive.

πληροθῇ (v. 32) See v. 9.

ἡμελλεν ἀποθνῄσκειν (cf. 19:7) This is a catenative construction (see 5.3.1.4 above). Here, formally expressed imperfective aspect morphemes are not available to the translator, because expressions such as jiāng zài sǐ or hùi sǐ-zhe are ungrammatical. Most Mandarin versions use auxiliary verbs such as jiāng/jiāngyào (MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, IG, HS, LÜ, TCV, NCV, CRV, CPB, RCUV, CSB), hùi (CLB), biyào
(SYD, ZHU), or gāi (HSC) for the imperfect (ἵμελλεν), and the monosyllabic verb si (“die”) with the φ morpheme for the present (ἀποθνῄσκειν). The CNT, on the other hand, has zào zāoshòu síwáng 要遭受死亡 (“will suffer death”), which is not recommended for translating a Greek present active infinitive verb. Still, SB uses the RVC qù for ἀποθνῄσκειν, which is not preferable because it does not reflect the aspect of the Greek. Therefore, the disyllabic verb shishi (“die”) with the φ morpheme is a more suitable choice for translating the present infinitive in Greek.

Εἰσπλήθεν οὖν πάλιν εἰς τὸ πραγματικὸν ὁ Πιλάτος καὶ ἐφώνησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ σὺ τοῦτο λέγεις ἡ ἄλλοι εἶπόν σοι περὶ ἐμοῦ; ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Πιλάτος· μὴ ἐγὼ Ἰουδαῖος εἰμί; τὸ ἔθνος τὸ σὸν καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς παρέδωκαν σε ἐμοῦ· τί ἐποίησας;

(18:33–35)

於是彼拉多回總督官邸去。把耶穌叫來，問他說：「你是不是猶太王？」耶穌答說：「這句話是你自己在說，還是別人對你說過有關我的事呢？」彼拉多答說：「我還是個猶太人不成？是你的同胞以及祭司長把你交給了我。你幹了什麼事？」


Again, Pilate went into the governor’s headquarters. He called for Jesus, asking him, “Are you the King of the Jews?” Jesus answered, “Are you saying this yourself, or did
others talk about me?" Pilate said, "Am I a Jew? It was your people and chief priests who
sent you to me. What did you do?"

eἰσοηλθέν (v. 33; cf. v. 1.) Rather than ὀγ ("again"), which is used in most
Mandarin versions (MSV, PK, JOHN, UV, WANG, BT, IG, HSC, SB, LÜ, TCV, NCV,
CRV, RCUV, CSB), εἰσοηλθέν...πάλιν should be rendered either by the verb hui 回
("[Pilate] went back into") with DVCs such as qù or dào (SYD, ZHU, CNT, CLB), or by
zóu 走 ("walked back to," HS) with the DVC hui.53

ἐφώνησεν (cf. v. 26) The ο morpheme is preferable here because there is no shift in
tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. For the
same reason, the following verb (εἴπεν) is rendered by the ο morpheme.

εἴπεν The ο morpheme is used here because there is no shift in tense-form to justify
the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

ἀπεκρίθη (vv. 34–35; also vv. 36–37) See v. 5.

λέγεις (v. 34) Most Mandarin versions translate the present form by either shuō
("say," MSV, PK, JOHN, UV, WANG, BT, IG, HSC, HS, SB, LÜ, CRV, NCV,
RCU, CSB) or wèn ("ask," SYD, ZHU, CNT) with the ο morpheme. However, zài is
preferable because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect of the present
tense-form in Greek.

εἴπον (cf. v. 8) In contrast to εἴπεν in v. 33 where the ο morpheme is used, the aorist
is used here within the quoted speech of Jesus, which justifies the use of a formally
expressed perfective morpheme. Also, -guò provides a better contrast to the present
tense-form (λέγεις) used in the same quotation of Jesus here.

53 See Morris, Gospel, 679 n. 78. Morris also adds other examples in John 6:15 and 10:40.
The aorist is used here in a direct quotation of Pilate's verbal exchanges with Jesus. Here, -le is preferable to the ø morpheme because it formally reflects the perfective aspect of the Greek.

See v. 3.

Formally expressed perfective morphemes are preferable here, because the aorist is used here as part of a direct statement. The perfective aspect markers -guo (PK, JOHMN) and -le (UV, WANG, BT, CNT, IG, HSC, HS, LÜ, SB, TCV, CLB, CRV, NCV, CPB, DCT, RCUV, CSB) may be used interchangeably here, for they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the Greek. SYD and ZHU, apparently mistaking the aorist indicative for a participle, have Ni zuò de shì shénme shì ne? (What is it that you did?), which is not preferable here because shì...de is normally reserved for the translation of Greek periphrastic constructions in Mandarin.54

Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world. My kingdom is from heaven. Wǒ de wángguó bìngbù shùyǔ zhè ge shìjiè. Wǒ de wángguó jiāshè shì zhǐshǐ zhè shìjiè dehuà, wǒ de shǒuxià qǐbù jiù zǎo wèile bìmàn wǒ zǎo Yóutàirén dài-dào ér dikàng-le-xiàqù ne? Suǒyǐ shuō, wǒ de wángguó bìngfēi chū yǔ cǐchū.

54 Similarly, the MSV has Ni guórán shì zuò shénme de 你果然是做什麼的 ("What exactly did you do?").
Jesus replied, "My kingdom does not belong to this world. If my kingdom were to belong to this world, my subordinates would have been fighting to prevent me being captured by the Jews, wouldn't they? Therefore, my kingdom does not come from here."

\(\text{ἀπεκρίθη}\) (also v. 37)  See v. 5.

\(\text{εἰ ἐκ τοῦ...τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις.}\)  Second class conditional clause (see 5.4.3 above).

\(\text{ἡγωνίζοντο}\)  Many Mandarin versions add an auxiliary verb such as \(\text{yào/biào/bì}\) or \(\text{hui}\) to the verbs \(\text{zhēngzhàn}\) (“fight,” PK, JOHN M, UV, WANG, BT, CRV), \(\text{zhànzhēng/zhàndōu}\) (“go to war,” ZHU, LÜ, RCUV), \(\text{zuòzhàn}\) (“do battle,” NCV), or \(\text{dīkàng/fānkàng}\) (“resist,” CNT, IG) with the \(\sigma\) morpheme. As noted in 5.4.3 above, Mandarin auxiliary verbs are not preferable for the rendering of the indicative verb in Greek conditional clauses. Nevertheless, a few versions that do not use auxiliary verbs add adverbs such as \(\text{zǎoyǐ 早已 (“already,” SB) or yīdìng 一定 (“certainly,” TCV), perhaps in an attempt to convey past-time reference or modal use of the imperfect tense-form in the protasis of the contrary to fact conditional statement (see 5.4.3). HSC adds the perfective aspect marker -\(\text{le}\), which does not reflect the imperfect aspect of the Greek. The two-morpheme aspect compound -\(\text{le-IDVC}\) (with no additional adverb or auxiliary verb) works best here because it morphologically reflects both the aspect and more heavily marked imperfect tense-form in Greek. The addition of the adverb \(\text{zǎo}\) is necessary here in order to express conceptual distance in Mandarin.

\(\piπταπδόθω\)  Some versions use the conjunctive \(\text{zhīyǔ 至於 (“as to”)}\) and the passive construction formed by the particle \(\text{bèi}\) to render the aorist passive subjunctive (UV, LÜ,

---

\(55\) The particle \(\text{ἀν}\) is supported by several major uncials, including A B C D E Θ Π L W Ψ. Interestingly, the original reading of the Codex Vaticanus (fourth century; B\*) does not contain the particle. Aland et al., \textit{Novum Testamentum Graece}, 310.
The běi construction, although grammatically acceptable, makes the sentence sound unnatural and very awkward in Mandarin. The passive construction formed by the particle zǎo, on the other hand, works much better here. However, a few other versions that render the verb phrase with active construction in Mandarin, for example, shì wǒ bù zhìyú luò zài 使我不至於落在 (“so that to prevent me from falling into...,” TCV) or bù ràng wǒ luò dào 不讓我落到 (“so that to prevent me from falling into...,” CPB), are nevertheless considered acceptable.

The RVC dào is preferable to the ø morpheme used in most Mandarin versions (MSV, PK, JOHN, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, IG, HSC, LÜ, SB, TCV, NCV, CPB, RCUV, CSB) for it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect signaled by the aorist subjunctive. In addition, the shift in tense-form from the imperfect (ηγωνίζοντο) to aorist also justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

βήεν οὖν αὐτὸς ὁ Πιλάτος· οὐκ οὖν βασιλεὺς εἶ σὺ; ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεὺς εἰμι. ἐγὼ εἰς τοῦτο γεγένηκα καὶ εἰς τούτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ. πάς ὁ οὖν ἐκ τῆς ἀλήθειας ἀκούει μοῦ τῆς φωνῆς. λέγει αὐτῶν ὁ Πιλάτος· τί ἔστιν ἀλήθεια; (18:37-38a)

彼拉多然後問他說：「那麼，難道你就是國王嗎？」耶穌回答說：「是你自己在說的：我就是國王。我正是這個緣故而聖誕降生、親自降臨於世上，如此我好為真理作證；凡屬真理的人，一切都聽著我的話。」彼拉多責問耶穌說：「何謂真理？」

Bilāduō ránhòu wèn tā shuō, “Nàme, nándào Nǐ jiūshì guówáng ma?” Yēsū huídá shuō, “Shì nǐ zījī zài shuō de: wǒ jiūshì guówáng. Wǒ zhèngshí zhègè yùángú ér shèng-dān-

56 For further discussions of the passive construction in Mandarin, see the commentary on οτάυρωθῇ (19:16a), p. 376 below.
Pilate again asked him, saying, "So, are you the king?" Jesus replied, "This is what you said: I am the king. For this very reason I was born a holy child, personally coming into this world, so that I may testify to the truth; the one who belongs to the truth, listens to everything (I say)." Pilate asked Jesus, "What is truth?"

ēπεν (v. 37) The ø morpheme is preferable here because up to this point there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective morpheme. In vv. 33-37, direct quotations are introduced by two aorists, étπεν and áπεκρίθη.

λέγεις See v. 5.

gεγέννημαι The perfect passive indicative is translated as shēng 生 ("to be born"
MOR, MAR, GŪ, DV, GO, BCV, SJ, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, SB, CLB, TCV, NCV, CRV, RCUV, CSB), dānshēng 誕生 ("coming into being," IG, CPB), chūshēng 出生 ("born," LÜ), jiàngshēng 降生 ("born," PK, JOHNM, BB, HSC), or tōushēng 投生 ("conceived to be born," HS) with the ø morpheme. Ricci has used the expression tuō-tāi-jiàng-shēng 託胎降生 (lit. "born a fetus"), a four-character set phrase commonly referring to the birth of the founder of a religion.57 The expressions jiàngdàn 降誕 ("born") and shinū dānshēng 室女誕聖 (lit. "born a holy child of a virgin") also appear on the Nestorian Stele, the former with reference to the birth of Tang Emperor Tai-Tsung (reigns from 763–79 C.E.) and the latter to that of Jesus. The four-character set phrase shēng-dān-jiàng-shēng ("born a holy child") with the ø morpheme precisely

57 Ricci, Tien-chu Shih-i, 448, line 580. See also example (29) in chapter 5.
translates the aspect of the perfect tense-form in Greek. This verb is left untranslated in Basset’s version (SL-MOR).

εἶληλυθα  Closely related to γεγένημαι, εἶληλυθα is translated by verbs such as rù 入 (“enter,” MOR), lín 到 (“arrive,” DV, GO, JOHN, BB, SJ), jiàng 降 (“descend,” WV), and lái 來 (“come,” SL-MOR) with the φ morpheme in several wenli versions. The majority of Mandarin versions use the φ morpheme: lái dào 來到 (UV, IG, BT, HSC, LÜ, SB, CLB, CRV, NCV, CPB, RCUV, CSB) and dào lái 到來 (PK, JOHNM, SYD, ZHU). Again, when used with the φ morpheme, the four-character phrase qín-zì-jiàng-lín (“come in person”) is preferable because it corresponds to the discourse function of the perfect tense-form in Greek.

ἀκούει Most Mandarin versions use the φ morpheme: tīng (“hear,” e.g. MSV, UV, SYD, IG, LÜ, TCV, CRV, RCUV) and tīngcōng 聽從 (“obey,” e.g. SB, CLB, CPB). The aspect marker -zhe is preferable to the φ morpheme because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form. Some versions add the auxiliary verb bi or biyào (PK, JOHNM, SYD, ZHU, HSC, HS), which is not preferable since ἀκούει is in the indicative mood.

λέγει (v. 38a)  See vv. 4, 17.

Καὶ τούτῳ εἴπὼν πάλιν ἔξηλθεν πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἐγώ οὐδεμίαν εὐρίσκω ἐν αὐτῷ αἰτίαν. ἔστιν δὲ συνήθεια υἱὸν ἰνα ἐν ἀπολύσῳ ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ πάσχα· βούλεσθε οὖν ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;

---

58 Ricci has qín lái jiù shì 親來救世 (“come in person to save the world”). Ricci, T'ien-chu Shih-i, 448, line 580.
59 The DVCs dào and lái used here do not convey aspect but only give spatial directions to the action.
After finishing saying these, he came out again, and spoke to the Jews: “I find no crime in him. However, according to your custom, I promise to release one person during the Passover. So now, do you wish that I release the ‘King of the Jews’ to you?” Once again they cried out, saying, “We don’t want this fellow! We want Barabbas!” This Barabbas was a robber.

εἰπὼν (v. 38b)  As in 18:1, the RVC wán (“finish”) is preferable to the ø morpheme because it better reflects the aspect of the Greek. Also, the shift in tense-form from the present (λέγει, v. 38a) to the aorist also justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

ἐξῆλθεν  See v. 1.

eὐρίσκω (see also 19:4, 6)  Most Mandarin versions render the present tense-form with RVCs such as chū/chūlāi (PK, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, HS, LŪ, SB, TCV, CLB,
NCV, CRV, DCT, RCUV, CSB, казалось (IG), or ышёт (CNT), which do not reflect the
imperfective aspect of the Greek. Interestingly, the author (presumably Bishop Alopen)
of the Jesus-Messiah Sutra (v. 193) offers a better translation by using 看 with the о
morpheme for this verb: Qi rén bú dāng sǐzúi. Wǒ shì bù wén bù jiàn. Qi rén bú hé dāng
si'其人不當死罪。我實不聞不見。其人不合當死 (“This man does not deserve death.
Indeed, I was not informed of such, nor did I find it. This man ought not to die.”). 60
However, the disyllabic verb, fājué (“find”) with the о morpheme, is preferable here
because it reflects the aspect and the more heavily marked feature of the present tense-
form in Greek.

The auxiliary verbs such as xào (MSV, UV, WANG, ZHU, LÜ, TCV, NCV, RCUV) or gāi (SB, CPB) are necessary additions for expressing volition in
Mandarin. Some versions simply use the о morpheme without the auxiliaries (e.g. HSC,
CNT), which is not preferable for translating non-indicative moods in Greek. The aspect
marker -le and the о morpheme are both suitable translations for the aorist, although the
former is stylistically a better choice for the second occurrence of ἀπολύσω.

Several Mandarin versions
render the perfective aspect in Greek with the imperfective morpheme: -zhe (rāng-zhe 喊
著, “be shouting,” LÜ and hān-zhe 喊著, “be yelling,” UV, IG, CLB, CRV, CPB, RCUV)
or qīlái (喊叫起来, “be crying out,” CNT). A few others use the о morpheme: dàshēng
hān shuo 大声喊說 (“shout loudly and say,” SB), dà hān 大喊 (“shout,” TCV), hānjiao
shuo 喊叫說 (“shout and say,” PK, JOHNM, WANG, HSC), and jìáorāng shuo 叫嚷說

60 My translation. The Jesus-Messiah Sutra continues with the statement of Pilate, wǒ shì bùnéng shǎ qì rén
我實不能肅其人 (“I really cannot kill this man,” v. 196; for the verse division, I follow Saeki). In his
translation, Saeki provides the paraphrase “I discovered no cause to kill this man.” This idea may be
implied in the context but is absent in the Chinese text. See Saeki, Nestorian Documents, 145.
(“clamor and say,” HS), all of which correspond to the perfective aspect of the Greek. However, the verb forms rāng-rāng (lit. “shout-shout”) and shuō-zhe (“be saying”) are preferable to the o morpheme because they both morphologically reflect the aspect of the Greek: verb reduplication reflects the perfective aspect of ἐκραύγασαν, whereas -zhe reflects the imperfective aspect signaled by λέγοντες.

Τότε οὖν ἔλαβεν ὁ Πιλάτος τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐμαστίγωσεν. καὶ οἱ στρατιώται πλέξαντες στέφανον εἰς ἀκανθῶν ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ, καὶ ἰμάτιον πορφυροῦν περιέβαλον αὐτὸν καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον· χαίρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· καὶ ἐδίδοσαν αὐτῷ ῥατίσματα. (19:1–3)

於是彼拉多將耶穌帶走，並且鞭打他。幾名士兵用荊棘編成冠冕，戴在他頭上，又給他披上紫袍，到他面前去，一邊走著，一邊說著：「猶太王萬歲！」然後他們就給他一個耳光打了下去。


Then Pilate took Jesus away, and flogged him. Some soldiers used thorns to make a crown and put it on his head, and then dressed him in a purple robe. They walked toward him and said, “Long live the King of the Jews!” Then they slapped him in the face.

ἔλαβεν (v. 1; cf. 18:3, 12, 31; 19:6, 16b, 23, 27, 30, 40) The shift in tense-form from the present (λέγοντες, 18:40) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme here (in this case, an RVC). Most Mandarin version use the o morpheme (e.g. MSV, UV, IG, SB, LÜ, TCV, NCV, RCUV), with the a few exceptions
which use RVCs (jū-zhù 构住, BT, HSC “seized”; shōu-xià 收下 “arrested,” HS; dāi-zǒu, “took way,” CSB).

ἐμαστίγωσεν While -le may be an option, the o morpheme is preferable since there is no shift in tense-form here to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

πλέξαντες (v. 2) The perfective aspect of the aorist participle is translated by the o morpheme (biānzuō 編作, “weave,” PK, UV, JOHNM, SYD, LÜ), the RVC chéng (biān-chéng, TCV), and the perfective -le (biān-le, CNT, HSC, RCUV), all of which are acceptable, although the RVC works best here because it morphologically reflects both the aspect and the less heavily marked feature of the aorist tense-form in Greek.

Although there is no shift in tense-form here, formally expressed perfective tense-forms are preferable to the o morpheme because they provide those three aorist tense-forms in v. 2 a better contrast to the soldier’s actions which are described in three imperfect tense-forms in v. 3.

ἐπέθηκαν Most Mandarin versions use dāi (“wear,” e.g. MSV, PK, UV, SYD, HSC, LÜ, CSB) with the o morpheme for the aorist. The TCV uses the stative aspect marker -zhe, which does not reflect perfective aspect of the Greek.

περιέβαλον The RVC shǎng is preferable (e.g. chuān-shāng 穿上, “put on,” PK, UV, RCUV, pī-shǎng, “throw on,” LÜ, CSB) to the o morpheme because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist in Greek.

ὥρχοντο (v. 3) Most versions have the o morpheme for the imperfect tense-form: for example, āijin 挨近 (“get close to,” UV) and dào 到 (“go,” HSC). The expressions jiēxù
de láídào 接續地來到 (“continue to come,” LÜ), yǐzài 一再 (“again and again,” DCT), and bùdúàn de láídào 不斷地來到 (“come ceaselessly,” CSB) are obvious attempts to express the iterative sense of the Aktionsart, which must be dismissed here. The aspect marker -zhe is preferable to the ø morpheme because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect signaled by the imperfect tense-form in Greek. The DVC qu (“away,” “be at a distance of”) may be added in order to convey conceptual remoteness grammaticalized by the two imperfect tense-forms in v. 3.

ελεγον The aspect marker -zhe is preferable to the ø morpheme (PK, UV, SYD, ZHU, CNT, IG, HS, SB, LÜ, TCV, CLB, CRV, NCV, RCUV, CSB) because it formally reflects the imperfective aspect of the imperfect tense-form in Greek.

χαίρε The present imperative is best translated as wànsuí (“long live (the king)!”) or lit. “ten thousand years (added to your life)!” SYD, WANG, HS, SB, LÜ, CLB, TCV, NCV, CPB, DCT, RCUV, CSB; also in Japanese versions (in the same Chinese characters): banzai はんざい, JCV, JRV, 万歳 CBT). Some versions have yuàn...ān 願...安 (DV), qīng...de ān 請...的安 (MSV, PK, JOHMN), or qīngān 請安 (HSC), which are in fact conventional terms used primarily for Chinese epistolary salutations (see also example (18) in chapter 5). Other terms may also be considered acceptable, including gōngxi/gōnghè 恭喜/恭喜 (“Congratulations!” SL-MOR, MOR, UV, BT, CNT, ZHU) and yuànmi xīlè 願你喜樂 (“We wish you happiness!” CRV).

εδίδοσαν...δαπίσματα (cf. ἐδωκεν ῥάπτισμα in 18:22) Most versions use the ø morpheme to translate the imperfect. LÜ has zhī gěi tā ěrguāzi 直給他耳刮子 (“kept on giving him slaps in the face”), which is a deliberate attempt to convey the iterative

---

61 The word-for-word translation of the NIV. Similarly, Brown suggests, “time and time again they came up to him.” See Brown, Gospel, 875.
Aktionsart of the imperfect tense-form in Greek. Similarly, the verb phrase liánlián de guó Tā 连连的掴祂 ("repeatedly slapped Him," CLB) expresses the same Aktionsart. These additions must be dismissed. Other versions simply use the φ morpheme, such as yòng shǒuzhāng dà tā 用手掌打他 ("struck him with the palms of their hands," UV, SYD, HSC), gěi Tā jīgé bāzhāng 给祂幾個巴掌 ("gave Him a few slaps in the face," IG), guó Tā 掕祂 ("slapped Him," CLB 1998), and dā Tā de liān 打祂的臉 ("struck His face," CNT). These are all acceptable translations of the imperfect, however, the more heavily marked two-morpheme aspect compound -le-IDVC is a much better choice than the φ morpheme, for it closely reflects both the aspect and the discourse function of the imperfect tense-form as the foregrounding device in Greek. In addition, the use of the two-morpheme aspect compound is justified by the shift in tense-form, that is, from the present (χαίρε) to the imperfect. Here, since conceptual remoteness has already been established by the DVC qù in v. 3, there is no need to make any more additions.

καὶ ἔξηλθεν πάλιν ἐξω ὁ Πιλάτος καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἵδε ἄγω υμῖν αὐτὸν ἔξω, ἵνα γνῶτε ὅτι οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν εὖρισκω ἐν αὐτῷ. ἔξηλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐξω, φορών τὸν ἀκάνθινον στέφανον καὶ τὸ πορφυρόν ἰμάτιον. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἵδοι ὁ ἀνθρώπος. (19:4–5)

接下来拉多再次走了出来，告诉他们说：「你们听好！我带着他到外邊来给你们，是要让你们体会出，我在他身上尚未发生罪状。」随后耶稣走了出来，头戴著荆棘冠冕，身披著紫袍。拉多告诉他们说：「你们看好！這個人！」

Jiěxiálái Bǐláduō zài cí zǒu-le chūlái, gāosù tāmen shūō, “Nǐmen tīng-hào! wǒ dài-zhe tā dào wàibian lái gěi nǐmen, shì yào ràng nǐmen tìhuì-chū, wǒ zài tā shēnshàng shàngwèi

---

62 See, for example, Keener, Commentary, 1120–21.
Pilate came out again and spoke to them, “Pay attention! I took him out to meet you, in order to let you know that I find no crime in him.” Then Jesus went out, wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe. Pilate spoke to them, “Here, look! The man!”

The aspect marker -le is preferable for both occurrences because the shifts in tense-form from the imperfect (εἰδόσαν) to aorist (v. 4), and from the present (ε.offsetWidth=750;v. 4) to aorist (v. 5) justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

See 18:21.

Most Mandarin versions add the auxiliary verbs jiào (MSV, PK, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, LÜ, SB, CRV), yào (HS, CSB), ràng (TCV, NCV, CPB, RCUV), or shì (JOHN, CNT, IG) to the verbs zhīdào (“know”), xiǎodé (“understand”), or mǐngbāi (“realize”) to convey volition, which is appropriate here. The RVC chū is preferable to the φ morpheme because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist.

See 18:38.

In Mandarin, depending on the direct object, there are several verbs that denote the action of wearing. Here, two different verbs must be used, dài (“wear [a hat]”) and pī (“wear [clothes]”), to translate the same Greek word. The aspect marker -zhe (e.g. MSV, PK, UV, SYD, ZHU, IG, HSC, LŪ, CLB, NCV, CRV, RCUV, CSB) is preferable.
to the ω morpheme because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect of the present participle.

λέγει  See 18:4, 5; 19:5.

ἰδοὺ (see also ἴδε in 18:21, 19:4; 1 Cor 15:51) RVCs are preferable to the ω morpheme for the same reason provided in the discussion on 18:21 above. While the verb form tīng-hǎo ("Listen up!" 18:21, 19:4) may be used again here, kàn-hǎo ("Here, look!" "Pay attention!") is a better choice because Pilate is calling attention not only to what he is about to say but also to the person he is presenting in front of the crowd. Many Mandarin versions simply use a monosyllabic verb with the ω morpheme, for example, qiāo ("look," TCV), kàn (na) ("see," "look," IG, HSC, RCUV), Nǐmén kàn (ba) ("You take a look!") PK, SYD, WANG, CNT, CLB), all of which denote "see" or "look."

"Ὅτε οὖν εἶδον αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες· σταῦρωσον σταῦρωσον. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος· λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς καὶ σταυρώσατε· ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐχ εὐρίσκω ἐν αὐτῷ αἰτίαν. ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· ὑμεῖς νόμον ἔχομεν καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὄφείλει ἀποθανεῖν, ὅτι νῦν θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἐποίησεν. (19:6–7)

祭司長和差役一看見他，就嚷嚷說著：「把他釘死在十字架上！釘死了他！」彼拉多告訴他們說：「你們自個兒把他帶走，然後再去釘吧！我的確在他身上尚未發覺有什麼罪狀。」猶太人對他答說：「我們自有律法，依法而言他應該死，因他把自己當成 神之子。」

---

64 Newman and Nida note that "listen" is better than "look." See Newman and Nida, *Handbook*, 576. In Mandarin, "listen" works better in exposition than narrative. See the discussion on 1 Cor 15:51 in my chapter 7.
Jisizhang he chaiyi yi kan-ji'an ta, jiù rang-rang shuo-zhe, "Ba ta ding-si zai shizijiia shang!
Ding-si-le ta!" Biladuo gaosu tamen shuo, "Nimen zig'er ba ta daiizo, ranhou zai qu ding ba! Wo diqu'e zai ta shenshang shangwei fazu'e you shenme zuizhuang." Youtairen du ta
da shuo, "Women ziyou lufa, yifa er yan ta yinggai si, yinwei ta ba ziji dang-cheng Shen zhizi.

As soon as the chief priests and assistants saw him, they cried out loudly, "Crucify him! Crucify him!" Pilate answered them, "Take him away yourselves and then crucify him! Indeed I find no crime in him." The Jews replied to him, "We have a law; according to that law, he must die, because he claimed to be the Son of God."

ειδον (v. 6) See 18:26.

οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ υπηρεται As Brown has pointed out, the repetition of the definite article oι before the second noun preserves the separation of the two groups.65 The CPB fails to see this significance and translates the second definite article oι as tamen de ("their").

ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες See 18:40.

σταύρωσον σταύρωσον The Jesus-Messiah Sutra uses the stative aspect marker -zhe (vv. 202–4) to record the event of Jesus being bound to a tree (mishang fu-zhe 木上縛著).66 The term shizi (lit. "ten-word"), which first appeared with direct reference to the Crucifix on the Nestorian Stele, was used in all Chinese versions from Basset's New Testament onward. The majority of Chinese versions use the φ morpheme to reflect the

65 Brown, Gospel, 876. Brown adds that these two groups constitute "the Jews" mentioned in v. 7.
perfective aspect of the aorist imperatives: Shì‘īng zhī, shì‘īng zhī (SL-MOR), Dīng zhī shì‘ījià, dīng zhī shì‘ījià (MOR, MAR, DV, GO, BCV, JOHN, SJ, GÜ), Dīng zhī shì‘ijià, dīng zhī shì‘ijià (UVW, UVB, UVE), Dīng tā shì‘ījià, dīng tā shì‘ījià (UV, CLB, CRV), Dīng zhī dīng zhī (GURY), Dīng zhī yú shì‘ījià, dīng zhī yú shì‘ījià (BB), Dīng tā zài shì‘ījià shàng, dīng tā zài shì‘ījià shàng (MSV, PK, JOHN, WANG, SB), Dīng tā shì‘ījià shàng! Dīng tā shì‘ījià shàng! (HSC), Dīng shì‘ījià! Dīng shì‘ījià! (SYD, ZHU, BT, LÜ, RCUV), Bā tā dīng shì‘ījià! Bā tā dīng shì‘ījià! (TCV, NCV), and Bā tā dīng zài shì‘ījià shàng! Bā tā dīng zài shì‘ījià shàng! (CPB, DCT). All of these phrases contain the same verb, dīng ("nail"), which expresses the idea “Crucify him” or literally, “Nail him onto the cross!” with slight variations in wording and emphases.

A few other versions, on the other hand, use the RVC sī (“die,” WV, IG, CNT) and shàng (“up,” HS, CSB). Although the ø morpheme is acceptable, dīng-sī is preferable because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form in Greek.

As Brown observes, the “double cry” reflects intensity, presenting the considerable hostility of the enemy. In Chinese, repetition of the exact verb form—especially when the repeated verb immediately follows the main verb—does not necessarily ensure added emphasis, rather it often has the opposite effect on the reader or listener. One could argue that this is in part due to the close morphological resemblance between the repetition of verb forms and verb reduplication in Mandarin. As treated in 3.2.5.2.d above, verb reduplication is composed of a verb and its reduplicant. Although verb reduplication is

---

67 GÜ adds the modal particle yé to the end of each verb phrase.
68 SB omits the pronoun tā for the first verb.
69 Brown, Gospel, 876.
used to grammaticalize the perfective aspect in Mandarin, it often occurs in contexts where the action may be described as short or insignificant in terms of duration and importance.70 For example, the verb yánjīū 研究 denotes “research” or “examine,” but its reduplicated form yánjīū-yánjīū usually means “take a look” or “worry about (later).” Therefore, here it is suitable to use a heavily marked two-morpheme aspect compound (e.g. RVC-le) for the second σταύρωσαν and an RVC for the first, since the repetition of the exact Mandarin verb does not convey added emphasis (see also v. 15; cf. repetition of perfect tense-form in 19:22).

λάβετε...καὶ σταυρώσατε (cf. 19:1, 6, 16b) As in v. 1, the RVC zōu is preferable here because there is a shift in tense-form from the present (λέγει) to aorist. The aorist is used in a direct quotation, which also justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. On the other hand, the ϕ morpheme is preferable for the other aorist used in the same quotation (σταυρώσατε), because there is no shift in tense-form.

εὐρίσκω  See 18:38.

ἀπεκρίθη (v. 7)  See 18:5.

ἔχωμεν (cf. 18:10; 19:10–11, 15) Morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes, while grammatically acceptable, are not preferable in this context. However, disyllabic verbs such as zīyǒu (“have,” HS) with the ϕ morpheme are preferable to monosyllabic ones with the ϕ morpheme, which are found in most Mandarin versions (e.g. MSV, UV, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, SB, LÜ, TCV, NCV, CRV, RCUV, CSB).

Formally expressed aspect morphemes, while grammatically acceptable, are not preferable in this context. As in 18:32, most Mandarin versions use auxiliary verbs such as yīnggāi/gāi (CNT, HSC, SB, LÜ, CSB) or dāng (JOHN) for the present tense-form (ὁφείλει) and sǐ ("die") or chūsì 處死 ("sentence to die," CLB, CPB) with the θ morpheme for the aorist (ἀποθανεῖν). Several others, on the other hand, have shì dāng sǐ de ("is to die," PK) or shì gāi sǐ de ("is to die," UV, SYD, ZHU, BT, TCV, NCV, CRV, RCUV). This is not preferable, because shi...de construction is not suitable for translating the infinitive but should be reserved for the periphrastic construction.

The RVC chéng ("finish") is preferable to the θ morpheme (e.g. MSV, PK, UV, ZHU, CNT, HSC, SB, LÜ, TCV, NCV, CRV, CPB, RCUV) because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect which is signaled by the aorist tense-form in Greek.

"Ὅτε οὖν ἤκουσεν ὁ Πιλάτος τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, μᾶλλον ἐφοβήθη, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον πάλιν καὶ λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦν πάθεν εἰ σὺ; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπόκρισιν οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ. (19:8–9)

当彼拉多聽了这话，就更加受驚。於是他再次進人官邸，質問耶穌說：「你到底是從那裏來的？」但是耶穌卻不給他回答。

ębäng Bilāduō tīng-le zhè huà zhīhòu, jiù gèngjiā shòujīng. Yūshī tā zài cì jīnrù guāndì, zhìwèn Yēsū shuō, "Nǐ dàodǐ shì cóng nà lǐ lái de?" Dānsì Yēsū què bùjī tā huídá.

---

71 The MSV has dīngzuò sīzúi 定做死罪 ("deserve the death penalty"); the CPB uses the passive construction bèi chāsì ("to be sentenced to death").
When Pilate heard this, he became even more frightened. He entered the governor’s headquarters again, and questioned Jesus, saying, “Where on earth are you from?” But Jesus gave him no answer.

\( 
\text{ἐκούσεν} \text{ (v. 8)} \quad \text{RVCs (e.g. jiàn, MSV, PK, UV, LÜ, HSC, NCV, CRV, RCUV; dào, DCT) and -le (SYD, IG, SB, CPB) are preferable to the acebook morpheme (CSB) because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist. Although the two aspect morphemes may be interchangeable, -le is preferable to RVCs because it accounts for more frequent use in subordinate clauses.} \text{ The aspect marker -le also marks the beginning of the discourse unit (vv. 8–16a).} \\
\text{ἐφοβήθη} \quad \text{Here, the acebook morpheme is suitable for the aorist since there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. The monosyllabic verb jīng (“frighten”) with the acebook morpheme is preferable to the monosyllabic verb hàipà 害怕 (“fear”) (PK, IG, NCV, CPB, DCT) with the acebook morpheme because the former is less heavily marked than the latter. The expression фа hàipà 發害怕 (“become afraid,” MSV, UV, LÜ, SB, CRV, RCUV) sounds awkward in Mandarin, apparently an attempt to capture the sense of “becoming.” Again, this ingressive or inchoative meaning of the verb pertains to Aktionsart, thus it must be dismissed. The passive construction formed by the particle shòu is suitable for the translation of the passive voice in Greek.} \\
\text{εἰσῆλθεν} \text{ (v. 9)} \quad \text{See 18:1.} \\
\text{λέγει} \quad \text{See 18:38a.} \\
\)

\footnote{Wang 王, Grammar, vol. 1, 335–36. See 3.2.5.2.c.α, pp. 125–26 above.}
λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος· ἐμοὶ οὖ λαλεῖς; οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχω ἀπολύσαι σε καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω σταυρώσαι σε; ἀπεκρίθη ἣςοῦς· οὐκ ἔχες ἐξουσίαν κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ οὔδεμιαν εἰ μὴ ἦν δεδομένον σοι ἀνωθεν· διὰ τούτο ὁ παραδοὺς μὲ σοὶ μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν ἔχει. (19:10–11)

彼拉多這時就告訴他說：「你不對我開口嗎？難道你這麼不知好歹—本人既持有著放你走的權力，亦持有著把你在釘上十字架的權力嗎？」耶穌答說：「要不是上天恩寵賞賜給你的，你早就沒持著任何裁決我的權力了。因此把我交出來給你的那個人，他負著的是更重的罪了。」


Pilate then said to him, “Are you not talking to me? Don’t you know what’s best for you that I have the power to release you and the power to crucify you?” Jesus replied, “If it was not bestowed to you from above, you would have no rights to judge me. Therefore, the one who handed me over to you, his holds a greater sin.”

λέγει (v. 10)  See 18:17.

λαλεῖ Most Mandarin versions use disyllabic verbs such as huídá (“answer,” PK, JOHN, UV, CNT, LÚ, SB, TCV, CLB, NCV, CRV, CSB), shuōhuà (“speak,” SYD, WANG, BT, HS, RCUV), kāikōu (“open mouth,” ZHU) or gàosū (“tell,” CPB) with the o morpheme, which are preferable to monosyllabic verbs such as shuo (“speak,” HSC) or dā (“answer,” MSV) because they better reflect the more heavily marked present tense-
form in Greek. A few others add auxiliary verbs such as γινώ (CPB) or γεί (“give,” HSC). Such additions are not preferable for the rendering of the indicative mood in Greek.

οὐκ οἴδας See 18:21 (cf. 18:2, 4, 19:35).

ἐχω (cf. 18:10; 19:7, 15) The aspect marker -zhe is preferable to the φ morpheme because it formally reflects the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form. Most Mandarin versions use the monosyllabic verb γοῦ (“have,” e.g. PK, JOHNM, UV, ZHU, BT, CNT, IG, HS, SB, LÜ, TCV, NCV, CPB, RCUV, CSB) with the φ morpheme.

σταυρῶσαι See v. 6.

ἀπεκρίθη (v. 11) See 18:5.

οὐκ εἰχε...εἰ μὴ ἦν δεδομένον σοι ἀνοθεν (v. 11) Many grammarians classify this as an example of the second class (contrary to fact; see 5.4.3) conditional without the particle ἀν in the apodosis. However, as Porter argues, it is the context of the argument—not the form of the conditional—that determines the conditional as unreal. It is best treated here as a first class conditional (see 5.4.2).

The perfect participle (δεδομένον) is most frequently translated by cığē 赐給 (“grant,” e.g. PK, UV, CNT, HSC, SB, CRV, CSB) or simply cığ (“grant,” MSV) or γεί (“give,” NCV, CPB) with the φ morpheme. LÜ uses the aspect marker -le (γεί-le), which does not reflect the stative aspect of the Greek. The stative aspect morpheme -zhe is not an option because the verb forms cığē-zhe and γεί-zhe are ungrammatical in Mandarin. Therefore, the four-character set phrase =en-chōng-shāng-ci (“bestow upon graciously,” see also 18:9, 11) works best here because the φ morpheme is a suitable Mandarin

73 These include Burton, Blass and Debrunner, Boyer, Zerwick and Grosvenor. See Burton, Syntax, §249; BDF, §360; Boyer, “Second Class Conditions,” 88; Zerwick and Grosvenor, Grammatical Analysis, 341.
74 Porter, Verbal Aspect, 306.
translation of the stative aspect of the perfect tense-form in Greek. Also, its heavily
marked feature corresponds to the perfect tense-form used as a frontgroun
ding device, highlighting the fact that Pilate’s power is a gift from God. The periphrastic construction,
ην δεδομένων, is translated by the construction shi...de in Mandarin.75

The imperfective aspect signaled by the Greek imperfect ἔχει may be reflected
formally by -zhe rather than by the ø morpheme (e.g. MSV, IG, HSC, SB, CPB, DCT,
CSB). The addition of the adverb zāo is necessary here in order to express conceptual
distance in Mandarin.

παραδοὺς  The RVC chūlài is preferable here because the shift in tense-form from the
perfect (δεδομένων) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect
morpheme. Most Mandarin versions use the ø morpheme (e.g. JOHNM, UV, SYD, ZHU,
CNT, SB, LÙ, NCV, CRV, CPB, CSB).

ἔχει  The aspect marker -zhe is preferable to the ø morpheme because it formally
reflects the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form. Some Mandarin versions use
the monosyllabic verb yōu ("have," e.g. SYD, ZHU, BT) or fū ("carry," IG, SB) with the
ø morpheme, while others do not translate the verb (e.g. MSV, JOHNM, UV, HSC, HS,
TCV, NCV, CRV, CPB). Still, two versions use -le (fān-le ἔτα, "committed," LÙ; yōu
-le, "had," CNT), which is not recommended here because -le does not reflect the aspect
of the Greek.

ἐκ τούτου ὁ Πιλάτος ἐζήτει ἀπολύσαι αὐτόν· οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐκραύγασαν
λέγοντες· ἔαν τούτον ἀπολύσῃς, οὐκ εἶ φίλος τοῦ Καίσαρος· πᾶς ὁ βασιλέα
ἐαυτὸν ποιῶν ἀντιλέγει τῷ Καίσαρι. ὁ οὖν Πιλάτος ἀκούσας τῶν λόγων τούτων

75 See discussions of periphrasis in 5.3.2.
From that point on, Pilate was thinking about releasing Jesus. Unfortunately, the Jews cried out and said, "If you free this man, you are not one (Greek reads "friend") of Caesar’s party. Anyone who declares himself king opposes Caesar.” When Pilate heard this, he took Jesus outside to a place called the “Stone Pavement” (in Hebrew called “Gabbatha”), and sat on the judge’s bench.

Several Mandarin versions have xiāngyào (or yào/xiàng, “wish”) shìfàng 释放 (“release,” MSV, PK, JOHN, UV, SYD, Wang, ZHU, BT, SB, LÜ, TCV, CLB, NCV, CRV, RCUV, CSB) with the ø morpheme for ἐξῆται ἀπολῦσαι. The problem with this translation is that the verb xiāngyào is used as an auxiliary to express volition or futurity in Mandarin. More importantly, it is set aside specifically to translate the non-indicative moods in Greek, including the subjunctive, optative, and
future form. For this reason, it is better to use different verb forms, such as *dāsuàn* 计算 (*plan,” HS), *xiàngfǎ* 想法 (*devise,” HSC), or *shèfà* 设法 (*try*). 76

However, -zhe is preferable to the ø morpheme since it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect of the imperfect tense-form in Greek. As for ἀπολύσαςι, RVCs such as *kāi* (HSC) or *zōu* are preferable to the ø morpheme because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the Greek aorist tense-form. The addition of the adverb *lǎo* is necessary here for the purpose of conveying remoteness in Mandarin. 77

εκραύγασαν λέγοντες See 18:40.

ἀπολύσαςι Like ἀπολύσαςι above, most versions (MSV, PK, JOHN, UV, WANG, BT, CNT, IG, LÜ, HS, SB, TCV, CLB, CRV, NCV, RCUV, CSB) use the ø morpheme.

As noted in the previous chapters, the perfective aspect marker -le is frequently used in contexts that include subordinate clauses and the protasis of conditional sentences. 78

Therefore, -le (SYD, ZHU, CPB) is preferable to RVCs such as *zōu* (“go”) or *kāi* (“open,” HSC).

φίλος Most versions render it with *zhōngchén* 忠臣 (“loyal subject,” e.g. PK, JOHN, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, CNT, TCV, NCV). A few have *péngyǒu* (“friend,” BT, IG, HSC, CRV, CSB).

ἀντιλέγει Most Mandarin versions use the ø morpheme (MSV, PK, JOHN, UV, SYD, ZHU, BT, CNT, IG, HSC, HS, SB, CRV, DCT, RCUV, CSB). The only exception

---

76 Compare the four Catholic versions, CNT, IG, SB, and CPB, which have *shèfà* with the auxiliary *yào*. Similarly, LÜ has *jiù xiǎng fǎ zì yào shìfāng* 就想法子要释放 (“devise means to release”).

77 *Lǎo* is extremely difficult to translate into English. As an adverb, it has a wide range of meanings which include: “always,” “for a long time,” “often,” and “very.” As an adjective, it denotes “old,” “experienced,” “original,” and “overdone.” See *Contemporary Chinese Dictionary*, s.v.

78 See 3.2.5.2.e.a and 5.3.2.2.e.e, pp. 125-26, 278-79 above. For a treatment of the third class conditional sentences, see 5.4.4, pp. 287-91.
is LÜ, which has dingzhuàng ("contradict," "clash") and employs -zhe, which is preferable to the ø morpheme because it formally reflects the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form. However, the addition of the auxiliary verb yào in LÜ is not suitable for the translation of the indicative mood in Greek. Here, the two-morpheme aspect compound zài...-zhe may be used to reflect the more heavily marked present tense-form in Greek.

ἀκούσας (v. 13) Most versions closely reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist. Some use -le (IG, LÜ, CLB, NCV, CSB), while others use RVCs such as jiàn (MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, TCV, CRV, CPB, RCUV) or dào (HS). The SB has the ø morpheme (yǐng, "as soon as he heard"). The perfective aspect marker -le is preferable to RVCs because, as noted above, it is used more frequently in subordinate clauses.79

ἲγαγεν See 18:13.

ἐκάθισεν Three different morphemes are used in Mandarin versions: the ø morpheme (zuotáng 坐堂, "sit on a case [of a magistrate]," PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, IG, HSC, RCUV; zuò, "sit," MSV, BT, CNT, SB, CRV), and the aspect markers -le (CSB) and -zhe (CPB). While both -le and the ø morpheme are both considered good translations, the latter is preferable because it better reflects the less heavily marked aorist tense-form and the perfective aspect it signifies in Greek. Also, the ø morpheme is preferable because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

λεγόμενον See v. 17.

79 See the commentary on ἴκουσέν (19:8), p. 367 above.
It was the day of Preparation for the Passover, around noon. Pilate said to the Jews, “Here, look! Pay attention! The King of your nation!” They cried out, “Get rid of him! Get rid of him! Crucify him!” Pilate asked, “Are you sure you want me to nail your King to the cross?” The chief priests replied, “We have no king but the Caesar.” Then Pilate handed him over to them to be crucified.

λέγει (v. 14) See 18:4.

ἰδε See 18:21, 19:4, 5.

ἐκραύγασαν (v. 15) See 18:40.
The MSV has *Qù-le tā! Qù-le tā! 去了他！去了他！* ("Get rid of him! Get rid of him!") with -le, and a similar expression is found in the DCT, *Shā-le tā! Shā-le tā! 殺了他！殺了他！* ("Kill him! Kill him!"). Most Mandarin versions use RVCs such as *miè* (PK), *diào* (e.g. UV, CNT, LÜ, SB, NCV, CRV, CPB, RCUV, CSB), and *qu* (HSC). SYD and ZHU, on the other hand have *Shā! Shā! 殺！殺！* ("Kill! Kill!") with the φ morpheme. The perfective aspect morphemes -le and RVCs are preferable to the φ morpheme because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form. Here, the repetition of the two aorist imperatives in Greek indicates prominence. However, this prominence cannot be rendered by simply repeating the exact same verb form in Mandarin, since it does not convey such added emphasis (see the discussion on v. 6 above). Therefore, the solution is found by using an RVC for the first *ξποv* and using the two-morpheme aspect compound RVC-le for the second.

The form *σταυρώσω* is ambiguous: it could be either the future form or the aorist subjunctive. In Mandarin translation, however, it is not a major issue since auxiliary verbs are used to translate both forms in Greek. Most Mandarin versions seem to construe it as the aorist subjunctive. Most translate it by the verb *dīng* ("nail") with the φ morpheme, along with auxiliary verbs such as *kēyī/kē* (e.g. PK, UV, HSC, NCV, CRV), *yào* (SYD, SB, RCUV) or *gāi* (CPB). A few others, however, use the RVCs *shàng* (CSB) and *sī* (CNT) with auxiliaries, which are also acceptable translations of the perfective aspect of the aorist.

See 18:5.

See 19:7.
παρέδωκεν (v. 16a; cf. 18:30, 35; 19:30) The shift in tense-form from the present (ἐξομένει, v. 15) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. The aspect marker -le is preferable to the ὅ morpheme (e.g. PK, UV, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, HS, SB, LÜ, TCV, NCV, CSB) because it better reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form in Greek.

σταυρωθη (see also vv. 18, 20) Explicit passive constructions may be possible in Mandarin translation here, but it is not absolutely necessary, since the passive action is already suggested by the context. However, as Mullie argues, passive verbs in Mandarin “always necessarily denote the suffering of an action, the undergoing of a treatment performed by a causal being on the subject, and so they are passive verbs in the most restricted meaning of the word.” So, the use of passive contractions formed by particles such as shòu (qù shòu dīng shìzhījià de kūxìng 去受釘十字架的苦刑, “to endure the cruel penalty of being crucified,” CNT) or yí bèi (yī bèi dīng shìzhījià 以被釘十字架 (to be crucified,” MOR) may be appropriate here.

6.2.6. Jesus Crucified (John 19:16b-37) 耶穌被釘十字架

This pericope may be divided into five sub-sections (vv. 16b-22, 23-24, 25-27, 28-30, 31-37). Smaller discourse boundaries, as noted in 6.1.2, are marked by conjunctives, such as οὖν (vv. 23-24, 25-27, 31-37) or μετὰ τοῦτο (vv. 28-30). The aorist tense-forms are used to set the scene of each sub-section (vv. 16b, 23, 26, 28, 31, 36), propel the narrative forward (vv. 17-22, 24, 27, 29-30, 32-34), and conclude the entire pericope (v. 37). The imperfect tense-forms are used for three specific items: the introduction of

---

80 Mullie, Structural Principles, vol. 2, 44.
the chief priests’ suggestion to Pilate (v. 21), the depiction of John standing beside Jesus’ mother (v. 26), and the jar of sour wine at the scene of the crucifixion (v. 29).

The present tense-forms are used to draw special attention to key items: the description of Jesus on his way to be crucified (v. 17), the site of the crucifixion and its name in Hebrew (v. 17), the suggestion of the chief priests to Pilate (v. 21), the introduction of Jesus’ statements (vv. 26–28), the content of Jesus’ statement (v. 28), the parenthetic statement of the author of the narrative (v. 35), and the introduction of the Old Testament quotation (v. 37).

The perfect and pluperfect tense-forms are reserved to highlight several items of critical importance in the narrative: the introduction of the content of the inscription (v. 19), the languages in which the inscription was written (v. 20), Pilate’s response to the chief priests’ request to reword the inscription (v. 22), the depiction of Jesus’ mother and his beloved disciple at the scene of the crucifixion (v. 26), Jesus’ premonitions of what will soon transpire (v. 28; cf.18:4), Jesus’ final words on the cross (v. 30), the explanation behind why the soldiers did not break Jesus’ legs (v. 33), and the testimony of the witness to the events (v. 35). The pluperfect tense-form is used to describe the people who were present at the scene of the crucifixion (v. 25).

Παρέλαβον οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ βαστάζων αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Κρανίον Τόπον, ὃ λέγεται Ἑβραϊστὶ Γολgota, ὃπου αὐτὸν ἐσταύρωσαν, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἄλλους δύο ἐντεύθεν καὶ ἐντεύθεν, μέσον δὲ τῶν Ἰησοῦν. ἔγραψεν δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλάτος καὶ ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ. ἦν δὲ γεγραμμένον· Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. (19:16b–19)
所以，他們就把耶穌帶走。這時耶穌親自背著十字架，往外走到了一個叫作「髑髏之丘」的地方（希伯來語叫作「各各他」）。就在那個地方他們將他釘上十字架。另外在場的還有兩名：一左一右，耶穌在中間。彼拉多又寫下一行公告，安在十字架上。是這樣寫著的：「猶太王、拿撒勒人耶穌」。


Therefore, they took Jesus away. Jesus then carried the cross by himself, and went out to a place called the “Place of the Skull” (“Golgotha” in Hebrew). It was there where they crucified him. There were two other persons that were there, one on the left, the other on the right, and Jesus in the middle. Pilate then wrote a public notice to be put on the cross. It was written, “King of the Jews, Jesus of Nazareth.”

παρέλαβον (v. 16b; cf. 18:3, 12, 31; 19:1, 6, 23, 27, 30, 40) RVCs such as zōu (lǐng-zōu 領走, “led away,” CNT; dàì-zōu, “took away,” HS, TCV, CSB) and the perfective aspect marker -le (PK, UV, BT, CRV, RCUV) are preferable to the ο morpheme (e.g. JOHNM, SYD, WANG, ZHU, IG, HSC, SB, LÚ, NCV, CPB) because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form. The MSV, on the other hand, has lā-zhē qù 拉著去 (“dragging away”) with the imperfective aspect marker -zhe, which does not reflect the aspect of the Greek.

βαστάζων σῶτό (v. 17) Most Mandarin versions use the aspect marker -zhe (PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, CNT, IG, BT, HSC, HS, LÚ, SB, CLB, TCV, NCV,
CRV, CPB, RCUV, CSB), which is preferable to the \( \emptyset \) morpheme because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect of the present participle in Greek. The MSV, on the other hand, uses the perfective aspect marker -\( \text{le} \), which does not reflect the aspect of the Greek. Regarding \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\varsigma \), \( \varphi\iota\iota\varsigma \) ("personally") translates the dative pronoun in terms of "by himself" rather than "his own."\(^{81}\)

\( \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\lambda\theta\varepsilon \nu \) (cf. 18:4, 16; 19:4) The shift in tense-form from to the present (\( \beta\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\varsigma\omega\nu \)) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme (in this case, -\( \text{le} \)).

\( \lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\nu \), \( \lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon\alpha \) (see also v. 13) Most versions, as in v. 13, use \( \text{mingjiào} \) 名 (lit. "its name is called," e.g. MSV, UV, HSC, SB, CRV), \( \text{ming} \) 名 ("name," PK), \( \text{jiào} \) 呼 ("call," LÜ, BT, HS, CSB), or \( \text{jiàozuò} \) 做 (WANG) with the \( \emptyset \) morpheme. Here, none of the formal imperfective morphemes may be used. However, the disyllabic verbs \( \text{jiàozuò} \) and \( \text{mingjiào} \) are preferable to monosyllabic ones for both Greek verbs because they better reflect the more heavily marked present tense-form.

\( \Gamma\omicron\lambda\gamma\omicron\theta\alpha \) The Chinese transliteration of \( \Gamma\omicron\lambda\gamma\omicron\theta\alpha \) appears in the \textit{Jesus-Messiah Sūtra} (v. 201) as \( \text{Qiju} \), which, as Karlgren suggests, might have been pronounced in seventh century China as [k\text{\textbar}u kj\text{\textbar}t] or [kj\text{\textbar}t kj\text{\textbar}t], apparently a closer representation to its Syriac original \( \text{\textabar}\alpha\lambda\alpha \) \(^{82}\). Today it is standardized as \( \text{Gegetē} \) 各各他 in Protestant versions, and \( \text{Geērgēdā} \) 哥耳哥達 in Catholic versions.

\( \varepsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu \) (v. 18; see also v. 23) The RVC \( \text{shàng} \) (HS, CSB) is preferable to the \( \emptyset \) morpheme (MSV, PK, JOHN, WANG, ZHU, CNT, IG, LÜ, CRV, CLB, TCV, NCV,

---

\(^{81}\) Brown, \textit{Gospel}, 898–99. The expression "by himself" is also found in some English translations (e.g. NRSV, NLT). Keener, on the other hand, recognizes \( \alpha\upsilon\tau\varsigma \) as emphatic ("his own cross"). This interpretation is found in several English versions (e.g. NASB, NIV, ESV). See Keener, \textit{Commentary}, 1133.

\(^{82}\) Haneda, "Remarks on the \textit{Jesus-Messiah Sūtra}," 266–67; Karlgren, \textit{Analytic Dictionary}, s.v.
CPB, RCUV) and -le (e.g. HSC) because it morphologically reflects both the aspect and discourse function of the aorist tense-form. Also, the shift in tense-form from to the present (λέγεται, v. 17) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. For the discussions of other morphemes used to translate the aorist forms of ὁραύω, see vv. 6, 14.

εὐραψεν (v. 19) RVCs such as xià (“down”) and -le (xiē-le, UV, SYD, HSC, LÜ, SB, NCV, CRV, CPB, RCUV, CSB) are both preferable to the ὥ morpheme (xiē, “write,” PK) because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form in Greek. Here, although there is no shift in tense-form, the RVC provides a better contrast to the stative aspect that is signaled by the perfect tense-form (γεγραμμένον) in the same verse.

ἔθηκεν (see also v. 42) Most Mandarin versions use monosyllabic verbs with the ὥ morpheme to translate the aorist: ān (“place,” PK, UV, SYD, HSC, LÜ, CRV), guà (hang,” CPB, CSB), dīng (“nail,” RCUV), and fāng (put,” SB, NCV). All of these are preferable, not only because the ὥ morpheme is a suitable Mandarin rendering of the perfective aspect in Greek, but also because monosyllabic verbs correspond to the less heavily marked aorist tense-form and its discourse function as a backgrounding device. In addition, the ὥ morpheme is a better choice because there is no shift in tense-form of the Greek here to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

ἤν γεγραμμένον (see also v. 20) The aspect marker -zhe (CPB, DCT, CSB) is preferable to the ὥ morpheme (xiē, “write,” e.g. PK, UV, SYD, CNT, HSC, LÜ, SB, NCV, CRV) because it morphologically reflects the stative aspect of the perfect tense-form. Periphrastic constructions in Greek, as treated in chapter 5, may be translated by
The ṣ morpheme might be an option here, but the translator has to utilize a four-character set phrase because it corresponds to the discourse function of the perfect tense-form as a frontgrounding device.

在此，有眾多猶太人讀了這個公告。這是因爲耶穌被釘十字架的地方，離城很近。况且那是用希伯來文、拉丁文、還有希臘文標榜著的。那時猶太人的祭司長，就開口回答彼拉多說：「別書寫『猶太王』了。寫『這個人自己說過：我是猶太王。』」彼拉多答說：「我是秉筆直書，不能增損一字。」

83 See discussions of periphrasis in 5.3.2.
The perfective aspect of the aorist is translated by  onBindViewHolder("see," PK, TCV),  onBindViewHolder("read," UV, WANG, CRV, RCUV), and  onBindViewHolder("read," MSV, JOHN) with the ø morpheme. The aspect marker -le (BT, LÜ, HSC, HS, SB, NCV, CPB, CSB) and RVCs (e.g. dào, DCT) are both preferable to the ø morpheme because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the Greek. Also, the shift in tense-form from the perfect (γυρμενον, v. 19) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. On the other hand, auxiliary verbs such as  onBindViewHolder(CL) or  onBindViewHolder(CNT) are unnecessary additions for translating the Greek indicative mood into Mandarin. Similarly, SYD and ZHU add the verb  onBindViewHolder("") ("come"), which is also unnecessary.

The aorist passive is rendered by  onBindViewHolder("") ("crucify") with the ø morpheme (e.g. DV, GURY, UVW, PK, LÜ, CLB, NCV, RCUV). As mentioned in the comments on v. 16a,  onBindViewHolder("") may be translated by passive constructions in Mandarin formed by particles such as  onBindViewHolder(e.g.  onBindViewHolder("") ("suffer penalty," HS) and  onBindViewHolder. For example, Ortiz and other early Catholic missionaries use the passive construction to refer to Jesus’ crucifixion in the Chinese translation of the Apostle’s Creed:

I believe that he suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified. He died and was buried.

Elsewhere in  onBindViewHolder( "A Short Commentary on Key Passages of the Bible," 1705), Ortiz use the RVC  onBindViewHolder in the same passive construction,  onBindViewHolder
kūnàn. Bèi dīng shízìjià sī 自甘受苦難。彼釘十字架死。 ("He willingly endured suffering, being crucified to death").

The expression bèi dīng shízìjià is found in many wenli and Mandarin versions (e.g. SL-MOR, MOR, MAR, GO, GŪ, SJ, WV; JOHN, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, CNT, IG, BT, HSC, SB, TCV, CRV, RCUV, CSB). While the RVC sī may be used, the φ morpheme is preferable since there is no shift in tense-form here to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

γεγραμμένον (see also v. 19) As in v. 19, the periphrasis formed by the imperfect form of εἰμί and the perfect passive participle is better translated by the shí...de construction, using the stative aspect morpheme -zhe to render its stative aspect (PK). Several versions render the periphrasis using the shí...de construction (UV, SYD, CNT, HSC, LŪ, SB, NCV, CRV, CPB, RCUV, CSB) but with the φ morpheme.

The IDVC qīlái is preferable to the φ morpheme found in most Mandarin versions (MSV, PK, JOHN, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, CNT, IG, BT, HSC, SB, LŪ, TCV, CLB, NCV, CPB, RCUV, CSB) because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect of the imperfect tense-form in Greek. In order to convey remoteness grammaticalized by the perfect tense-form, nàshí ("then," "at that point") may be added (cf. 18:5, 15).

γράφει Most Mandarin versions (e.g. PK, UV, ZHU, IG, CNT, HS, SB, LŪ, TCV, NCV, CSB) use the monosyllabic verb xiē ("write") with the φ morpheme. The disyllabic verb shūxiē ("write") with the φ morpheme works better here, since expressions such as

---

86 Ortiz, Commentary, 19. The expression bèi dīng shízìjià is also noted by Varo (彼主釘十字架) and Mullie (彼在十字架上). See Varo, Arte, 127; Mullie, Structural Principles, vol. 2, 45.
xiē-qí (xiē-IDVC) or xiē-zhe, while grammatically acceptable, are not normally used in prohibitions.

eἶπεν (see also 18:8, 9, 21, 32) The shift in tense-form from the present (γράφε) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. The aorist also occurs in a quoted speech of the chief priests to Pilate.

ἀπεκριθη (v. 22) See 18:5.

δὲ γέγραφα, γέγραφα Many wenli versions have Shū zé shū yī 書則書矣 (lit. “written is written,” DV) or Shū zhē shū yī 書者書矣 (“what was written, it has been written,” WV) with the ω morpheme, both of which are acceptable translations of the verb phrase. Similarly, the CNT has Wō shì zhèyàng xiè de jiù zhèyàng le 我是這樣寫的就這樣了 (“this is the way I wrote it and that’s it”). Basset, on the other hand, uses the temporal deixis yī (“already”) to convey completion, Yú suǒ yè, yī shū yī 余所業、已書矣 (“what I have written, I have already written,” SL-MOR). This addition of temporal adverbs is followed in many versions: for example, MOR and MAR use céng (“ever”) in the expression Wō céng suǒ xiè jiù xiè zhī 我曾所寫就寫之 (“what I have once written, I wrote it”). Other expressions include Wō yī shū zhī, zhē shū zhī yī 我已書之。則書之矣, GO), Wú zhī suǒ shū, zhē yī shū zhī yī 吾之所書、則己書之矣 (GŪ), Wō suǒ shū zhē, yī shū zhī yī 我所書者、已書之矣 (BCV, SI, UVW, UVB), shū zhē yī shū 書者己書 (GURY), and Wō suǒ xiè de, wō yǐjīng xiè-le (NCV, CSB), all of which denote the idea “what I have once written, I have already written it.”

87 Unlike the cases in vv. 6, 15 where repetition of exact verb forms are aorist imperatives, here are two perfect tense-forms with in the indicative mood. The presence of the relative pronoun ω also indicates that this is not a simple sentence. Therefore, the translation issues raised earlier do not apply here.
The majority of Mandarin versions, however, use the perfective morpheme -le and the RVC shàng, for example, Wō xié-le, jiù xié le (“[once] I wrote it, I write it,” HSC, SB, DCT, RCUV).88 Most of these versions also use a temporal adverb, for example, Wō suǒ xié-le de, wō yǐjīng xié shàng le (“what I wrote, I already finished writing it,” LÜ, CRV) and Wō suǒ xié de, wō yǐjīng xié-shàng le (“what I wrote, I already wrote it,” PK, UV).

The stative aspect realized by the two perfect forms is best translated by two four-character set phrases with the 0 morpheme. The translation provided here, Wō shì bìng-bì-zhí-shū, bìngèng zēng-sūn-yī-zī, closely reflects the aspect and the discourse function of the perfect forms as frontgrounding devices, highlighting that Pilate’s written words stand firm.

The majority of Mandarin versions, however, use the perfective morpheme -le and the RVC shàng, for example, Wō xié-le, jiù xié le (“[once] I wrote it, I write it,” HSC, SB, DCT, RCUV). Most of these versions also use a temporal adverb, for example, Wō suǒ xié-le de, wō yǐjīng xié shàng le (“what I wrote, I already finished writing it,” LÜ, CRV) and Wō suǒ xié de, wō yǐjīng xié-shàng le (“what I wrote, I already wrote it,” PK, UV). The stative aspect realized by the two perfect forms is best translated by two four-character set phrases with the 0 morpheme. The translation provided here, Wō shì bìng-bì-zhí-shū, bìngèng zēng-sūn-yī-zī, closely reflects the aspect and the discourse function of the perfect forms as frontgrounding devices, highlighting that Pilate’s written words stand firm.

88 Compare Newman and Nida’s suggestions: “what I have written will remain just that way” or “... will remain just as I have written it.” Newman and Nida, *Handbook*, 586. It is clear that Newman and Nida follow the interpretation that the first perfect is aoristic whereas the second one is durative or continuative. See, for example, Robertson, *Grammar*, 895; BDF, §342; Brown, *Gospel*, 586.

While the soldiers crucified Jesus, they took his clothes and divided them into four parts, one for each person, including his tunic. This tunic had no seams, which was woven in one piece from top to bottom. So they discussed among themselves, saying “Let us not tear it apart; let us draw lots and see who will get it.” This was to fulfill what the Bible (says), “They divided my clothes, and for my tunic they drew lots.” So that is what these soldiers did.

εἰσπαύρωσαν (v. 23; see also v. 18) In this sub-section (vv. 23–24), 10 aorist tense-forms were used to describe what the soldiers did to Jesus’ clothes. For the first aorist, the RVC shàng or -le (e.g. MSV) is preferable to the ø morpheme because the shift in tense-form from the perfect (γέγραψα, v. 22) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective morpheme. The remaining aorists used in this sub-section will be treated individually.

ἐλαβον (cf. 18:3, 12, 31; 19:1, 6, 16b, 27, 30, 40) The ø morpheme (e.g. UV, WANG, BT, HSC, TCV, CRV, RCUV) is preferable to -le (e.g. IG, SB, CSB) because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. Several Mandarin versions do not translate this verb (MSV, PK, JOHNM, ZHU, CLB, CPB, DCT).
For the same reason for ἐλάβον provided above, the ϑ morpheme (MSV, UV, BT, HSC, HS, LÜ, TCV, CRV, RCUV) is preferable to -le (CNT) and the RVC chéng ("finish," PK, SYD, ZHU, IG, SB, NCV, CPB, CSB).

Again, the ϑ morpheme which is used in most Mandarin versions (e.g. MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, ZHU, BT, IG, CNT, SB, LÜ, TCV, CLB, RCUV, CSB) is preferable for the same reason for ἐλάβον provided above.

RVCs such as kāi ("split open," PK, UV, SYD, WANG, SYD, ZHU, BT, HSC, SB, TCV, NCV, CRV, RCUV, CSB) or liè ("split," MSV and LÜ) work best here for the translation of the perfective aspect signaled by the aorist subjunctive. The aspect marker -le (CPB) is also a good option. Since the aorist is used here in a direct quotation, a formally expressed perfective morpheme is preferable to the ϑ morpheme (fēngè 分割, "divide," HS).

The aorist subjunctive is translated by jiū (DV, CSV, TRNT, RAGUET), niān/zhuājiū (MSV, PK, UV, SYD, CRV, HSC, LÜ, CPB, CNT), chōuqīān (NCV, RCUV, CSB), or zhīsāi (SB) with the ϑ morpheme, all of which denote "cast lots" and reflect the perfective aspect of the Greek. The ϑ morpheme is used here also because there is no shift in tense-form. Some versions add the auxiliary verbs ràng (CSB) or lāi (NCV) to express volition, which are also preferable here.

See 18:9.

The RVC diào and the aspect marker -le (PK, UV, WANG, BT, CNT, IG, HSC, SB, LÜ, CLB, TCV, NCV, CRV, CPB, DCT, RCUV, CSB) are both preferable to the ϑ morpheme (MSV, JOHNM, SYD, ZHU, HS) because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect realized by the aorist tense-form. The fact that the aorist is
used in an Old Testament quotation also justifies the use of a formally expressed
perfective aspect morpheme.

ἔβαλον κλῆρον All Chinese versions use the same term for λόγος μεν here, most of
which have the ὅ morpheme for the perfective aspect of the aorist (e.g. DV, PK, UV,
MSV, SYD, CNT, LÜ, SB, CRV, NCV, CPB, RCUV, CSB). The ὅ morpheme is
preferable to -le (HSC) because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a
formally expressed aspect morpheme. The ὅ morpheme also provides textual cohesion to
the previous sentence in which the same verb form, chōuqiān with the ὅ morpheme, is
used to translate λόγος μεν.

ἐποίησαν (cf. 18:35; 19:7, 23) The ὅ morpheme (PK, JOHN M, ZHU, CNT, SB, LÜ,
CLB, NCV) is preferable to -le (UV, WANG, IG, BT, HSC, TCV, RCUV, CSB) because
there is no shift in tense-form here to justify the use of a formally expressed aspect
morpheme. Note that, because of its position at the end of the sentence, le is used here as
a modal particle as opposed to the aspect marker -le.

Εἰστήκεισαν δὲ παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἢ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἢ ἀδελφὴ τῆς
μητρός αὐτοῦ, Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή. Ἰησοῦς οὖν ἴδων
τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὸν μαθητὴν παρεστῶτα ὁ ἤγαπα, λέγει τῇ μητρί· γύναι, ἰδε ὁ
υἱός σου, εἶτα λέγει τῷ μαθητῇ· ἱδε ἡ μήτηρ σου. καὶ ἀπ’ ἐκείνης τῆς ὀρας ἔλαβεν
αὐτὴν ὁ μαθητὴς εἰς τὰ ἴδια. (19:25–27)

在耶稣的十字架旁边站著的，有他的母親及他母親的姊妹，還有高羅巴的妻子
馬利亞，和抹大拉的馬利亞。當耶穌看到母親和他所鍾愛著的那位門徒在一處站
著，就告訴母親說：「婦人，您看好！這位是您的兒子。」接著又告訴這門徒
說：「你看好！這位是你的母親。」從此之後，那位門徒就把她接回了他自己的家。

再耶穌的十字架旁邊站著，有他的母親、他母親的姊妹，並有迦略氏迦利利的馬利亞，以及馬利雅的夫子馬達拉。當耶穌看到母親和他所愛的門徒站在那裡，他對母親說，「婦人，看哪！這裡是你的兒子。」這時他對門徒說，「看哪！這裡是你的母親。」從那以後，這名門徒就領著他的母親回家。
character set phrase in order to reflect the heavily marked perfect tense-form in Greek. This verb is not translated in the CNT and CPB.

**ἡγάπα**  Most Mandarin versions render this imperfect tense-form by ἀι ("love," PK, MSV, JOHN, UV, BT, HSC, SB, LÜ, CLB, NCV, CRV, RCUV, CSB), zhōng'ai ("love," HS, TCV), tè ài 特愛 (lit. "especially love," CNT), zuì qīn'ài 最親愛 ("love the most," SYD), or ài zhòng 愛重 (lit. "deeply love," ZHU) with the ὁ morpheme. However, -zhe is preferable to the ὁ morpheme because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect that is signaled by the Greek. In order to establish remoteness in Mandarin, nà wèi ("that one") may be added here.


ἐλαβεν (v. 27; cf. 18:3, 12, 31; 19:1, 6, 16b, 23, 30, 40)  RVCs (e.g. xià, HSC) and the aspect marker -le are both preferable to the ὁ morpheme used in most Mandarin versions (PK, JOHN, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, IG, HS, SB, LÜ, CLB, TCV, CRV, NCV, CPB, DCT, RCUV, CSB) because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist. On the other hand, SYD uses -zhe (dài-zhe, "bringing"), which is not preferable because it does not reflect the aspect of the Greek. The shift in tense-form from the present (λέγει) to aorist also justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

Μετὰ τοῦτο ἐίδως ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται, ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή, λέγει· διψῶ. σκεύος ἐκεῖτο δἐξος μεστὸν· οπόγγον ὁὐν μεστὸν τοῦ δἐξως ύσσωτερ περιθέντες προσήνεγκαν αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι. ὅτε οὖν ἔλαβεν τὸ δἐξος [ὁ]
之後，耶穌洞察一切都已大功告成，為了應驗經上所說，就開口說：「我乾渴。」在那裏有人放著一個盛滿了酸酒罈子；他們就把沾滿酸酒的海綿綁在牛膝草上，往他的嘴裏送。當耶穌嚐了那酸酒，就說：「大功告成！」然後低下頭，交出靈魂。


Ránhòu dǐxià-le tóu, jiāo-chū línhún.

After this, Jesus, knowing everything had already been accomplished, in order to fulfill what the Scripture says, said, “I am thirsty.” A jar full of sour wine was left standing there; so they put a sponge dipped with sour wine on a branch of hyssop, and held it to his mouth. As Jesus tasted that sour wine, he said, “It is accomplished!” and then bowed his head and gave up his spirit.

eἰδῶς (v. 28; see also 18:4) The stative aspect of the perfect participle is translated by the ὁ morpheme in most Mandarin versions (e.g. PK, UV, CNT, HSC, LÜ, SB, CRV, CPB, CSB). However, rather than the disyllabic verb zhídào (“know”), eἰδῶς is best translated by a four-character set phrase, dōng-chá-yī-qì (“see all clearly”), because it marks the frontgrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse, highlighting Jesus' knowledge that his earthly mission is finally accomplished.


τέτελεσταῖ (see also v. 30) Many Mandarin versions (e.g. MSV, PK, UV, SYD, LÜ, CNT, HSC, SB, NCV, CPB, RCUV) use the perfective aspect marker -le, though there are a few exceptions that use the ὄ morpheme (e.g. CRV, DCT). It is best here, and also in v. 30, to translate τετελεσταί by the four-character set phrase 大公告成 (“all is accomplished”) with the ὄ morpheme, because it reflects the discourse function of the perfective tense-form in Greek as the frontgrounding device.

λέγετι (see also vv. 26–27) The ὄ morpheme is preferable to IDVCs because the same exact verb form is used in v. 27 to introduce a direct quotation of Jesus. More heavily marked disyllabic verbs such as 开口 (“speak,” lit. “open one’s mouth”) or 說道 (MSV; cf. 19:37) are preferable to the less heavily marked monosyllabic verb 說 (“say”) used in most Mandarin versions (e.g. PK, JOHN, UV, SYD, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, SB, LÜ, TCV, NCV, CPB, RCUV, CSB).

dιψάω The ὄ morpheme is the preferable choice for the present tense-form (e.g. MSV, PK, UV, CNT, HSC, LÜ, SB, CRV, RCUV, CSB). However, the disyllabic verb 喝 is preferable to monosyllabic verbs such as 喔 because it reflects the more heavily marked present tense-form in Greek.

ἐλάβετο (v. 30; cf. 18:3, 12, 31; 19:1, 6, 16b, 23, 27, 40) Most Mandarin versions translate ἐλάβετο by verbs such as 吃 (“eat,” MSV), 喝/喝 (“taste,” PK, UV, SYD, HS, SB, NCV, CPB, RCUV, CSB), 收 (“receive,” LÜ, CRV), 飲 (lit. “drink,” CNT), or 喊 (lit. “crack,” HSC) with the perfective -le, which are all good translations of the aorist. The DCT, however, has 喝過-le with the heavily marked two-morpheme aspect compound -過-le, which is not preferable because it does not reflect the discourse function of the aorist as the backgrounding device.
See 18:11, 25, 31–33, 37.

tetēlēstai (see also v. 28.) The same word used in v. 28 is now expressed as an exclamation of Jesus’ last word on the cross. Basset has Fu chéng yī “Father, it is accomplished!” SL-MOR) and most Chinese versions translate it with similar expressions, using either the modal particle yí or le: Chéng le! 成了！(PK, JOHNM, UV, BT, CLB, TCV, NCV, CRV, DCT, RCUV, CSB), Chéng yí 成矣 (BCV, GURY, BB, JOHN, SJ, UV, UVW, UVB, UVE, WV), Wànquán le! 完全了！(ZHU), (Dōu)wánchéng le! (都)完成了！(HS, LÚ, CNT, SB, CPB), Wán le 完了 (MSV, IG, HSC),^89 Bi yí 華矣 (DV, GO), and Yī bi le 已畢了 (MOR, MAR, GÙ). All of these versions denote the idea that “It is done!” or “It is finished!” Interestingly, the four-character set phrase dà-gōng-gào-chéng, which is the most fitting translation of tetēlēstai in Mandarin, is used as the subject heading of this passage in the 1998 revised CLB.

κλίνας The shift in tense-form from to the perfect (tetēlēstai) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme (in this case, -le).

parēdokēv (cf. 18:30, 35; 19:16a) Some versions use the aspect marker -le (MSV, CNT, HSC, SB, NCV, CPB, RCUV) or RVCs such as qì (“abandon,” HS), qù (“depart,” MOR, MAR), or chū (“out,” IG, CSB),^90 however, the majority of Chinese versions use the ø morpheme (e.g. SL-MOR, GÙ, GO, BCV, DV, GURY, BB, SJ, PK, JOHN, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, WV, CLB, CRV). RVCs and -le are the most suitable because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect realized by the aorist tense-form.

---

^89 The MSV has Shiqìng wàn le 事情完了 (“Things are done”).

^90 The CSB has both the RVC and perfective -le.
Since it was the day of Preparation, the Jews did not want the body still hanging on the cross on the Sabbath; also Sabbath is an important holiday. The Jews asked Pilate to have their legs broken and their body taken away. So the soldiers came and broke the legs of the first person who had been crucified with him, and then the other. But as they came...
close to Jesus, they found that he was already dead, and so they did not break his legs.

Instead, one soldier pricked his side with a spear, and immediately blood and water came out.

μείνῃ (v. 31)  The ø morpheme, which is used in most Mandarin versions (e.g. JOHNM, UV, ZHU, BT, CNT, IG, SB, LÜ, TCV, NCV, CRV, CSB) is preferable here because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

ὁρώτησαν  See 18:19.

κατεαγόσιν (cf. v. 36)  Most versions use RVCs such as ㄆuàn ("break," MSV, UV, SYD, CNT, LÜ, SB, CRV, NCV, CPB, RCUV, CSB) or ㄓé 习近 ("break," HSC), which closely reflect the perfective aspect that is signaled by the aorist subjunctive in Greek. Here, RVCs are stylistically preferable to the ø morpheme, although there is no shift in tense-form. The ㄅā...ㄍē construction used in some versions (e.g. CSB) conveys the idea that Pilate had ordered someone to complete these actions. A few versions add verb phrases such as ㄐiào ㄇㄣ (MSV, PK, JOHNM, LÜ, CRV) or ㄆài ㄇㄣ (SYD, CNT, CPB), both of which express the same idea, while other versions (e.g. PK, UV, SB, NCV) do not use such constructions.

ἀρθοῦσιν  Some Mandarin versions use RVCs such as ㄓou ("away," IG, HS, CLB, TCV, CPB, RCUV), while the majority of others (e.g. MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, LÜ, SB, CRV, NCV) use the ø morpheme. The ø morpheme is preferable here because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed aspect morpheme. The conjunctive ㄓi繁 ("so that") expresses the sense of projection of the subjunctive mood in Greek. This verb is not translated in the CNT.
The perfective aspect of the aorist passive participle is most commonly translated by the ø morpheme (MSV, PK, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, IG, HSC, HS, SB, LÜ, TCV, CRV, NCV, RCUV, CSB). Here, the passive construction (e.g. formed by the particle bèì) is optional and is used in only a few Mandarin versions (e.g. CNT, CPB, DCT, CSB). Such an addition sounds unnatural in Mandarin and, therefore, it is not recommended here.

The monosyllabic verb làì (“come,” UV, WANG, CRV, CSB) with the ø morpheme is preferable to -le (CNT, IG, LÜ, NCV, CPB) because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed aspect morpheme.

The aspect marker -le (PK, CPB, ZHU) and RVCs such as dào (“arrive,” e.g. UV, WANG, BT, CNT, LÜ, SB, CLB, CSB) and jìn (near,” TCV) are preferable to the ø morpheme (e.g. MSV) because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form. Stylistically, -le is preferable to other formally expressed perfective morphemes because it accounts for more frequent use in subordinate clauses in Mandarin.91

The ø morpheme is preferable because there is no shift in tense-form here to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

Almost all Mandarin versions have sī-le with the perfective -le (MSV, PK, UV, CNT, IG, HSC, LÜ, SB, NCV, CRV, DCT, RCUV, CSB), the exception being the CPB, which uses the ø morpheme. The stative aspect, along with its frontgrounding function in discourse realized in the perfect participle, is best rendered here by the

---

91 See 3.2.5.2.c.a, pp. 125–26 above.
heavily marked four-character set phrase *ming-duàn-qí-jué* (lit. "life ends and spirit departs") with the ø morpheme.

ενυξέν (v. 34; cf. ἐξεκέντησαν in v. 37) The aspect marker -le (HS) and RVCs such as *pô* ("penetrate," PK), *chuān* ("through," DCT), *kāi* ("open," HSC), and *rù* ✗ ("enter," CPB, CSB) are preferable to the ø morpheme (MSV, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, LÜ, TCV, CLB, CRV, NCV, RCUV) because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist. Conversely, the ø morpheme is preferable to RVCs and -le because there is no shift in tense-form here to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. The RVC *rù* is an ideal choice here because it establishes a better connection to the related term *ἐξεκέντησαν* in v. 37 where an RVC is also used to render the aorist.

Three Catholic versions use the two-morpheme aspect compound RVC-*le*, *ci-tōu-le* (CNT, SB) and *ci-kāi-le* (IG). This is not preferable because it does not reflect the less heavily marked aorist tense-form in Greek.

ἐξῆλθεν (see also 18:1) The ø morpheme (e.g. MSV, PK, UV, ZHU, BT, CNT, LÜ, TCV, CRV, RCUV) is preferable to -le (CPB, CSB) because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed aspect morpheme.

καὶ ὁ ἐωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκεν, καὶ ἀληθινὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία, καὶ ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθὴ λέγει, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς πιστεύσητε. ἔγενετο γὰρ ταῦτα ἵνα ἢ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ ὁποῖον οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ. καὶ πάλιν ἐτέρα γραφὴ λέγει· ὃψονται εἰς δὲν ἐξεκέντησαν. (19:35–37)

(That person who saw it in his own eyes has testified, his testimony is true; and he thoroughly understands that he is telling the truth.) These things happened, so that the Scripture may be fulfilled: “His bones will not be broken.” And elsewhere it says: “They will gaze upon the person they pierced.”

ēpavoid (v. 35) Most Mandarin versions use kàn-jìàn (“see,” e.g. MSV, PK, UV, IG, HSC, LÜ, SB, NCV, CRV, RCUV, CSB) with the RVC jìàn for the Greek perfect tense-form. A few others use four-character set phrases such as qǐnyǎn kàn-jìàn 親眼看見 (“see with one's own eyes,” CPB) or qǐnyǎn jiànzhào (“see with one's own eyes,” CNT) with the RVCS jiàn and zháo. However, the four-character set phrase, qǐn-yǎn-mù-dú (“see with one's own eyes”) works better here not only because it is more heavily marked than the other two, but also because the ø morpheme closely reflects the stative aspect of the original.

μμαρτύρηκεν The perfect form is translated most frequently by the verb phrase zuò (jiàn)zhèng 作(見)証 (“witness,” e.g. MSV, PK, UV, HSC, SB, CRV, CPB),

92 The MSV and the CPB uses zuò 作 instead of zuò 作.
zeug (SB), or zhèngmíng 證明 (“prove,” CNT) with the ə morpheme. A few others use the perfective aspect marker -le (IG, LÜ, RCUV, CSB). The NCV adds the temporal deixis yǐjīng (“already”), apparently to convey past-time reference. Like the ἔωρσκός, μεμφέτηρηκεν is best translated by a four-character set phrase with the ə morpheme because it marks frontgrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse.

οἶδεν  See 18:21.

λέγει  See 18:4.

πιστεύσετε  Most Mandarin versions render volition expressed by the aorist subjunctive by adding auxiliary verbs such as kěyǐ (PK, UV, LÜ), yào (CSB), zúyǐ (CNT), jiào (SB), or hào/hāoshí/hàoràng (IG, NCV, RCUV) to the verb xiāngxīnxīn 相信/信 (“believe”) with the ə morpheme. RVCs such as zhào are preferable to the ə morpheme because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist. Also, the shift in tense-form from the present (λέγει) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

ἔγένετο (v. 36)  The aspect marker -le (e.g. PK, UV, SYD, IG) is preferable to the ə morpheme (e.g. MSV, LÜ, SB, NCV, CRV, CSB), because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist. This verb is not translated in the CNT.

συντριβήσεται (cf. v. 31)  Some versions use auxiliary verbs such as huì (PK, JOHM, LÜ, CPB), yào (CNT, IG, HSC), ké (UV, NCV, CRV, RCUV), and dē (ZH) to express the expectation of the future form, while a few others do not make such additions (e.g. MSV, CSB). The passive construction formed by the particle bèi is appropriate here (see v. 16a).
The disyllabic verb *shuōdào* ("say") is preferable here to monosyllabic verbs such as *shuō* ("say," MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, ZHU, BT, IG, HSC, LŪ, SB, TCV, NCV, CRV, DCT) or *yún* ("say," HS) found in most Mandarin versions because it is often used to introduce a direct quotation from a written text. Several other versions (CNT, CLB, CPB, RCUV) do not translate *lèyī*.

A second future form is found here in the same Old Testament quotation and is expressed by similar auxiliary verbs in most Mandarin versions, for example *biyào* (PK), *bi* (LŪ), *yào* (UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, SB, TCV, CLB, NCV, CRV, RCUV), or *néng* (CNT). Another common auxiliary, *jiāng*, is also used, especially in newer versions (e.g. CPB, CSB). The MSV and JOHNM use both auxiliary verbs, *jiāng* and *yào*, which is also acceptable. IG, on the other hand, has *zhǎnwàng* ("look forward") without an auxiliary verb or aspect morpheme.

The monosyllabic verb *ci* ("stab") with the RVC *tōu* ("through," all Catholic Mandarin versions: IG, CNT, HSC, SB, CPB) is preferable to *zhā* ("pierce," e.g. PK, UV, WANG, BT, HS, LŪ, CRV, RCUV), *ci* ("stab," e.g. JOHNM, CLB, NCV), or *chuō* ("jab," MSV, ZHU) with the Ø morpheme.

RVCs are preferable also because the aorist is used in an Old Testament quotation. The heavily marked two-morpheme aspect compound RVC-*le* (*ci-*le, TCV) is not preferable because it indicates foregrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse.

### 6.2.7. Jesus Buried (John 19:38–42) 耶穌被葬

In this final pericope, the aorist tense-forms are used to set the scene (v. 38), propel the narrative forward (vv. 39–41), and conclude the entire Passion narrative of John (v. 93).

---

93 See, for example, *Contemporary Chinese Dictionary, s.v.*
The present tense-forms are used to draw special attention to the preparation of Jesus’ burial by Nicodemus according to Jewish custom (v. 39–40), whereas the perfect tense-forms are reserved to highlight two items: Joseph of Arimathea, who was a secret disciple of Jesus (v. 38), and the description of the new tomb (v. 41).

After this, a man named Joseph of Arimathea asked Pilate to remove the body of Jesus for burial. This man was a disciple of Jesus, but he kept it secret for fear of the Jews. Pilate permitted. So he came and took his body away.

After this, a man named Joseph of Arimathea asked Pilate to remove the body of Jesus for burial. This man was a disciple of Jesus, but he kept it secret for fear of the Jews. Pilate permitted. So he came and took his body away.

See 18:19.

Joseph of Arimathea is mentioned in the Nestorian document the *Lord of the Universe’s Discourse on Almsgiving* (vv. 115–117) as *Yaōxi* 姚覡, which might have been pronounced [jāu ziœ] in early seventh century China, a close phonetic representation of the Syriac ܐܐ. At least a dozen different transliterations appear in Chinese versions: *Limādā zhī Ruōsè* 利馬達之若瑟 (SL–MOR), *Limādā zhī Ruōsè* 利馬達之若瑟 (SL–MOR),

---

Yālimādiyā zī Ruòsèfū 亚利马弟亚之若瑟弗 (MOR, MAR), and Ālīr Māfēiyà rén, Yīwòsīfū 阿輝若瑟斐人 (GURY), Yālimātài rén, míng jiào Yuēsè 亚利玛太人、名叫约瑟 (PK, JOHNM), 95 and the most common, Yālimātài rén Yuēsè 亚利玛太人约瑟 (e.g. DV, UV, WANG, BT, CRV). 96 The Catholic versions are the most diverse: Yēlimādi de Ruòsè 耶利玛弟第若瑟 (CNT), Yālimādà rén Ruòsè 亚利玛大若瑟 (WV), Yālimādiyà rén Ruòsè 亚利玛弟亚人若瑟 (HSC), Yālimātēyà rén Ruòsè 阿黎玛特雅人若瑟 (SB), and Yālimātài rén Ruòsè 亚利玛太人若瑟 (CPB).

κεκρυμμένος Here is an example of the participle used as a modifier of a substantive. 97 Most Mandarin versions use expressions such as ànàn de zuò 暗暗的作 (PK, UV, IG, NCV, CRV, CSB), ànzhōng zuò 暗中作 (HSC), or yǐnmì de 隱密地 (LÜ) with the φ morpheme, all of which denote “follow secretly.” SB, on the other hand, uses the perfective -le, which does not reflect the stative aspect of the Greek. The stative aspect conveyed by the perfect participle may be better reflected by the four-character set phrase bi-kòu-cáng-shé (“keep one’s mouth shut”) with the φ morpheme.

ἀπῆ (cf. v. 31) The shift in tense-form from the perfect (κεκρυμμένος) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

ἐπιτέτρεψεν The φ morpheme (e.g. PK, UV, WANG, BT, HSC, SB) is preferable to -le (MSV, ZHU, CNT, IG, LÜ, NCV, CRV, CSB) because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed aspect morpheme.

Ἣλθεν See v. 32.

95 JOHNM has 亚利马大 instead of 亚利玛太.
96 The DV omits rén.
97 See the discussion of example (23) in chapter 5, pp. 267–68.
RVCs such as zòu ("leave," e.g. CPB), qù ("go," PK, UV, SYD, LÜ, NCV, CSB), or hui ("return," IG) are preferable to the ō morpheme because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form. Despite the fact that there is no shift in tense-form, RVCs are stylistically preferable to the ō morpheme and establishes a better connection to ἐρή where the same RVC is used to render the aorist tense-form in Greek.

Nicodemus, who had visited Jesus before, also came. He was bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, weighing about a hundred pounds (or about 30 kilograms). They took Jesus' body and wrapped it with spices on the linen, according to the burial custom of the Jews.
Despite the fact that there is no shift in tense-form, the perfective aspect marker -guò (MSV, CNT) is preferable to the φ morpheme (HS, CLB, CRV) not only because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form in Greek, but also because it is stylistically better here. Most Mandarin versions use the verb phrase lái jiàn 来见 (“come to visit,” PK, JOHNM, WANG, BT, IG, HSC, LÜ, SB, TCV, NCV, CSB) or qù jiàn 去见 (“go to visit,” UV, SYD, ZHU, CPB, RCUV) with the φ morpheme, which is not preferable since a single participle in Greek does not warrant such translation.

The aspect marker -zhe (PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, IG, HSC, HS, LÜ, SB, CLB, CRV, NCV, RCUV, CSB) is preferable to -le (MSV, TCV, CPB, DCT) because it reflects the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form in Greek.

(see also v. 33) As in v. 23, the aspect marker -le (IG, SB, LÜ, CRV, NCV, CPB, CSB) is preferable to the φ morpheme (SYD, ZHU, CNT) because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist. Also, the shift in tense-form from the present (φéρον) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

(see 18:12) Despite the fact that there is no shift in tense-form, RVCs such as hào (“good,” MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, ZHU, BT, IG, LÜ, SB, TCV, NCV, CRV, CPB, DCT, RCUV) and qìlái (“up,” HSC, CNT, CSB) are preferable to the φ morpheme (HS) because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form in Greek. RVCs also establish a possible connection to the same exact verb form used in the first pericope (18:1–14) where it is mentioned that the arresting party “tied up” (kūn-RVC) Jesus and brought him before Annas.
The infinitive functions as a modifier of the substantive (ἐνθος; see also 5.3.1.5). Most Mandarin versions recognize this use of the infinitive: ἀν(/bin)zàng de guīfǔ 安(放)葬的规矩 (“burial custom,” MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, SYD, WANG, BT, TCV, CRV), binzàng (de) xi/(fēng)sū 殡葬的风俗 (“burial custom,” IG, HSC, SB, CLB, CSB), rùliàn de fāngfǎ 入殓的方法 (“burial method,” HS), zànglí de guǐli 葬礼的规矩 (“funeral rite,” NCV), sāngzàng de guīfǔ/xísū 丧葬的规矩/习俗 (“burial custom,” RCUV, CPB), or binlián lí 殡殓礼 (“burial rite,” CNT). The only exception is LÜ, which not only renders the present infinitive as a modifier of the substantive, but also adds the verb bàn (“handle”; zhào Yǔtàiérén yǔbèi ānzàng de guīfǔ bàn 照猶太人豫備安葬的規矩辦 (lit. “handle [the body] according to the Jewish custom of preparation for burial”). This is not preferable because of the apparent tautology and awkward syntax in Mandarin.

98 See, for example, Robertson, Grammar, 1075–76; Brooks and Winbery, Syntax, 128–29; Porter, Idioms, 198–99.

99 SB has máizàng de xísū 埋葬的習俗 (“burial custom”). For a comprehensive survey of Chinese terms relating to death and burial, see Watters, Essays, 245–327.
At the place where Jesus was crucified, there was a garden. In it there was a new tomb, where no one had ever been laid. Because it was the Jewish day of Preparation, and the tomb was nearby, they laid Jesus there.

εὐσταυρώθη (v. 41; see also v. 20) The same word also occurs in v. 20, but the Mandarin versions provide different translations. The PK uses the ο morpheme in v. 20, while here it uses the RVC si instead. Similarly, the UV uses the passive construction formed by the particle bèi in v. 20, but here it simply has dīng shízi jià. Also, this verb is left untranslated in WV and HS. The same phrase used to translate εὐσταυρώθη, bèi dīng shízi jià, should also be used here. In addition, there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed aspect morpheme.

Ἡ υπερήμενος The periphrastic construction may be translated by the four-character set phrase ān-zàng-rù-liàn (lit. “prepare the body and place it in the coffin”) with the ο morpheme expressed in the shi...de construction. The four-character set phrase reflects the discourse function of the perfect tense-form as a frontgrounding device.

ἐθηκαν See v. 19.

6.3. Conclusion

Table 6.2 is a compilation of all Mandarin aspect morphemes used in the five representative Mandarin versions (Protestant and Catholic, plus FOLEY, the author’s own translation provided in this chapter) to translate the Greek verb forms in John 18–19. All these sample New Testament versions (except LU) are prepared by committees. LU is chosen here on the basis of its literal approach to translating.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PERFECTIVE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>IMPERFECTIVE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>STATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LÜ</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO LEY</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2. Summary of Greek tense-forms with their corresponding aspect morphemes used in John 18–19 in the representative Mandarin versions
The top number refers to the total occurrences of the Mandarin aspect morpheme employed to translate the given Greek tense-form. The bottom percentage refers to the total occurrences of the given morpheme divided by the total occurrences of that Greek tense-form. This table allows for an accurate measurement of these five versions in translating aspect in Greek into Mandarin. Take for example the aorist tense-form in Greek, which the current dissertation argues may be translated into Mandarin by the ø morpheme or by any of the perfective aspect morphemes (i.e. -le, -guò, RVCs, verb reduplication, two-morpheme aspect compounds).102 The first column of the first row indicates that the ø morpheme (in monosyllabic verbs) was used a total of 82 times, or 44% of the time, to translate the aorist tense-form in PK.

At first glance, it would appear that, with the exception of the perfect tense-form, the numbers are relatively high: for the aorist, PK (91.5%), UV (94.5%), SB (100%), LÚ (96.5%), NCV (95%); for the present, PK (92.5%), UV (93%), SB (90.5%), LÚ (93%), NCV (90%); for the imperfect PK (83%), UV (91%), SB (83%), LÚ (91%), NCV (100%); for the perfect, PK (76%), UV (73%), SB (65%), LÚ (55%), NCV (69%); and for the pluperfect PK (80%), UV (100%), SB (100%), LÚ (100%), NCV (100%). A closer examination, however, indicates that these versions employ the morphologically expressed aspect morphemes far less frequently for translating the perfective and imperfective aspects in Greek: 17%–30% for the aorist (vs. 52.5% in FOLEY), 4%–7% for the present (vs. 41% in FOLEY), and 8% for the imperfect tense-forms (vs. 83% in FOLEY).

102 See Table 4.1, p. 166 above.
The average rates for accuracy in translating aspect in the five representative versions are as follows: PK (84.6%), UV (90.3%), SB (87.7%), LÜ (87.1%), and NCV (90.8%). However, these scores by no means suggest that these versions are good translations of the Greek tense-forms. The numbers shown in Table 6.2 indicate that these versions tend to use the less heavily marked monosyllabic verbs with the ø morpheme more often than any other morpheme to translate the five tense-forms that grammaticalize the perfective, imperfective, and stative aspects in Greek. The imperfective aspect morphemes, including zài, IDVCs, and two-morpheme aspect compounds, are never used. None of these versions utilizes four-character set phrases for translating the most heavily marked perfective and pluperfect tense-forms. These observations demonstrate that the translators of these sample versions have either deliberately, or, more likely, inadvertently, ignored aspect in relationship to grounding and markedness—either Greek or Mandarin—and their critical functions at the discourse level.

This chapter has served to demonstrate that the proposed theory of translating Greek aspect into Mandarin aspect can be successfully applied to the practice of Bible translation. Upon examining the Passion narrative of John, several points may be observed. First, with the exception of cases in which the marking of prominence is evident due to pragmatic or syntactic effects (e.g. the repetition of the exact verb form where the reduplicant follows immediately after the verb), two-morpheme aspect compounds are not used to translate the aorist tense-form in the Passion narrative of John, even though they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect in Greek. On the other hand, two-morpheme aspect compounds may be used to represent the more heavily marked present and imperfect tense-forms. However, because the contexts in which the
imperfective aspect compounds can be utilized in Mandarin are rather limited, the translator may compensate for this limitation by using the more heavily marked disyllabic verbs as opposed to the less heavily marked monosyllabic ones.

Second, four-character set phrases with the ø morpheme may be used consistently to render the stative aspect in Greek realized by both the perfective and pluperfect tense-forms. Four-character set phrases also reflect these two most heavily marked tense-forms and their function as frontgrounding devices in discourse.

Third, formally expressed perfective aspect morphemes may be preferable to the ø morpheme, especially under any one (or more) of the following conditions: (1) There is a shift in tense-form in the Greek. (2) The aorist tense-form occurs in either a direct quotation or conditional clause. (3) The aorist is used to establish textual cohesion at the discourse level. Fourth, conceptual distance ([+remoteness]) grammaticalized by the imperfect and pluperfect tense-forms in the Greek indicative mood may be rendered in Mandarin by lexical means (i.e. by adding extra words such as lāo, zāo, nà, qù).

Fifth, although passive constructions are not obligatory in Mandarin, certain expressions in Greek (e.g. ἐσταυρωθή) may be consistently rendered by the bèi construction. Sixth, to avoid confusion, auxiliary verbs in Mandarin should be used for the sole purpose of translating non-indicative moods. Seventh, in terms of phonological translation, biblical transliteration should follow the conventions found in most existing Mandarin versions. Finally, Greek periphrastic constructions may be consistently rendered by shì...de in Mandarin. In the next chapter, Paul’s exposition of the resurrection of the dead in 1 Corinthians 15 provides a second sample passage to test the validity of the proposed translation theory.
CHAPTER 7 1 CORINTHIANS 15

7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. Aim of the Chapter

Paul’s exposition of the resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15 provides a second sample text to test the validity of the proposed translation theory. The translation provided here is written following the principles of systematic rendering of the Greek verbal aspect into Mandarin verbal aspect developed in this dissertation. As in chapter 6, this chapter conducts a critical and comprehensive review of the writings of the Nestorian, Manichaean, and Catholic missionaries, as well as over sixty Chinese Bible versions, twenty of which are in Mandarin. Although other linguistic issues pertaining to Bible translation (e.g. figurative speech) are also included, the primary focus is on addressing issues related to the grammatical translation of verbal aspect from Greek into Mandarin. This chapter serves as the conclusion to the current dissertation.

7.1.2. Discourse Structure of 1 Corinthians 15

Paul’s exposition of the resurrection of the dead is divided into five discourse units (or pericopes): the resurrection of Christ (vv. 1–11), the resurrection of the dead (vv. 12–34), the resurrection of the body (vv. 35–49), the victory over death (vv. 50–57), and conclusion (v. 58). Discourse boundaries are marked by shifts in tense-form and in grammatical person. The change in grammatical person from the first (κηρύσσομεν) and second (ἐπιστέψοντε) in v. 11 to the third (λέγουσιν, v. 12), for example, as well as the shift in tense-form (from the aorist to the present), indicate the beginning of the second pericope (vv. 12–24). Likewise, the shift in tense-form from the present in the

---

1 See 6.1.2, pp. 296–97 above.
first person (λολῶ) in v. 34 to the future form in the third person (ἐρεῖ) in v. 35 marks the beginning of the third pericope (vv. 35–49). Once again, the tense-forms are switched from the future form (φορέσομεν, v. 49) back to the present (ἐγκάμι, v. 50), thereby introducing the fourth pericope (vv. 50–57). In contrast to the Passion narrative of John, epistolary conventions such as salutations (ἀδελφοί [μου ἄγατητοί], vv. 1, 50, 58) and rhetorical questions (πῶς λέγουσιν ἐν ὑμῖν τινες, v. 12; ἀλλὰ ἐρεῖ τις, v. 35) are used to introduce new pericopes. Boundaries of smaller discourse units are determined by conjunctives such as γὰρ (vv. 9–11), νυνί δὲ (vv. 20–28), ἐπεῖ (vv. 29–34), and οὔτως καί (vv. 42–47).

Excluding vague verbs (εἰμί and ἐγκάμι) and future forms, the total number of verbs used in 1 Corinthians 15 is 113. The aorist tense-form functions as the backgrounding device at the discourse level and occurs 45 times (40%) in the exposition. The present tense-form functions as the foregrounding device, and occurs 54 times (48%). The perfect tense-form serves as the frontgrounding device, and occurs 14 times (12%).

7.1.3. Nestorian and Early Catholic Records Concerning Resurrection

The earliest known Chinese source concerning the resurrection of the dead appears in an early seventh century Nestorian text called the Discourse on Almsgiving. Its author, Bishop Alopen, reports that “we remember that this Messiah said (whilst He was yet alive), ‘in three days, I will rise again from the dead’” (Sān rīnēī yú sī zhōng yù qī 三日內於死中欲起, v. 120). Adam (Ātān 阿該) is mentioned here as the first man to sin (vv. 82–99), and “thereby all men without exception might be raised from the dead and ascend up to Heaven even as He” (Yīqiē rēn yúhòu yù qī cóng sī. Yū shāngtiān qù 一切人

---

2 See, for example, Ellingworth and Hatton, Handbook, 290.
3 For the Chinese text, English translation with notes, see Saeki, Nestorian Documents, 51–70; 206–247.
A millennium later, Catholic missionaries also made explicit reference to the resurrection in Chinese. Ricci, for example, uses the expression *fù shēng guītiān* 復昇歸天 ("re-ascend into Heaven"), whereas Ortiz's version of the Apostles' Creed reads *disān rì zi sǐzhè zhōng fūhuò... *wǒ xīn ròushēn zhī fūhuò 第三日自死者中復活... 我信肉身之復活 ("On the third day he came back to life from the dead... I believe in the resurrection of the body"). Paul's exposition of the resurrection of the dead in 1 Corinthians 15 was first translated into Chinese (from the Vulgate) by Jean Basset around 1738.

7.2. Chinese Translation of 1 Corinthians 15

The Chinese translation provided in this section was written according to the principles of systematic rendering of the Greek verbal aspect into Mandarin verbal aspect developed in chapters 2–5 of this dissertation. The presentation of the Greek text, the principles of English translation, and the format of each section follow the system outlined in chapter 6 (see 6.2).

7.2.1. The Resurrection of Christ (vv. 1–11) 論基督復活

This pericope may be divided into two sub-sections (vv. 1–8, 9–11). The smaller discourse boundary, as noted in 7.1.2, can be determined by the conjunctive *γάρ* (v. 9). Paul uses the aorist tense-form to set the stage for arguments he presents later in the chapter. He uses it to lay down his assumption regarding the saving power of the Gospel (vv. 1–2), present an old creedal formula (vv. 3–5), recount Christ's post-resurrection

---

4 English translation is by Saeki. See Saeki, *Nestorian Documents*, 211.
7 Strandenaes, “Sloane MS #3599,” 61–64. See 2.1.3, p. 19 above. For a general introduction to 1 Corinthians, see, for example, Thiselton, *Commentary*, 1169–82.
appearances (vv. 6–8), explain why he is least worthy among the apostles (v. 9–10), and conclude his preliminary remarks (v. 11). He employs the present tense-forms to specify a number of significant details: to state the purpose of his address to the believers at Corinth (v. 1–2), to note the present condition of the five hundred witnesses to Christ’s appearance (v. 6), and to describe his place among the apostles (vv. 9–11). He also utilizes two perfect tense-forms to focus on two critically important facts: the Corinthians’ firm faith (v. 1) and Christ’s resurrection (v. 4).

\[\text{\textit{Γνωρίζω}} \ \text{δὲ \ ὑμῖν,} \ \text{ἀδελφοί,} \ \text{τὸ εὐαγγέλιον \ ὑμῖν, \ ὁ \ καὶ} \ \text{παρελάβετε,} \ \text{ὅτι \ ὑμῖν,} \ \text{οἱ} \ \text{καὶ} \ \text{πάντες \ ἡμῖν,} \ \text{τίνι} \ \text{λόγῳ \ εὐαγγελισάμην} \ \text{ὑμῖν \ εἰ} \ \text{κατέχετε,} \ \text{ἐκτὸς} \ \text{εἰ} \ \text{μὴ} \ \text{εἰκῇ} \ \text{ἐπιστεύοσατε.} \ \text{(15:1–2)}\]

手法妹妹們，我向你們提起，我給你們傳過的福音，也就是你們所受的、靠它立足腳跟、並且因它而得救，要是你們仍堅守著我給你們傳過的道，除非你們徒然的信了。

弟兄姊妹們，我向你們提起，我給你們傳過的福音，也就是你們所受的、靠它立足腳跟、並且因它而得救，要是你們仍堅守著我給你們傳過的道，除非你們徒然的信了。

Dixiong jiēmèimen, wǒ xiàng nǐmen tǐ-qǐ, wǒ gěi nǐmen chuán-guò de fūyǐn, yějiù shì nǐmen suǒ shòu de, kǎo tā lǐ-zú-jīào-gēn, bīngqiě yīn tā ěr déjiù, yàoshi nǐmen réng jiānshǒu-zhe wǒ gěi nǐmen chuán-guò de dào, chūfēi nǐmen túrán de xìn le.

Brothers and sisters, I bring to your attention, the gospel that I preached to you, that is, what you received, in which you stand firm, and through which you are saved, if you still hold firmly to the message I preached to you, unless you believe in vain.

\[\text{γνωρίζω} \ (v. 1) \ \text{Several versions add auxiliary verbs such as} \ \text{yào (ZHU, LÜ, HS, CRV, CPB, RCUV) or} \ \text{yuànyì (CNT) to verbs such as} \ \text{zhīdào 知道 ("know") or} \ \text{chōngwēn 重温 ("remind," CLB) with the} \ \text{∅ morpheme, while a few versions use RVCs such as} \ \text{qīng (wǒ yuànyì nǐmen rèn-qīng 我願意你們認清, “I wish you to realize,” SB) or} \ \text{mǐng (wǒ yào} \]
bā...jiāng-míng 要把...讲明, “I want to clarify,” NCV), both of which denote “clear.” Such additions are inappropriate, since auxiliary verbs in Mandarin are reserved for the translation of the non-indicative moods in Greek, including the future form, infinitive, subjunctive, and optative moods. The RVC míng (“clear,” HSC), on the other hand, is not preferable because it expresses the perfective aspect. Earlier Mandarin versions (e.g. PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT) have gàosù nǐmen zhīdào (“tell you so that you know”) with the ə morpheme, which is not preferable for the indicative mood in Greek. The IDVC qǐ is preferable to the ə morpheme because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form.

εὐπρεπῶν (cf. 2) The shift in tense-form from the present (γνωρίζω) to aorist justifies the use of the aspect marker -guò instead of the ə morpheme, which is found in most Mandarin versions. With the exception of the CNT, HS, and HSC, these versions add temporal adverbs such as xiānqián 先前 (“previously,” MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, SB, LÜ, CRV, RCUV), cōngqián 從前 (“before,” NCV), yīqián 以前 (“in the past,” TCV), or cèngjīng 曾經 (“once,” CPB) as a way to establish past-time reference. This is not preferable because the aorist tense-form in Greek is not used to grammaticalize past-time reference.

παρελλῆσθε (cf. παρελλῆσθαι, v. 3) Most Mandarin versions reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist by using -guò (PK), -le (UV, WANG, ZHU, CNT, HS, BT, TCV, CRV, NCV, RCUV), the RVC xià (“down,” HSC), or the ə morpheme (MSV, JOHNM, CLB). Here, the ə morpheme is used instead of the formally expressed morphemes not only because it is stylistically preferable, but because it better reflects the less marked

---

8 BT has shuō-míng gěi nǐmen zhīdào (“tell you to let you know”).
aorist tense-form in Greek. In addition, the ø morpheme works better because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of the formally expressed morphemes.

ἔστήκετε (cf. εἰστήκειν in John 18:5) Several version render the perfect indicative by an adjectival phrase, for example zhànli de zhù 站立得住 (e.g. PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, RCUV) or zhànli de wēn 站立得稳 (ZHU, NCV), both of which denote “standing firm.” A few versions translate it as a verb, others translate it with the RVCs wēn (“firm,” SB) or zhù (“firm,” CRV), and still others translate it with the stative aspect marker -zhe (HSC). Although -zhe reflects the stative aspect of the perfect tense-form, the four-character set phrase lì-zú-jīāo-gēn (“stand firm,” lit. “have a strong footing”) with the ø morpheme is a better choice because its heavily marked feature conveys frontgrounded prominence in Mandarin discourse, which closely corresponds to the perfect tense-form in Greek.

σώζεσθε (v. 2) Most Chinese versions (SL-MOR, MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, CNT, BT, HSC, SB, CLB, NCV) use déjiù (“be saved”) with the ø morpheme. Here, morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes are not an option, because expressions such as déjiù-zhe or zài déjiù are ungrammatical. The addition of auxiliary verbs such as biyào (CNT), binéng (PK), or huì (TCV, RCUV) is not preferable because such additions are reserved for translating the non-indicatives in Greek. HS uses the perfective -le, which is also not preferable because it does not reflect the imperfective aspect signaled by the present tense-form in Greek. The verb phrase zhújiàn déjiù 逐渐得救 (“begin to be saved” or “gradually to be saved,” CRV) must be rejected because it expresses not aspect but the ingressive Aktionsart of the verb.
λόγος/λόγος  Some versions use ἰησοῦ ("good news," SL-MOR, MSV, HSC, CLB, TCV, SJ), while others render it formally: 话 (BT, LÜ, SB, CRV) and 言 (DV), both of which denote "word." Several Mandarin versions do not translate this word (e.g. PK, JOHNM, UV, ZHU, CNT). The most suitable term for λόγος is 聆 ("way," "message," "sermon," "truth," "reason," "doctrine," etc., WANG, HS, NCV, CPB). Ricci has used 聆 in the context of Jesus' earthly ministry (传道 zhi gong yi bi 傳道之功已畢, "his preaching ministry has been completed").

εὐγελίσθη (cf. v. 1) The repetition of this exact same verb in the same discourse unit (vv. 1–8) may be due to emphasis. However, this type of repetition is different from the examples found in John 19:6 and 19:15, in which the repeated verb follows immediately after the other. Here, the translator may formally translate the aorist, that is, use the same verb form, 传, with the perfective aspect marker -guò.

κατέχετε The shift in tense-form from the aorist (εὐγελίσθη) to the present justifies the use of imperfective aspect markers such as 在 (LÜ, HS), -zhe (MSV), or IDVCs (e.g. xiàqù). However, in order to avoid tautology, the translator might not want to use a heavily marked two-morpheme aspect compound here. Obviously, the perfective -le does not reflect the imperfective aspect of the Greek (chishōu-le 持守了, SB). The φ morpheme may be acceptable if it is expressed by a disyllabic verb such as chishōu ("guard," ZHU, NCV) or jiānshōu 堅守 ("stand fast," TCV, CRV, CPB), but not by a monosyllabic verb (e.g. shōu, JOHNM) or a four-character set phrase (e.g. jīn-shēn-bāo-shōu 謹慎保守, "guard carefully," CNT). The addition of auxiliary verbs such as nénɡ...
(PK, UV, WANG, HSC) and ăo (CLB) is not preferable for translating the indicative mood in Greek into Mandarin because auxiliary verbs express volition as well as futurity. ēπιστεύσατε (see also v. 11) The shift in tense-form from the present back to aorist may justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. However, the translator does not have a choice here, since when le occurs at the end of a sentence it must be interpreted as a modal particle and not a perfective aspect marker (see 3.2.5.2.c.a above). Other perfective morphemes such as -guò or RVCs, while grammatically acceptable, render the sentence rather awkward.

Most Mandarin versions use the 0 morpheme for the aorist, however, some are better than others. The monosyllabic verb xìn (“believe”) with the 0 morpheme (e.g. MSV, JOHNM, HSC, SB, CPB) is preferable to the disyllabic verb xiāngxin (“believe”) with the 0 morpheme (e.g. PK, LÜ) because it better reflects the less heavily marked aorist tense-form in Greek. Several other versions (e.g. UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, HS, CRV, NCV) add the verb shí (“be”) to the front of the verb, which is not preferable because the shí... (de) construction is reserved for the translation of periphrastic construction in Greek into Mandarin. The CNT, on the other hand, has xīnxīn shí kōngxū de 信心是空虚的 (“faith is void”), which is not a preferable choice because ēπιστεύσατε is translated as a noun.

παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρῶτοις, δ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς καὶ ὅτι ὄψθη Κηφᾶ, εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα (vv. 3–5)
What I preached to you is also what I received: most important is that Christ, in accordance with the scriptures, died for our sins, and was buried; also according to the scriptures, (Christ) had risen from the dead on the third day; and was seen by Cephas, and then by the twelve apostles.

παρέδωκα (v. 3)  Paul uses two aorists (παρέδωκα and παρέλαβον) to introduce what he considers to be the cornerstones of Christian faith. The φ morpheme is used here because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of the morphologically expressed perfective aspect morphemes. The monosyllabic χυάν (“pass on,” UV, ZHU, CNT, SB, LÜ, CRV, RCUV) is preferable to disyllabic verbs such as χυάνσου 傳授 (MSV, CPB) or χυάντιάο 傳交 (“deliver,” NCV), because it better reflects the less heavily marked aorist tense-form in Greek.

παρέλαβον  As in v. 1, the φ morpheme (MSV, JOHM, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, SB, LÜ, TCV, CLB, CRV, CPB, RCUV) is preferable to the formally expressed perfective morphemes, since there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of -guò (PK) or -le (NCV). Also, as in v. 1, the monosyllabic χοú (“receive”) is preferable to disyllabic verbs (e.g. λίγχσου 領受, UV, ZHU, SB, LÜ, RCUV, etc.) because it better reflects the less heavily marked aorist tense-form in Greek.
Paul now states what many biblical commentators believe to be an early creedal formula, introduced by ὁτι, using two aorists (ἀνέθεσαν, ἐτάφη, vv. 3–4) and a perfect (ἐγόργερτον, v. 4). 12 Although there are no shifts in tense-form in v. 3, the aspect marker -le (UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, HS, SB, LÜ, TCV, NCV, CRV, CPB, RCUV) and RVCs such as qù ("go") are both preferable to the ø morpheme (e.g. sf, "die," MSV, PK, CLB; sǐwāng, "die," CNT) because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form. JOHNM and BB have shòu sf ("suffer death"), which does not reflect the active voice of the Greek, since the particle shòu forms the passive construction in Mandarin. 13

It needs to be emphasized here that the use of a single morphologically expressed aspect morpheme does not mark prominence in Mandarin discourse, but rather better reflects the perfective aspect that is signaled by the aorist in Greek.

Most Mandarin versions use the aspect marker -le (JOHNM, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, LÜ, NCV, CRV, RCUV) for the aorist, with the exception of the MSV and the three Catholic versions (CNT, HSC, CPB), which have the ø morpheme. ἐτάφη is best translated by bèi zàng-diào ("be buried") for two reasons: first, the construction formed by the particle bèi (HS, SB, HSC, TCV, CPB) morphologically reflects the passive voice of the Greek, and, second, the RVC diào morphologically reflects the perfective aspect signaled by the aorist tense-form in Greek. Here, -le may be used interchangeably with RVCs.

---

12 See, for example, Fee, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 722–23; Horsley, 1 Corinthians, 198; Collins and Harrington, First Corinthians, 528–40.
13 See, also, example (20) in my chapter 4 and the commentary on σταύρωσεν (John 19:16a) in my chapter 6.
γήγερται (v. 4; see also vv. 12–14, 16–17, 20, 29, 32, 35, 42–44, 52)  

Paul now shifts from the aorist to perfect tense-form in order to highlight the risen Christ. Several versions have ふさな ("come back to life," PK, JOHNM, CNT, CPB, GURY) or ふ生 ("come back to life," MSV, BCV) with the ʔ morpheme. Other versions (UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, TCV, HS, SB, NCV, CRV, RCUV) use the perfective -le, which does not reflect the stative aspect of the perfect tense-form. The IDVC ำ used in HSC is not preferable because it expresses the imperfective aspect. Similarly, I.Ü’s translation, で 付-le-ำ ("get to be raised"), is not preferable, either, for two reasons. First, the two-morpheme aspect compound -le-IDVC does not reflect the stative aspect of the Greek. Second, the auxiliary verb で is not a suitable addition for rendering the Greek indicative mood into Mandarin. The four-character set phrase 从- Turtle-付-活 ("rise from the dead") with the ʔ morpheme works best here because it marks frontgrounded prominence in Mandarin and reflects the stative aspect of the perfect tense-form in Greek.

ὁφθη (vv. 5–8)  

Several Greek grammatical references, lexicons, and biblical commentaries treat this passive form of ὄριον in the intransitive sense, “become visible” or “appear,” although the verb form clearly denotes “he was seen.” It is evident that Paul uses this exact same verb form four times in the same discourse unit for emphasis. Most versions reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist by using RVCs such as amientos ("see," PK, LÜ, HS, HSC) or the ʔ morpheme (CNT, SB, TCV, CLB, NCV, CRV, CPB).

See, for example, Winer, Treatise, 275; Turner, Syntax, 58; BDF, §313; BDAG, s.v.; Conzelmann; Commentary, 248; Collins and Harrington, First Corinthians, 533; Garland, 1 Corinthians, 687.

See, for example, Fee, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 731 n. 87; Thiselton, Commentary, 1208. Collins and Harrington add that in the LXX, the verb is used for the appearances of God. He cites several Old Testament examples, which include Gen 12:7; Exod 6:3; 1 Kgs 3:5. See Collins and Harrington, First Corinthians, 531.
Some use the verb phrase xiǎn/xiàn gěi...kàn 顯/現給···看 (lit. "appear to...see," MSV, JOHN, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, RCUV), which may be acceptable in this context where the indirect object is specified (in the dative case). Two other Mandarin versions have kàn-jìàn ("see," with the RVC jiàn) expressed in passive constructions formed by the particles bèi (PK) and gěi (LÜ). Although these formally expressed passive constructions are grammatically acceptable in Mandarin, they sound rather unnatural to native speakers. The ø morpheme is used here because it better reflects the less heavily marked aorist tense-form in Greek. In order to provide textual cohesion, the other three occurrences of ὧθη will also be consistently translated by the monosyllabic verb xiàn with the ø morpheme.

επείτα ὧθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίων ἀδελφῶν ἐφάπαξ, ἤν οἱ πλείονες μένουσιν ἔως ἄρτι, τινὲς δὲ ἐκοιμήθησαν· ἐπείτα ὧθη Ἰακώβῳ ἵνα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν ἑσχάτον δὲ πάντων ὠσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὧθη κάμοι. (vv. 6–8)

之後，他現於五百多位弟兄姊妹之前，其中有一大半至今還活著，但是也有一些人已死去（或睡）了。接下來，他又現於雅各面前，還有眾使徒之前。到最後，他竟現於這個如同重生而生的我之前。


After this, he appeared to more than five hundred brothers and sisters, most of them still living, but some already died (or fell asleep). Then he appeared to Jacob, and also to the apostles. At last, he even appeared to me, as though I were born of adoption.
Several versions have \textit{zài} ("around," MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, HS, HSC, LÜ, NCV, CRV), \textit{jiànzài} （"still live in good health," CPB), or \textit{cúnzài} （"exist,"

CN T) with the \og morpheme. All of these translations reflect the imperfective aspect of the original, although disyllabic verbs are preferable for their closer representation of the more heavily marked Greek present tense-form. However, \textit{-zhe} (SB, TCV, DCT) is preferable to the \og morpheme because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect signaled by the present tense-form in Greek. Also, the use of \textit{-zhe} is justified by the shift in tense-form (from the aorist to present).

A few Mandarin versions use the \og morpheme to reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist (PK, CNT, SB, CPB, DCT), while most others use perfective morphemes such as RVCs (e.g. \textit{zhāo}, JOHNM; \textit{qù}, HSC) and \textit{-le} (MSV, UV, WANG, BT, ZHU, CLB, CRV, NCV). Two-morpheme aspect compounds such as RVC\textit{-le} (\textit{xìà-le}, HS) and \textit{zài...zhe} (LÜ) are not preferable because they build foregrounded prominence in Mandarin. Also, the aspect compound \textit{zài...zhe} expresses the imperfective aspect. Therefore, the two single aspect morphemes, namely, RVCs and \textit{-le}, are both preferable to the \og morpheme and two-morpheme aspect compounds because they morphologically reflect the discourse function and the perfective aspect of the aorist. More importantly, RVCs or \textit{-le} provide the grammatical contrast that Paul intended to bring out between those who are still living and those who have already died.

The word \textit{shītú} ("apostle") is used here to differentiate from a related term, \textit{mèntú} ("disciple"), which is commonly used for \textit{μητής} (see John 18:1).
Expressed in figurative speech, this word presents an extremely difficult challenge to the translator. Some of the most common interpretations include “abnormally born,” “untimely born,” and other more specific terms for a premature birth such as abortion, stillbirth, or miscarriage. Many earlier Chinese versions prefer these more specific terms such as tuōshēng 脱生 (SL-MOR, MOR), tuōchán 脱產 (MAR), xiǎo chàn’ér 小產兒 (GÜ), duōtái (ér shēng) 墮胎 (而生) (BT, HSC, ZHU), and liǔ chàn’ér 流產兒 (SB), all of which denote an “aborted child.” Interestingly, GURY employs huáttāi shēng zhē 滑胎者, which refers specifically to one born of a woman who has experienced repeated (or habitual) miscarriages.

Most versions, however, adopt a less formal translation. For example, in the 1840 revision of GÜ, Medhurst compares Paul to xiǎo quàn 小圈, or, literally, the “little ring through an animal’s nose by which it is led,” in order to emphasize Paul’s own feelings of insignificance among the other apostles as expressed in the Greek. The most common expression used in Chinese versions reflects the direct influence of the KJV: bù dào chǎnqi suǒ shēng 不到產期所生 (MSV, PK, JOHN, UV, WANG, LÜ, NCV, CPB, RCUV) in Mandarin or wěi jí qí ér chǎn 未及期而生 (DV, GO, BCV, JOHN, CSV, UVW, SJ, BB, WV; cf. TRNT) in wenli, both of which closely resemble the KJV’s rendering of “born out of due time.”

---

16 For a summary of discussions, see, for example, Conzelmann; Commentary, 259 n. 95; Garland, 1 Corinthians, 691–93; Fee, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 732–34; Thiselton, Commentary, 1208–10.
17 Fee, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 733; Collins and Harrington, First Corinthians, 537; Ellingworth and Hatton, Handbook, 293–94; BDF, §433, Fee suggests that with the definite article, “freak” might provide another possible reading. See also Thiselton, Commentary, 1208.
18 Giles, Chinese-English Dictionary, 386. See also Encyclopedic Dictionary, vol. 6, 124.
19 The CPB has bù zúyùe 不足月 (“immature birth”); the RCUV has wèi dào chǎnqí ér shēng 未到產期而生 (“born out of due time”); the CSV and JOHN have wèi jí chǎnqí ér shēng 未及產期而生 (“born out of due time”); the WV has shēng bù jí shì 生不及時 (“born short of its due time”). Similarly, the TRNT (also
More paraphrased expressions are also found in Mandarin versions: 康 “useless,” CNT), 不配看見 言 ("unworthy of seeing Him,” CLB), and ぶきふ 並將 de qingkuàng xià chūshēng 在不正常的情況下出生 (TCV), the last example fully embraces English versions that have “abnormally born” (e.g. NIV, NAB, TEV). 20

The expression 多-胎-兒-生 ("born out of abortion") is preferable to other translations for two reasons. First, it more closely reflects the lexical meaning of the Greek. Second, the figure of speech introduced by ὄσπερεῖ (“as though”) in the Greek text warrants the use of the four-character set phrase in Mandarin in order to convey prominence in the discourse (vv. 1–8).

Ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰμὶ ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων ὡς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος, διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ· χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμὶ ὁ εἰμὶ, καὶ ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἔε ἐμὲ οὔ κενὴ ἐγεννηθεί, ἀλλὰ περισσότερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἐκοπίασα, οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ ἀλλὰ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ [ἵ] σὺν ἐμοί. εἴτε οὖν ἐγὼ εἴτε ἐκεῖνοι, οὕτως κηρύσσομεν καὶ οὕτως ἐπιστεύσατε. (15:9–11)

原因是我眾使徒中屬最微小的，甚至不配稱作使徒，因我迫害過 神的教會。然而，我有今天的造就，乃歸功於 神。他所賜我的恩寵，並非徒然。事實上，我比眾使徒更加勞累。但是，這不是靠我自己，倒是靠 神的恩寵在我身邊。因此，不管是我，或是他們，我們這樣傳下去，你們也這樣信了。

other Japanese versions, CBT, JCV, JRV, RAGUET) has tsukita rane mono 月足らね者 (“one born immaturity”).

20 The expression “untimely born” is found in several English versions (e.g. NASB, NRSV, ESV). See also BDAG, s.v. The DCT has zài nânchān de qingkuàng zhěxià, chíchí cái shēng chūlái de rén in 難產的情況之下，遲遲才生出來的人 (“one born only after a long and difficult labor”).

Because of this, I am the least among the apostles, because I persecuted God’s church. However, I give credit to God for my achievement today. The grace he has given me is not in vain. In fact, I toil much harder than the apostles. But, I do not rely on myself, but rather on God’s grace at my side. So, whether it was I or they, this is the manner in which we preach, and also the manner in which you believe.

καλείσθαι (v. 9) The disyllabic verb *chēngzuò* (“call,” PK) with the ø morpheme is preferable to the monosyllabic verb *chēng* (“call”) found in most Mandarin versions (e.g. UV, JOHMN, WANG, ZHU, CNT, BT, HS, HSC, LÜ, CLB, CRV, NCV) because it better reflects the more heavily marked feature of the present tense-form.

ἐδίωξα (see also example (2) in chapter 2) Some versions use the perfective aspect morphemes -guò (CNT, HSC, SB, TCV, CLB, CRV, CPB, RCUV) and -le (HS, LÜ), while others use the ø morpheme (MSV, PK, UV, WANG, ZHU, NCV). Here, -guò and -le are both preferable to the ø morpheme because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form. The shift in tense-form from the present to the aorist also justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

Temporal deictic indicators such as cēngjīng (“once,” “ever,” CNT) or cēng (“ever,”
MSV, JOHNM, BT, RCUV) are unnecessary additions, since -guō alone expresses the perfective aspect in Mandarin.

ἐκοπίασα (v. 10) Most Mandarin versions use disyllabic verbs such as láokū 努伲 (“toil,” MSV, PK, UV, ZHU, HSC, LŪ, NCV, CRV, RCUV), lǎolù 勞祿 (“toil,” SB), or gōngzuò 工作 (“work,” CNT) with the o morpheme, which are less than ideal here. The RVC lèi (“weary”) is preferable to the o morpheme because it formally reflects the perfective aspect that is signaled by the aorist tense-form in Greek.

χάριτι/χάρις χάρις is most frequently translated by ēnyōu 恩祐 (“kindness,” SL-MOR, MOR), ēn 恩 (“kindness,” “favor,” Ricci, MAR, GŪ, GO, BCV, GURY, SJ, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, ZHU, SYD, CSV, LŪ) or ēndiān 恩典 (“grace,” “favor,” MSV, BT, TCV, CLB, NCV, RCUV). Other translations include chōngyōu 寵佑 (“loving protection,” WV, HSC), huì 惠 (“benevolent,” JCV, CBT), and ēnchōng (“imperial favor,” CNT, SB, CPB, Ricci, RAGUET). All of these terms are current today in Chinese Christian contexts, and therefore they may be used interchangeably for the same Greek word.

Nishiwaki asserts that the character kēn 懇 and the Greek word χάρις were closely related phonetically in ancient China. According to the Japanese scholar, the archaic pronunciation of 懇 is conjectured [xar], which supposedly corresponds to the first syllable of the Greek word χάρις. In modern Chinese, however, 懇 denotes sincerity and therefore it is not preferable for the translation of χάρις.

---

21 Ricci uses ēn 恩 or ēnhui 恩惠 (“favor”) interchangeably. Ricci, "T’ien-chu Shih-i," e.g. 94, line 61.
22 GURY has zhūēn 主恩 ("the Lord’s grace"). GŪ has tiānēn 天恩 ("heaven/God’s grace"). Ricci, "T’ien-chu Shih-i," e.g. 422, line 544.
23 The underlining is present in the original. The archaic pronunciation of 懇 is conjectured [xar→kō→kon]. Nishiwaki, Notes, 212. Compare Karlgren, who gives the reading ['k'ēn]. See Karlgren, Analytic Dictionary, s.v.
The verb phrase that denotes "I am who I am" is extremely difficult to
translate into Chinese.\(^{24}\) Notice that the difficulty lies not with the grammar, but with the
lexical choice that must conform to natural syntax in contemporary Mandarin. Literal
renderings, for example, \(wó děi wéi wó\) 我得為我 (lit. "I become me"), while
grammatically acceptable, sound rather awkward to native ears (GURY).\(^{25}\) Most formal
translations add words such as \(jīn(rì/tiān)\) ("today," SL-MOR, GÜ, MSV, SJ, UV, HSC,
SB, TCV, CLB, CRV, NCV, CPB) or \(xiànzài\) ("now," ZHU, CNT, LÜ): \(wó chéngwéi\)
\(jīnri dè wó\) 我成為今日的我 (lit. "I become today’s me," SB). The expression \(wó yǒu\)
\(jīntiān de zàojiù\) 我有今天的造就 (lit. "I have today’s accomplishment") is preferable
because it sounds more natural to native speakers of Mandarin.\(^{26}\)

\(κηρύσσωμεν\) (v. 11) The IDVC \(xiàqù\) is preferable to the \(ο\) morpheme used in most
Mandarin versions (e.g. MSV, PK, UV, ZHU, CNT, HS, LÜ, TCV, CRV, NCV, CPB,
RCUV) because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect of the present tense-
form in Greek. SB uses \(-le\), which is not suitable because it expresses the perfective
aspect in Mandarin.

\(ἐπιστεύσατε\) See v. 2.

7.2.2. The Resurrection of the Dead (vv. 12–34) 論死人復活

This pericope may be divided into three sub-sections (vv. 12–19, 20–28, 29–34).
Smaller discourse boundaries, as noted in 7.1.2, are marked by the conjunctives \(vuvì δέ\)
(v. 20) and \(ἐπτεί\) (v. 29). Paul uses the aorist tense-forms to state the consequences were

\(^{24}\) Ellingworth and Hatton suggest less formal expressions such as "I have become an apostle," "But what I
am today, I am by God’s grace," or "But God’s grace has made me what I am today, that is, an apostle."

\(^{25}\) GO has \(wó děi wéi suòwéi yì\) 我得為所為矣 ("I end up getting to be like this").

\(^{26}\) Compare MOR, \(yú děi jīnri zhì jīng\) 余得今日之境 ("I am in such circumstance today").
the dead not raised (vv. 15–19, 32, 34), foretell Christ’s action at his second coming (v. 24), and describe God’s rule (v. 25–28). He employs the present tense-forms to draw attention to a number of significant details: to introduce his argument (v. 12), to nullify the false claim that denies the resurrection of the dead (vv. 13–19, 29–34), to describe human mortality (v. 20), and to describe God’s sovereignty over the enemy (v. 24–26).

He utilizes the perfect tense-forms to highlight several critically important facts: Christ’s resurrection (vv. 12–14, 16–17, 20, 29, 32), the believer’s hope in Christ (v. 19), the dead for which Christ became the firstfruits (v. 20), and submission of all things to God (v. 27).

Ei ἐὰν Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται, πῶς λέγουσιν ἐν ὑμῖν τινες ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν; εἰ δὲ ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται: εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγήγερται, κενὸν ἄρα [καὶ] τὸ κήρυγμα ἡμῶν, κενὴ καὶ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν: εὐρισκόμεθα δὲ καὶ ψευδομάρτυρες τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ὅτι ἠγείρεν τὸν Χριστὸν, ὅν οὐκ ἠγείρεν εἰπερ ἄρα νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται. (vv. 12–15)

如果説基督死而復甦在世宣揚著，你們中間為什麼有人又說起了沒有死人復活的事呢？要不是有死人復活的事，基督就無死而復甦了。若基督沒有死而復甦，我們的宣傳就成白費，你們的信仰也落空了。不僅如此，果真死人不復活的話，那麼我們就被人指著説是 神的僞證人，因為我們曾為 神作過見證，説他叫他所沒有復活過來的基督復活過來。

Rúguō shuō Jīdū sī-’ér-fū-sū zài bèi xuānyáng-zhe, nīmen zhōngjiān wēishénme yòurén yǒu shuō-qí-le méiyōu sīrén fūhuó de shì ne? Yàobushi yǒu sīrén fūhuó de shì, Jīdū jiù wú sī-’ér-fū-sū le. Ruò Jīdū méiyōu sī’érfūsū, wōmen de xuānchuán jiù chéng báifēi, nīmen de xīnyāng yě luòkōng le. Bùjīnrúcí, guózhēn sīrén bù fūhuó de huà, nàme
If Christ is proclaimed as raised from the dead, why are some among you saying that there is no resurrection of the dead? If there is no resurrection of the dead, Christ has not been raised from the dead. If Christ has not been raised from the dead, our preaching is futile, and your faith comes to nothing. Not only this, if indeed the dead are not raised, we are regarded as God’s false witnesses, because we have testified on God’s behalf that he raised Christ whom he did not raise.

κηρύσσεται (v. 12) Several versions use the ο morpheme for the present passive:

chuán 傳 ("pass on," e.g. PK, JOHNM, UV, ZHU, WANG, BT, TCV, NCV, CRV) or xuānjiāng 宣講 ("preach," CNT). Two Catholic versions (SB, HS) use the aspect marker -le, which does not reflect the imperfective aspect of the Greek. The CPB has chuánbào 傳報 ("convey a message") with the ο morpheme, but adds the temporal adverb yǐ ("already") to indicate a past event. The aspect marker zài (CLB) is preferable to the ο morpheme because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect of the Greek present tense-form. Still, the two-morpheme aspect compound zài...zhe is the ideal translation because it closely reflects the heavily marked present tense-form in Greek. In addition, the shift in tense-form from the aorist (Ξητοστότατε, v. 11) to present also justifies the use of a two-morpheme aspect morpheme. Although the passive construction formed by the particle bèi ( bèi xuānchuán 被宣傳, "be preached," LÜ) is not obligatory, it is best to keep it here to better reflect the passive construction of the Greek. This verb is not translated in HSC.


In this sub-section (vv. 12–19), Paul again uses repetition for emphasis, but this time he does so by repeating a perfect tense-form five times. As in v. 4, ἐγήγερται may be translated by the four-character set phrase sī-ēr-fū-sū ("rise from the dead") with the o morpheme, because it marks foregrounded prominence in Mandarin and reflects the stative aspect of the perfect tense-form in Greek. To establish textual cohesion to the other pericopes where the same verb form is used, each occurrence of ἐγήγερται may be consistently rendered by the same set phrase.27

λέγουσιν The shift in tense-form from the perfect (ἐγήγερται) to present justifies the use of a two-morpheme aspect compound. Here, the aspect compound IDVC-le is the ideal choice not only because it closely reflects the imperfective aspect that is expressed by the present tense-form in Greek, but also because it reflects the discourse function as a foregrounding device.

ἀνάστασις (see also vv. 13, 21, 42)28 Most Chinese versions (e.g. SL-MOR, MOR, MAR, GURY, GO, GÜ, MSV, PK, JOHNM, BB, UV, WANG, BT, WV, CNT, HSC, LÜ, SB, TCV, CLB, NCV, CRV, RCUV) use the term fūhuó ("come back to life") or

27 Ellingworth and Hatton have noted that, in certain languages, the repetition of various verb forms that Paul uses for emphasis might make the sentence "heavier." See Ellingworth and Hatton, Handbook, 298. This is mainly a stylistic concern, but in Mandarin, it applies to lexical as well as grammatical elements. For example, vv. 27–28, Paul uses the repetition of different verb forms of ὑποτάσσω: four aorists (ὑπέταξεν, ὑποτάσσαντος, ὑποτάσσας, ὑποτάσσας), one perfect (ὑποτάσσαται) and one future (ὑποτάσσηται). The verb zhihū ("subdue") may be used consistently for the aorists and future, whereas the four-character set phrase gān-fū-xiā-fēng should be used for the perfect. The repetition of lexical content does not necessarily make the sentence appear "heavy" in Mandarin. The repetition of grammatical elements, on the other hand, would. This motivates the translator to substitute the aspect marker -le to an RVC in one of the aorists (see v. 27).

28 It is interesting that Paul uses this word four times only here in 1 Corinthians 15 and not in any other chapters. The verb form ἀνίστημι occurs only in 1 Cor 10:7 (ἀνίστημον), where Paul cites an Old Testament quotation from Exod 32:6. When compared with ἐγέρω, as O'Donnell observes, the verb ἀνίστημι is used less frequently to refer to resurrection. In this context, however, it is clear that the ἀνάστασις ἐκρήγον could not be interpreted other than as the resurrection of the dead, since Paul uses the verb phrase ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται right before it. See O'Donnell, "Resurrection," 149–50.
fushēng ("come back to life," "regenerate," DV, BCV). A few other expressions are also found: huishēng 回生 ("bring back to life," ZHU), qǐ 起 ("get up," CSV), and fūqǐ 復起 (UVW, UVB, UVE). Graves argues that fūqǐ is preferable to fushēng not only because qǐ better reflects the sense of upward movement expressed by the prefix ᾳvα-, but also because fushēng connotes mere temporary "resuscitation." 29 Although the aforementioned terms are all acceptable for the translation of ᾳνάστασις, fūhuó and fūqǐ are preferable here. Furthermore, while these two terms do not differ significantly in meaning and may be used interchangeably, it is best to use fūhuó for all four occurrences in order to provide textual cohesion to other discourse units.

eυρισκόμεθα (v. 15; cf. εὑρίσκω, John 18:38, 19:4, 6) Most Mandarin versions use the θ morpheme for the present tense-form, with the particle bèi to indicate passive voice. Some versions use disyllabic verbs such as gōngrèn 公認 ("recognize in public," BT), or dāngzuò 當作 (RCUV), which are preferable to monosyllabic ones such as zhī ("regard," LÜ) or shì 视 ("view," SB) because they better reflect the more heavily marked present tense-form in Greek. Still, the translator may use -zhe, which is ideal here because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect that is signaled by the present tense-form in Greek.

ēμαρτυρίσομεν The shift in tense-form from the present to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme here, such as -guò (NCV) or -le (CPB), either of which is preferable to the θ morpheme that is used in most Mandarin versions (e.g. MSV, PK, JOHN, UV, SYD, ZHU, CNT, HSC, HS, TCV, CLB, CRV, DCT, RCUV).

29 Graves, "Uniform Names," 120-21. See also chapter 2 of this dissertation.
Here is another example of Paul repeating the exact same verb form for emphasis. It is obvious that verbal aspect plays a critical part in understanding the significance of Paul's argument. RVCs such as *guōlái* (lit. “come over”) or the aspect marker *-le* (WANG, SB, HSC, NCV) are both preferable to the Ø morpheme (MSV, PK, JOHN, UV, ZHU, BT, CNT, HS, TCV, CRV, DCT, RCUV) for the first occurrence of *ηγεῖρεν* because they formally reflect the perfective aspect in Mandarin. LÜ, on the other hand, uses the IDVC *qīlái*, which is not preferable because it expresses the imperfective aspect. The addition of *shí* 使 (“make,” “let,” JOHN, CNT, SB, CLB, NCV, CPB, RCUV) or *jiào* 诮 (“call,” “let,” MSV, PK, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, LÜ, CRV) is necessary here in order to convey the transitive sense of the verb.

Similarly, for the second occurrence of *ηγεῖρεν*, formally expressed aspect morphemes are preferable to the Ø morpheme that is found in most Mandarin versions (MSV, PK, JOHN, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, HS, SB, TCV, CRV, NCV, CPB, DCT, RCUV). LÜ uses the two-morpheme aspect compound *-le-IDVC* for the second occurrence of *ηγεῖρεν*, which is not preferable because it expresses the imperfective aspect. Here, the translator has the option of using the same or different perfective aspect morphemes for the two occurrences of *ηγεῖρεν*. As in vv. 1–2 where *-guō* is used for the two aorists (εὐπρεπεῖσθαι), the RVC *guōlái* may be used for both aorists here.

---

30 For discussions of the first class conditional sentences in Greek, see 5.4.2, pp. 281–84 above.
See example (31) in 5.4.2. Paul uses this present verb form twice in vv. 15–16. The φ morpheme is used here for both occurrences in order to establish textual cohesion to the previous pericope where the same verb form is used.\(^{31}\)

ei γὰρ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, οὔτε Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται· εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγήγερται, ματαιὰ ἡ πίστις ύμῶν, ἐτι ἐστὶ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ύμῶν, ἃρα καὶ οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ ἀπώλευντο. εἰ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ ἐν Χριστῷ ἡπτικότες ἐσμὲν μόνον, ἑλειονότεροι πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐσμέν. (15:16–19)

死人若不復活，基督也就沒有死而復活了。基督要是沒有死而復活，你們的信仰豈不是徒勞無功了，你們也依舊身處自己的罪中。還有那些在基督裏睡著 [死] 的人也滅亡了。如果我們僅僅在此生對基督是空虛所歸的，我們豈不就比眾人更加可悲了。


If the dead do not come back to life, then Christ has not come back to life from the dead.

If Christ has not come back from the dead, your faith would have been in vain, and you would still be living in your sins. And those who already rested in Christ would also have perished. If only for this life we have hope in Christ, we are more pitiful than all people.

See example (31) in 5.4.2.

See v. 6.

---

\(^{31}\) Porter notes that the present tense-form is used to mark textual cohesion in exposition. See Porter, *Idioms*, 305.
RVCs such as wáng "die," UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, SB, LÜ, TCV, NCV, CRV, CPB, RCUV), shī "lose," MSV), or mò "die," PK, JOHNM) are suitable because they formally reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist. Also, the frequent shifts in tense-form from the present to perfect, the perfect to aorist, and finally the aorist back to perfect (vv. 16–19) justify the use of formally expressed perfective morphemes for the two aorists in v. 18.

See example (6) in chapter 2.

Nuvı de Χριστός εγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι’ ἀνθρώπου θάνατος, καὶ δι’ ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνῄσκουσιν, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθοῦνται.

(15:20–22)

然而基督早已死而復活，並成為主懷安息者初熟的果實。也就是說，死亡既出自一人，死人復活也同樣出自一人。因此，如同眾人在亞當裏長逝者，同樣的，在基督裏眾人也將被復活。


Now Christ has already been raised from the dead, and become the firstfruits for those who are already dead. That is to say, death came through a person, the resurrection of the dead has also come through a person. Therefore, just as in Adam all die, likewise, in Christ all will be made alive.

See v. 4.
The four-character set phrase *zhū-huái-ān-xī* ("rest in the Lord’s side") with the ǝ morpheme closely reflects the stative aspect and the heavily marked perfect tense-form in Greek.

The first man in the Bible is referred to by various forms in Chinese: *Ātán* (from the Syriac ܐܬܢ) in the Nestorian document, the Discourse on Almsgiving (vv. 82–99), *Yādānɡ* in Ricci’s *T’ien-chu Shih-i*, and *Ādām* in Basset’s New Testament (SL-MOR). At least four other different forms are also used in Chinese versions: *Yādamài* (MOR, MAR), *Yātān* (GÜ, GO), *Ādamā* (GURY), and *Yādānɡ* (DV, BCV, SJ). Today, both Catholic and Protestant Mandarin versions follow the DV’s transliteration, *Yādānɡ*.

Paul now shifts from the perfect (v. 20) to present tense-form. Some versions use -le (e.g. UV, LÜ, SB, TCV), which is not preferable because rather than the imperfective, it expresses the perfective aspect in Mandarin. On the other hand, -zhe is ideal here because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect that is signaled by the present tense-form in Greek.

The future form may be translated by adding auxiliary verbs such as *bi* (e.g. JOHN, JOHNM, SJ, LÜ), *yào* (PK, UV, WANG, CNT, HSC, SB, CRV, NCV), *jiāng* (SL-MOR, MOR, MAR, GO, GURY, CPB), or *ké* (HS) to the verb with the ǝ morpheme. The added emphasis expressed by *jiānglái biyào fūhuó* ("must be raised in the future," CLB) may be acceptable here. ZHU and BT, on the other hand, have *yào chéng-le huó de* ("will become alive"), which is not preferable because -le

---

33 Fee notes that *ζυγοποιηθησονται* is used here instead of *ἐγείρω* because "it offers the "proper contrast with ἀποθνησκω." Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 751 n. 24.
expresses the perfective aspect in Mandarin. The particle *bèi*, which is used here to indicate the passive voice in Mandarin, is preferable.

εκαστος δε εν τω ίδιω ταγματι ἄπαρχῃ Χριστός, ἐπειτα οι τοι Χριστοι εν τη παρουσίᾳ αυτου, ειτα το τέλος, ὅταν παραδιδότι την βασιλείαν τω θεω και πατρι, ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν και πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν και δύναμιν. (15:23–24)

每個人照次序復活：基督乃初熟的果實；接著是那些基督再降臨的時候，屬基督的。之後，就是末日。那時基督就要把一切執政、掌權、權力全給毀掉，就把國遞交予父　神。

Every person is made alive according in his or her order: Christ is the firstfruits; and then followed by those who belong to Christ when Christ returns. After that is the end. At that time Christ will destroy every ruler, authority and power, and then hand over the kingdom to God the Father.

παραδιδῷ (v. 24) Here, morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes are not an option, because expressions such as *jiāo-zhe* or *zài jīāo* in this context are ungrammatical. Considering their more heavily marked features, disyllabic verbs such as *jiāofù* 交付 (“hand over,” ZHU), *jiāohuán* 交還 (“return,” TCV), or *díjiāo* (“hand over”) with the ø morpheme are preferable to monosyllabic verbs with the ø morpheme for translating the Greek present tense-form, as found in most Chinese versions: *jiāo* (“turn in,” PK, JOHN, BB, UV, WANG, BT, CNT, LÜ, SB, CLB, NCV, CRV, CPB, RCUV), *fù* (“hand over,” SL-MOR, MOR, MAR, UVW, UVB, UVE), *ràng* 讓 (“yield,” GÜ), *fān*
("return," DV), *huán* 還 ("return," GO, BCV, WV, MSV, HS), and *guī* 邏 ("return," GURY).

καταργήσῃ (cf. καταργεῖται, v. 26)  A few Mandarin versions use disyllabic verbs such as *huīmiè* 毀滅 ("destroy," JOHM) or *xiāomiè* 消滅 ("eliminate," CNT) with the θ morpheme, while several others use the perfective aspect marker -le (PK, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, NCV, RCUV). Some versions also add auxiliary verbs such as *huī* (CLB), *jiāng* (SB), *yāo* (TCV), or *bīyāo* (LÜ). WV and CRV add the temporal adverb *yí* 已 ("already"), apparently in an attempt to refer to the event having taken place in the past. Single aspect morphemes such as -le or RVCs (e.g. *dìào*, LÜ) are preferable to the θ morpheme because they formally reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist. The shift in tense-form from the present (παραδείγμα) to aorist also justifies the substitution of the aspect marker -guò for the θ morpheme, which is found in most Mandarin versions.

Finally, the addition of an auxiliary verb (e.g. *yāo*) is necessary to convey the projection that is grammaticalized by the subjunctive verb form in Greek.

δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεὺσειν ἄχρι οὗ θὴ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. ἐσχάτος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος· πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ ὅτι πάντα ὑποτέκταται, δῆλον ὅτι ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῶ τὰ πάντα. ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τότε [καὶ] αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, ἵνα ἦ ὁ θεὸς [τὰ] πάντα ἐν πάσιν.

(15:25–28)

因为祂必须统治下去，直到祂将一切仇敌都置于祂的足下。最终所消灭的仇敌便是死亡。因为「他使万物皆屈伏在了他的足下。」既然说万物都甘伏于威，显
然不包括被他制伏的位。当万物都被他制伏时，就连 神子自己也将被制伏在他的位，好让 神成为万物之主。

Yīnwèi tā bìxū tōngzhì-xiàqù, zhídào tā jiāng yǐqiè chóngdī dōu zhī zài -le tāde zúxià. 

For he must reign until he puts all enemies under his feet. The final enemy to annihilate is death. For “he has put all things in subjection under his feet.” Since it said that all things are put in subjection, it is obvious that it does not include the one who has put all things in subjection. When all things are subjected to him, even God's Son himself will be subjected to the one who puts all things in subjection under him, so that God will be the Lord of all.

δεῖ...βασιλεύειν (v. 25) Paul now shifts tense-form from the aorist (καταργήσῃ) back to the present. Almost all existing Chinese versions, except MOR, employ auxiliary verbs such as bi (MAR, GÜ, DV, JOHN, SJ, UVE), bìxū (PK, ZHU, LÜ, SB, TCV, RCUV), biyào (UV, WANG, BT, NCV, CRV), biding (JOHNM), yào (CLB, CPB), yīnggǎi (CNT), or yí (GURY) with the ø morpheme.34 HSC uses the awkward combination of two auxiliary verbs, bi and gāi. HS has fēi tōngzhì bùkē 非統治不可 (“must reign,” “have no other choices but reign”). The WV has gài Jīdū zhī chéngquán yē 蓋基督之棄權也 (“therefore it is Christ's reign”), rendering the verb phrase with a noun.

34 MOR has gài qì dāng wáng 蓋其當王 (“hence he becomes king”).
Here, an auxiliary verb such as bi, yào or bixū is necessary to translate the Greek catenative construction, δεῖ + infinitive (see 5.3.1.4). The IDVC xiàquⅱ is ideal here because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect and the more heavily marked present tense-form.

Many versions have bā(šì)...qūfū 把(/使) • • 屈伏 (“have...subdued,” BT, CNT, HSC, SB, TCV), while others have it more literally, bā...fāng(/chūzhī) 把 • • 放(/处置) (“place,” “put,” PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, ZHU, LÜ, NCV, CRV, RCUV) or jiāng...zhí 將 • • 置 (“put,” HS). The shift in tense-form from the present (βασιλέων) to aorist justifies the preference for the aspect marker -le instead of the o morpheme, which is found in most Mandarin versions. The aspect marker -le better reflects the perfective aspect signaled by the aorist tense-form in Greek.

καταργεῖται (v. 26; cf. v. 24) Here, morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes are not an option, because expressions such as huīmiè-zhe or zài huīmiè are ungrammatical. Most versions use disyllabic verbs such as huīmiè 毁滅 (“destroy,” PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, HSC, SB, TCV, NCV, DCT), xiāomiè 消滅 (“eliminate,” ZHU, CNT), qīngchū 清除 (“eliminate,” HS), fèichū 廢除 (“abolish,” CRV), or jiānmiè (“annihilate,” CLB) with the o morpheme, which reflect the imperfective aspect of the Greek present tense-form. Some versions use passive construction formed by particles such as bèi (SJ, WV, JOHNM, ZHU, LÜ, SB), suō 所 (PK, UV, WANG, BT, HSC), or jiàn 見 (BCV), which are appropriate here.35 The addition of yào (TCV, NCV, CLB, CNT) is not preferable, since auxiliary verbs in Chinese are reserved for translating the Greek non-indicative moods.

35 For discussions of the passive construction in Mandarin, see the commentary on σταυρωθῇ (John 19:16a) in chapter 6.
The verb phrase, *shī...fū* 使・・・伏（"subdue"）or *jiào...fū* 叫・・・服（"submit," JOHNM, UV, WANG, ZHU, NCV, CRV) with the ø morpheme is preferable to more heavily marked disyllabic verbs such as *shùnǐ fū* 顺服（"submit," LÜ), *qū fū* 屈伏（"submit," BT, CNT, HSC, SB, TCV), or *guī fū* 归服（"surrender," MSV, PK) for the aorist. Some add temporal adverbs such as *yǐ*（"already," GÜ, HS) and *chéng*（"ever," BCV) to the verb as a way to convey a past event. A few other versions add auxiliary verbs such as *yào* (CLB) and *bì* (DV), which are not preferable for the translation of the indicative mood in Greek. Still, the shift in tense-form from the present (καταργεῖται, v. 26) to aorist justifies the use of the aspect marker -le instead of the ø morpheme, which is found in most Mandarin versions.

In vv. 27–28, Paul uses the repetition of different verb forms of ὑποτάσσω to strengthen his argument: four aorists (*ὑπέταξεν*, *ὑποτάξαντος*, *ὑποτάγη*, *ὑποτάξαντι*), one perfect (*ὑποτάσσασθαι*), and one future (*ὑποταγήσεται*). See the discussions on each occurrence below.

εἴτη The aorist subjunctive is best translated by *shuō*（"say"）with the ø morpheme (e.g. MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, LÜ, SB, NCV, TCV, CLB, CRV, CPB), since there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. Here, for stylistic reasons, an auxiliary verb may not be preferable.

ὑποτάσσασθαι Some Mandarin versions use the perfective -le (UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, LÜ, SB, NCV, CRV, RCUV), while a few others use the ø morpheme (MSV, PK, JOHNM, HS, CNT, CPB), RVCs (xià, HSC), or simply omit it from the translation (TCV, CLB). The four-character set phrase *gān-fù-xià-fēng*（"submit"）is preferable here not only because the ø morpheme reflects the stative aspect of the perfect tense-form, but
also because it corresponds to the discourse function as the frontgrounding device in Greek.

υποτάξαντος/υποτάξαντι (vv. 27–28) Like υπέταξεν above, these two aorist participles may be translated by the same verb form zhīfù-le in Mandarin because there are shifts in tense-form from the perfect (υποτέτοκτα) to aorist and from the future (υποταγήσεται) to aorist.

υποταγῆ (v. 28) In contrast to the three aorists noted above, this verb form is a passive subjunctive. RVCs such as xià (HSC) and zhù are preferable to -le (UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, LÜ, NCV, CRV) mainly for stylistic reasons. The particle bèi is used here to indicate passive voice in Mandarin.

CLB and SB add the temporal adverb yíhòu 以後 (“after”) at the end of the clause to indicate a subsequent action, whereas the majority of Mandarin versions have shí 時 or de shí(hòu) 的時(候) (“at that time when,” e.g. PK, UV, JOHNM, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, LÜ, NCV, TCV, CRV, CPB), denoting a simultaneous action. The context suggests that the latter is preferable.

υποταγήσεται Auxiliary verbs such as bi (JOHNM, HS, LÜ, WV), jiāng (CPB), or yào (MSV, PK, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, SB, TCV, NCV, CRV, RCUV) are preferable additions to the verb to translate the Greek future form. Passive constructions formed by particles such as shòu (WV, HS) are acceptable, but not absolutely necessary.

Ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσασιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; εἰ ὁλος νεκρῶι οὐκ ἐγείρονται, τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν; Τί καὶ ἰμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν πάσαν
Otherwise, what would happen to those who were baptized on behalf of the dead? If indeed the dead are not raised, why are people baptized on their behalf? Why are we endangering ourselves at every hour? (Brothers and sisters), I die everyday! This means that I swear by your boasting which I have in Christ Jesus.

\(\text{βαπτιζόμενοι/βαπτίζονται} \) (v. 29; see, also, discussions in chapter 2)

Morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes, while grammatically acceptable, are not preferable here. Most wenli and Mandarin versions have \((\text{ling})\text{shòu xílí} \) (领受洗) (“receive the baptismal rite,” e.g. MOR, GÜ, DV, BCV, MSV, PK, BB, JOHNM, SJ, UV, UVW, UVE, WANG, CNT, HS, HSC, LÜ, SB, CLB, TCV, NCV, RCUV) or \(\text{lingxí} \) (lit. “get a wash,” SL-MOR, MOR, GURY, WV, CPB) with the \(\circ\) morpheme. The disyllabic \(\text{xílí} \) is preferable to simply \(\text{xí} \) (“wash,” “bathe”) for the

---

36 The word \(\text{άδελφοί} \) is supported by several major uncials, including K A B K P, but omitted in G6 D F Ψ. Ellingworth and Hatton think that it is strange here because elsewhere Paul uses \(\text{άδελφοί} \) to introduce a new theme. See Ellingworth and Hatton, Handbook, 309.

37 Ellingworth and Hatton note that \(\text{τί πνεύματος} \) might be understood in terms of “what possible reason can those people have.” Ellingworth and Hatton, Handbook, 308. Compare Thiselton, who interprets the future as a “logical present,” “what do people think they are doing.” Thiselton, Commentary, 1241.
imperfective aspect of the Greek present participle. ZHU has shìxí (lit. “give someone a wash”), which does not reflect the passive form of the Greek. Baptist versions use shòujìn (lit. “receive the immersion rite,” GÜ 1840, BT, UVB, CRV) or shòuzhàn (lit. “be dipped,” MAR, CSV).

ἀγείρονται  See example (31) in 5.4.2.

κινδυνεύομεν (v. 30) Most Chinese versions have màoxiān (SL-MOR, DV, GURY, MSV, PK, JOHN, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, LÜ, SB, TCV, CRV, NCV, RCUV) with the ø morpheme. To reflect the more heavily marked present tense-form in Greek, the two-morpheme aspect compound zài...-zhe may be used. A few Mandarin versions, on the other hand, employ four-character set phrases with the ø morpheme, for example, zì-tòu-wéi-xiàn (lit. “throw oneself into danger,” HSC) and lín-wéi-lū-xiàn (lit. “face deadly peril and meet with danger,” HS). Similarly, the CPB has the paraphrased expression zhàn-zhàn-jīng-jīng shēnghuó (lit. “live with extreme caution”) with the heavily marked four-character set phrase zhàn-zhàn-jīng-jīng, denoting “trembling with fear.” Four-character set phrases are not preferable here because they are reserved for translating the frontgrounding tense-forms (i.e. perfect and pluperfect) in Greek.

ἀποθνῄσκω (v. 31) Most Chinese versions use disyllabic verbs such as māōsī (“risk one’s life,” lit. “risk death,” MSV, PK, JOHN, JOHN, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, SB, NCV, RCUV) or chāngsī (lit. “taste death,” GURY) with the ø morpheme, which are preferable to the less heavily marked monosyllabic verb sī (“die,” SL-MOR, LÜ, CRV) for the Greek present tense-form. As Liu has pointed out, the addition of shì (“be”)
to the front of màoši (UV, WANG, ZHU, BT) is redundant. Similarly, the shi...de construction (HSC, SB, NCV) is not preferable here either, because the construction is reserved for translating periphrastic constructions in Greek. On the other hand, a few Mandarin versions use the aspect marker -zhe (CNT, TCV, CPB), which is preferable to the ø morpheme because it formally reflects the imperfective aspect of the Greek.

Another good option is zài, which may be used interchangeably with -zhe. For stylistic reasons, however, single aspect markers are preferable because the expression zài mào-zhe sǐ without the predicate sounds rather strange and repetitive in Mandarin, especially when the aspect compound has already been used in the previous sentence.

Also, the entire construction (HSC, SB, NCV) is not preferable here either, because the construction is reserved for translating periphrastic constructions in Greek. On the other hand, a few Mandarin versions use the aspect marker -zhe (CNT, TCV, CPB), which is preferable to the ø morpheme because it formally reflects the imperfective aspect of the Greek.

Another good option is zài, which may be used interchangeably with -zhe. For stylistic reasons, however, single aspect markers are preferable because the expression zài mào-zhe sǐ without the predicate sounds rather strange and repetitive in Mandarin, especially when the aspect compound has already been used in the previous sentence.

38 Liu 劉翼凌, “Notes,” 106.
If I fought with wild beasts like an ordinary man in Ephesus, what good is it to me? If the dead had not been raised, “Let us eat and drink! For tomorrow we will die.” Do not be deceived: “Bad company corrupts good character.” Wake up and do good; do not sin, because some still do not know God. I am saying this to your shame.

εἰρωμάχησα (v. 32) The verb ἄρσημα “fight with wild beast”) with -le is preferable to the ο morpheme found in most Mandarin versions (MSV, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, ZHU, CNT, BT, LÜ, HSC, HS, SB, CLB, TCV, CRV, NCV, CPB, DCT) because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist. The shift in tense-form from the present (ἔχω, v. 31) to the aorist also justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

The term ἄρσημα ("court of beast-fighting") is commonly used to refer to the Roman Colosseum in Mandarin. Most Chinese versions use the verb phrase yǔ( tong) yēshòu zhandòu (野獸戰鬥) with the ο morpheme ("do battle with beasts," e.g. BCV, BB, PK, JOHN, JOHNM, WANG, ZHU, BT, CRV). The verb “do battle” is expressed in several different ways, for example, bōdòu 搏鬥 (CNT, SB, CLB, NCV, RCUV), gédòu 格鬥 (WCV, HS, LÜ, TCV, CPB), dīzhàn 挖戰 (GÜ), jiāozhàn 交戰 (GÜ 1840), dòu 搏 (MAR, GO, SJ, UVW, UVB, UVE), or dí 敵 (MOR). The DV has gānsōu dōushòu zhī lànxìng 甘受鷄詐之匪刑 (lit. “endure willingly the abusive punishment of the beast-fighting”) while GURY translates it similarly, cēng shòu shōudòu xīng 曾受鷄刑 ("have once been punished by beast-fighting").

έγειρονται (cf. vv. 15–16, 29) The two-morpheme aspect compound -le-IDVC may be used here at the conclusion of the pericope (vv. 12–34) instead of the ο morpheme, which has been used to translate the previous three occurrences of the present passive verb. This
decision is made out of the following considerations. First, the shift in tense-form from
the aorist (ἐθνικούκχησα) to the present justifies the use of the aspect compound.
Second, it better reflects the imperfective aspect that is signaled by the present tense-form
in Greek. Third, the more marked present tense-form is used at a prominent place that
introduces an Old Testament quotation from Isa 22:13. Most Mandarin versions use the ø
morpheme (e.g. PK, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, HS, SB, TCV, CRV, NCV,
CPB), with the exception of LÜ, which uses IDVCs.

φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν The two aorist subjunctives are best translated by the
reduplicated verbs, chī-chī hē-hē 吃吃 (lit. “eat-eat-drink”), as many
Mandarin versions have done (e.g. UV, WANG, BT, CNT, HS, LÜ, TCV, CRV, NCV,
DCT, RCUV). The shift in tense-form from the present (ἐγείρονται) to aorist also
justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. A few other
versions, including most wenli versions, use the ø morpheme (e.g. SL-MOR, GÜ, DV,
GURY, MSV, PK, JOHNM, ZHU, HSC, SB, CPB).

ἀποθνῄσκομεν Here, morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes are
not an option, because expressions such as sī-zhe or zài sī are ungrammatical. Disyllabic
verbs such as zuògū 作古 (“die”) or sīwáng 死亡 (“die,” CNT) are preferable to
monosyllabic verbs sī (“die,” ZHU, HSC, LÜ) or zhōng 终 (“end,” MAR) with the ø
morpheme. Most versions add auxiliary verbs such as yào (MSV, JOHNM, UV, WANG,
BT, CNT, SB, TCV, CRV, NCV, RCUV) or jiāng (SL-MOR, MOR, MAR, GÜ, SJ, HS).
Because of αὐριον, such additions may be acceptable here. However, the expression, shì
yào sī de le (PK) is not preferable because the shì...de construction is reserved for the
translation of the Greek periphrastic construction.
\[\text{πλανός} \ (v. 33) \quad \text{Most Mandarin versions add auxiliary verbs such as } \text{yào (e.g. MSV, UV, WANG, BT, HSC, TCV, CLB, NCV, CRV) or } \text{kē (PK, JOHNM, SB) to the verb with the } \emptyset \text{ morpheme. Such an addition is not absolutely necessary here. Disyllabic verbs such as } \text{zīqǐ 自欺 ("deceive," PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, NCV), } \text{míhuò 迷惑 ("confuse," CRV) or } \text{yúnmòng ("fool," TCV) are preferable to monosyllabic verbs such as } \text{wù 請 ("mislead," SB). The expression, } \text{shòu-piàn-shàng-dàng 受騙上當 ("be made a fool of," CPB), is not preferable because four-character set phrases are reserved for translating the stative aspect in Greek. However, the passive construction formed by the particle } \text{shòu is preferable for the passive voice of the Greek.}
\]

\[\text{φθείρουσιν} \quad \text{Morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes, while grammatically acceptable, are not preferable in this context. The disyllabic verb } \text{bàihuài ("corrupt," e.g. PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, CNT, LÜ, TCV, CRV) with the } \emptyset \text{ morpheme is preferable to monosyllabic verbs such as } \text{huài 坏 ("ruin," SL-MOR, MOR, BCV, GURY), } \text{bài 敗 ("decay," MAR, GÜ, WV), or } \text{sàng 丧 ("lose," DV, MSV) for the present tense-form in Greek. ZHU has shi } \text{bàihuài shánxing de 是敗壞善行的 ("is what corrupts good deeds"), which is not preferable because the } \text{shi...de construction is reserved for the translation of the Greek periphrastic construction. Similarly, the addition of } \text{shi ("be") to the verb, found in some early Mandarin versions (e.g. PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT), and auxiliary verbs such as } \text{huì (NCV, CPB), } \text{bì (WV), } \text{yào ("will," MSV), or } \text{dé ("get," GÜ 1840) do not correspond to the indicative mood in Greek.}
\]

\[\text{ἐκνύπατε} \ (v. 34) \quad \text{The monosyllabic verb } \text{wù 醒悟 ("awaken") with the } \emptyset \text{ morpheme is preferable to disyllabic verbs such as } \text{xīngwù 醒悟 ("come to realize," PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, BT, SB, TCV) or } \text{xīngwù 省悟 ("come to realize," HSC). However, RVCs such}
as guōlái (LÜ, CLB, NCV, CRV) or lái are preferable to the ø morpheme because they formally reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist. The shift in tense-form from the present (φθείρουσιν) to aorist also justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. On the other hand, the aspect marker -zhe (MSV, CPB) is not preferable because it expresses the stative aspect in Mandarin. Auxiliary verbs such as yīngdāng/dāng (PK, JOHNM, SJ, LÜ, SB), yào (MSV, UV, WANG, BT, HSC, TCV, CRV, RCUV), or gāi are necessary here to render the Greek subjunctive used in commands.

μη ἀμαρτάνετε Two Catholic versions, SB and CLB, have buryào/bié zài fānzuì le 不要/別再犯罪了, denoting “do not continue/stop sinning,” which reflects the Aktionsart-based understanding of the Greek present tense-form in the context of prohibitions (see discussions in chapter 5; cf. ESV, TNIV). 39 Most Mandarin versions have buryào fānzuì (“do not sin,” PK, JOHMN, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, TCV, CRV, NCV), which is preferable here. The MSV uses the perfective aspect -le, which is not preferable because it does not reflect the aspect of the Greek.

ἐχουσίν The aspect marker -zhe is preferable to the ø morpheme (e.g. shí, “are,” LÜ, CPB, CRV) because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect which is signaled by the present tense-form in Greek.

λαλῶ The marker zài is preferable to the ø morpheme (shuō, “say,” e.g. MSV, PK, UV, ZHU, HSC, LÜ, SB, NCV, CPB, RCUV) because it morphologically expresses the imperfective aspect of the Greek present tense-form.

39 The ESV has “do not go on sinning,” whereas the TNIV has “stop sinning.”
7.2.3. The Resurrection of the Body (vv. 35–49) 論軀體復活

This pericope may be divided into two sub-sections (vv. 35–41, 42–49). Smaller discourse boundaries, as noted in 7.1.2, are marked by the conjunctive οὐτῶς καί (v. 42). Paul uses the aorist tense-forms to lay down assumptions regarding the nature of resurrection (vv. 36, 38, 49). He employs the present tense-form to call attention to a number of significant details: the Corinthians’ denial of the resurrection of the body (v. 35), the analogies of plant organisms (vv. 36–38) and inanimate objects (v. 41), the application of the analogy of the plant organism to the resurrected body (vv. 42–44), and the contrast between the natural and spiritual body (v. 45). He utilizes a perfect tense-form to introduce the Old Testament quotation to highlight the contrast between the natural and spiritual body (v. 45).

'Ἀλλὰ ἐρεῖ τις· πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροὶ; ποῖῳ δὲ σῶματι ἔρχονται; ἄφρων, σὺ δ ο σπείρεις οὐ ζωοποιεῖται ἔὰν μὴ ἀποθάνῃ· καὶ δ σπείρεις, οὐ τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενησόμενον σπείρεις ἀλλὰ γυμνὸν κόκκον εἰ τύχοι σίτου ἢ τίνος τῶν λοιπῶν· ὁ δὲ θεὸς διδωσιν αὐτῷ σῶμα καθὼς ἠθέλησεν, καὶ ἕκαστῳ τῶν σπερμάτων ἰδίου σῶμα. (15:35–38)

有人會問：「死人是如何復活呢？是以什麼樣的軀體過來呢？」糊塗人，你所播種的要不死去，就無法救活了起來。更何況你所播種的，不是播種那將來有的軀體，而是子粒，說不定是麥子，或是其他穀類。然而 神隨意賜給它身軀，及給各等穀粒其軀體。

Yóurèn huì wèn, “Sirèn shì rúhé fúhuò ne? Shìyì shènmeyàng de qūtí guòlái ne?”

Hútú rèn, nǐ suǒ bōzhòng de yào bù sǐ-qù, jiù wúfā bèi jiù-le-qīlái. Gèng hékuāng nǐ suǒ
bōzhòng de, bù shì bōzhòng nà jiānglái yǒu de qūǐ, érshì zhǐlì, shuō bù-dīng shì màiizi, huòshì qítā gūlèi. Rán’ér Shén suǐyì shàngcì gěi tā shěnqū, jí gěi gèdēng gūlǐ qí qūǐ.

Some may ask, “How are the dead raised? With what kind of body are they coming?” Foolish people, if what you sow has not died, it is not made alive. Also, what you are sowing, is not the body that will be, but a grain, which might be of wheat or of some other grain. But God is giving it a body according to his wishes, and to every grain its own body.

ἐρεῖ (v. 35) Auxiliary verbs such as οὖ (BT, HSC, CRV), and ὑι (LÜ, NCV, RCUV) are necessary additions to the verb to convey the sense of expectation of the future form.

ἐγείρονται (see also vv. 42-44) As in its previous occurrences (vv. 15–16, 29, 32), this present form is translated into Mandarin by the verb fūhuó (“come back to life,” “resurrect”) with the o morpheme. This helps to establish textual cohesion to the previous pericope (vv. 12–34) where the same Greek verb form is used.

ἐρχονται Morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes, while grammatically acceptable, are not preferable in this context. PK and JOHM use the RVC zhào (dé-zhào, “get”), which does not reflect the imperfective aspect signaled by the present tense-form. Most Mandarin versions use monosyllabic verbs such as lái ("come," UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, HS, LÜ, CRV) or yǒu ("have," TCV) with the o morpheme. Disyllabic verbs such as huílái 回來 ("return," HSC) and guólái 過來 ("come over") with the o morpheme are preferable to monosyllabic verbs because they better reflect the more heavily marked Greek present tense-form. Some of these versions also add auxiliary verbs such as yào (LÜ, NCV) or hui (TCV), apparently to convey the
future-referring present tense-form, which are not suitable additions for translating the indicative mood in Greek.40

στείρεις (vv. 36–37) Just as for ἐρχόμενοι (v. 35), morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes are not an option here. Disyllabic verbs such as bōzhòng ("sow," CNT, SB) or gēngzhòng （栽種 "till," CPB) with the ə morpheme are preferable to the monosyllabic verb zhòng ("plant," PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC, LÜ, CRV, NCV, RCUV) with the ə morpheme because they better reflect the more heavily marked present tense-form in Greek.

ζῳοποιεῖται (v. 36; cf. ζῷοποιήσονται in v. 22) Some versions have shēng 生 ("live," UV, WANG, HS, CRV), fāyá 发芽 ("sprout," CPB), or huó 活 ("live," PK) with the ə morpheme. Others use the IDVC qǐlái (ZHU, BT, LÜ), which is preferable to the ə morpheme because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect of the present tense-form in Greek. The MSV and SB, on the other hand, use the RVC chūlái, which is not preferable because it expresses the perfective aspect. Several versions add auxiliary verbs such as néng (UV, ZHU, BT, CNT, HS, HSC, CLB, CRV, NCV, RCUV) or dé (JOHNM, LÜ, SB), which are not preferable for translating the indicative mood in Greek. However, the expression bèi jiù-le-qǐlái ("be made alive") is ideal here because the two-morpheme aspect compound -le-IDVC establishes a better contrast to the aorist (ἀποθάνη) that follows.

_auxiliary verbs such as yào or bì/bīxū (WV, CPB) are preferable here for rendering the sense of projection that is grammaticalized by the subjunctive verb form in Greek. The monosyllabic verb sī ("die") with either the RVC qǜ ("go," LÜ, CLB, NCV)

40 See 4.2.2.2, pp. 185–87 above for the discussion of the Greek present tense-form used for future reference.
or -le (MSV, BT, HSC, SB, TCV) is preferable to the ø morpheme (PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, CNT, CRV, RCUV) because it formally reflects the perfective aspect of the Greek aorist tense-form. The shift in tense-forms from the present (ζηγονοιεται) to aorist also justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme.

tὸ γενηρόμενον (v. 37) The articular future participle is used here as a predicate to the noun τὸ σῶμα, thus it is translated most frequently by shì jiānglái de/zī 是將來的/之 (“that is coming in the future,” e.g. GURY, PK, JOHNM, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CRV).

eἰ τύχοι This aorist optative with the conditional marker eἰ may be formally understood as “if it should chance” or “if it should turn out that way.” This expression is generally understood as an adverb meaning “perhaps,” as some Mandarin versions (dàgāi shì 大概是, “probably,” yēxǔ shì 也许是, “maybe,” CRV, NCV) have.41 Several Mandarin versions use the conjunctive huòshì 或是 (“or,” e.g. JOHNM, ZHU, CNT, HSC, LÜ) with no attempt to provide a formal translation of the Greek. However, the expression shuō bu -dìng is an ideal choice here for three reasons. First, it translates τύχοι as a verb (shuō, “speak”). Second, it contains the RVC dìng (“fix”), which reflects the perfective aspect signaled by the aorist tense-form. Finally, since in modern speech shuòbùdìng is used beyond its literal sense to express contingency, it is unnecessary to add an auxiliary verb such as kēnèng (“be possible”), huì (“can,” “shall”), or déyī (“be able to,” “so that . . . may”), which is often the case (see 5.2.2).

καθώς ἥθελησεν (v. 38) The Greek verb form here cannot simply be translated by a monosyllabic verb with the ø morpheme in Mandarin. Most versions use expressions

---

41 See, for example, Fee, First Epistle to the Corinthians, 781, 665 n. 35; Thiselton, Commentary, 1264; BDAG, s.v. It contains only the protasis of a fourth class conditional clause (see 5.4.5, pp. 291–93 above).
such as zhào(zhe)/suí(zhe) zìjī de yìsī 照(著)/随(著)自己的意思 (“according to one’s wishes,” UV, WANG, HSC, LÜ, SB, CLB, NCV, CRV, RCUV),\(^{42}\) or suíyì (“as one pleases,” SL-MOR, MOR, MAR, GÜ 1840, DV, GURY, MSV, PK, JOHNM, ZHU, BT, CNT).\(^{43}\) Considering the less heavily marked aorist tense-form, suíyì with the 0 morpheme is preferable.

\[\text{Où πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐ ᾗ αὐτὴ σὰρξ ἄλλα ἄλλη μὲν ἀνθρώπων, ἄλλη δὲ σὰρξ κτηνῶν, ἄλλη δὲ σὰρξ πτηνῶν, ἄλλη δὲ ἰχθύων, καὶ σῶματα ἐπουράνια, καὶ σῶματα ἐπίγεια· ἄλλα ἐτέρα μὲν ἢ τῶν ἐπουρανίων δόξα, ἐτέρα δὲ ἢ τῶν ἐπιγείων. ἄλλη δόξα ἡλίου, καὶ ἄλλη δόξα σελήνης, καὶ ἄλλη δόξα ἀστέρων· ἀστὴρ γὰρ ἀστέρος διαφέρει ἐν δόξῃ. (15:39–41)\]

凡肉体皆各有不同：人是一樣，獸又是一樣，鳥是一樣，魚又是各不一樣。接
下來有天體，地物；但天體之光輝是一樣，地物之光輝又是另一樣。日有日的榮
光，月有月的榮耀，星有星的榮華。此星和彼星的榮華，皆有別。

Fán ròutì jìe gē yǒu bùtóng: rén shì yǐyàng, shòu yōu shì yǐyàng, niǎo shì yǐyàng, yú yōu shì líng yǐyàng. Jiéxiálái yǒu tiāntí, diwǔ; dàn tiāntí zhī guānghuī shì yǐyàng, diwǔ zhī guānghuī yǒu shì líng yǐyàng. Rì yǒu rì de róngguāng, yuè yǒu yuè de róngyào, xīng yǒu xīng de rónghuá. Čì xīng hé bǐ xīng de rónghuá, jiē yōubié.

Not all flesh is the same; there is one kind for humans, another for animals, another for birds, and another for fish. There are also heavenly bodies and earthly bodies, but the glory of the heavenly bodies is of one kind, and the glory of the earthly bodies is of another. The sun has its glory, the moon has its glory, and the stars have their glory. This star and that star differ in their glory.

\(^{42}\) SB has xīnyì 心意 (“intention”) rather than yìsī.

\(^{43}\) GURY has suí ji yì 随意意 (“according to one’s wishes”) instead of suíyì.
διαφέρει (v. 41)  Here, morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes are not an option. Several expressions are used: (恪)yóu bùtóng (各)有不同 (“each has its own difference,” PK, JOHN, ZHU), yóu fēnbìé 有分别 (“have difference,” UV, WANG, BT, CNT, HSC, SB, CRV), yóu chābìé 有差別 (“have difference,” LÙ), and bù xiāngtóng 不相同 (“not the same,” CLB, CPB). Here, although the ə morpheme is the only option, disyllabic verb phrases such as yǒubié (“differ”) are preferable to adjectives such as bùtóng 不同 (“different,” NCV). 


Oútwos kai ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, ἐγείρεται ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ. σπείρεται ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δόξῃ. σπείρεται ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δυνάμει. σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν. ἐστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐστιν καὶ πνευματικόν. (15:42-44)


死人復活也是如此。所播種的是必朽的，所復活的則是不朽的；所播種的是恥辱的，所復活的卻是榮耀的；所播種的是懦弱的，所復活的乃是強健的；所播種的是屬氣的肢體，所復活的是屬靈的軀體。若有血氣之身，也有靈性之體。

Sirén fūhuó yēshí rúcí. Suǒ bōzhòng de shì bìxiù de, suǒ fūhuó de zéshí bùxiù de; suǒ bōzhòng de shì chìrú de, suǒ fūhuó de quēshí róngyáod de; suǒ bōzhòng de shì nuòruò de, suǒ fūhuó de nǎishi qiángjìng de; suǒ bōzhòng de shì shǔ qí de zhītǐ, suǒ fūhuó de shì shǔ líng de qūtǐ. Ruò yǒu xiéqí zhī shēn, yě yǒu lǐngxìng zhī tǐ.


So is it with the resurrection of the body. What is sown is perishable, what is raised is imperishable; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual body.

ἀνάστασις (v. 42)  See v. 12.
In this sub-section (vv. 42–49), this present tense-form is repeated four times in connection with ἐγείρεται. The verb bözhòng with the ο morpheme is used consistently for each occurrence.

Paul repeats this present tense-form five times along with σπείρεται in this sub-section. The verb fūhuó (“come back to life,” “resurrect”) with the ο morpheme is repeatedly used here out of discourse and stylistic considerations. First, it helps to establish textual cohesion to the previous pericopes in which the same Greek verb form also occurs (vv. 15–16, 29, 35). Second, the ο morpheme is preferable because there is no shift in tense-form to justify the use of the formally expressed imperfective aspect morphemes. Third, the disyllabic verb with the ο morpheme is stylistically a better choice because it mirrors the other present tense-form that is also used in the repetition.

οὗτος καὶ γεγραμμένον ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπος Ἁδὰμ εἰς ψυχήν ζώσαν, ὁ ἑσχατος Αδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. ἀλλ' οὐ πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικόν ἀλλὰ τὸ ψυχικόν, ἔπειτα τὸ πνευματικόν. ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπος ἐκ γῆς χοῖκός, ὁ δεύτερος ἀνθρώπος εἰς οὐρανοῦ. (15:45–47)

經上記著說，「頭一個人亞當初成了活著的人」，最後的亞當竟成了使人活起來的神靈。然而屬靈不在先，是屬血氣在先。後來才有屬靈。第一人來自於紅塵；第二人出自於天。

It is written in the scriptures, “The first man, Adam, became a living person.” The last Adam became the life-giving spirit. But the spiritual does not come first but the physical. The spiritual comes later. The first man was from the dust of the earth; the second man is from heaven.

γέγραπται (v. 45) See example (17) in 4.2.4.2.44

dέντο Several earlier Chinese versions follow the KJV by rendering it with shòu zào wéi 受造為 (“was made,” SL-MOR, MOR, MAR, PK, JOHN, JOHNM, cf. TEV, TCV) with the φ morpheme, while most versions have chéngwéi/wéi 成為/為 (“become,” GO, BCV, GURY, CPB), and chéng (“become,” GÜ 1840) with the φ morpheme, or chéng-le (UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, LÜ, SB, CRV, NCV, RCUV) with the perfective aspect marker -le. The aspect marker -le is preferable to the φ morpheme because it formally reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist. Also, the shift in tense-form from the perfect (γέγραπται) to aorist justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. This verb is not translated in the DV.

ψυχήν ζῶσαν This phrase is expressed in at least a dozen different ways in Chinese: huó(de)/(shēng) hún 活的/(生)魂 (“living soul,” SL-MOR, MOR, HS, CRV), huó-zhe de hún 活著的魂 (“living soul,” BT), huó/(shēng) líng 活/(生)靈 (“living spirit,” MAR, GÜ 1840, BCV, SB), xièqi zhi hún 血氣之魂 (“living soul,” GURY), xièqi zhi/(de) rén/(huózhé) 血氣之/(的)人/(活著) (“living person,” DV, GO, SJ, TRNT, MSV, PK, JOHNM), huóde xièqi rén 活的血氣人 (lit. “living person that is alive,” LÜ), yǒu huó qì de rén 有活氣的人 (“person with living ‘chi’/spirit,” ZHU), yǒu xièrōude shēngming 有血肉的生命 (“life of flesh and blood,” HSC), jùyǒu xièrōude shēngming de huó rén 具有

44 See Ellingworth and Hatton, who recommend the translation “it is written in the Scriptures.” Ellingworth and Hatton, Handbook, 318.
血肉生命的活人（"living person with flesh and blood," CPB), 有生命的人（"living person," CNT, CLB, TCV, NCV, RCUV), and 有灵的活人（"living person with spirit," UV, WANG). Ricci translates ψυχή by linghún 灵魂 or hún 魂, both of which are used in Chinese philosophy to denote "soul." Here, huó rén（"living person"）is preferable because it is a closer lexical translation of the Greek. The aspect marker -zhe is preferable to the ø morpheme because it formally reflects the imperfective aspect that is signaled by the present participle in Greek.

Several terms are used in Chinese (and Japanese) versions to translate πνεῦμα in this context: fēng 風（"wind," SL-MOR, MOR, MAR), Shén（"God," Ricci, GÜ, DV, MSV, JOHN, CNT, HSC, SB); ling 精（"spirit," GO, BCV, SJ, PK, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, HS, LÜ, TCV, CRV, NCV, RCUV, TRNT, RAGUET, JCV, CBT), shénling 精神（"spirit," CPB), shénling（"divine spirit," WV), and zhǔ 主（"Lord," CLB). In this context, shénling is preferable because it contains the character Shén（"God"）with reference to Christ’s divinity.

The earliest documented reference to the Holy Spirit in Chinese may be traced back to the seventh–ninth centuries, when Nestorian and Manichaean missionaries were active in China. The Nestorians used several different terms, including Yuán fēng 元風（"original wind"），Xuánfēng 玄風（"abstruse wind"），Jīngfēng 淨風（"pure wind"），and a transliterated term from the Syriac ḫ̄ūḵē ḫ̄ātāb，lúhé ningjùshā 虐訶寧俱沙 or simply lúhé（see chapter 2). Their contemporaries, the Manichaeans, adopted the term fēng（"wind"）: qīngjìng wéimiào fēng 清浄微妙風（"pure and delicate wind"）or jīngfā

---

45 Ricci, T'ien-chu Shih-i, 166, line 163.
46 Ricci uses the expression hún nài Shén yè 魂乃神也（"a soul is a spirit"). Ricci, T'ien-chu Shih-i, 166, line 164.
Like the Nestorians, the Manichaeans also used a transliterated term, *huó shíyùnnéng yù yuērlé* 活時領習 ("Living and Chosen Spirit") from the Middle Persian [wād žāwandag ud wīžidag].

From the seventeenth century onward, Catholic missionaries in China used the transliterated term *sibiliduō sānduō* 斯彼利多三多 (from the Latin *Spiritus Sanctus*).

Some versions have *ci shēngming* 賜生命 ("give life," PK, JOHNM, ZHU, BT, TCV, CRV, RCUV) or *jiào (shì) rén (shēng)huó* 叫(使)人生命 with the ø morpheme ("make one live," UV, WANG, HSC, LÜ, SB, NCV, MSV). Others use four-character set phrases such as *shǐyú shēngming* 施予生命 ("give life," CNT) or *ci rén lingming* 賜人靈命 ("give people life," CLB) with the ø morpheme. However, the IDVC *gilái* is preferable to ø morpheme because it morphologically reflects the imperfective aspect signaled by the present tense-form in Greek. HSC adds the auxiliary verb *néng*, which is not suitable for rendering the Greek indicative mood.


---


50 The MSV has *jiào rén fúhuó* 叫人復活 ("make one live again").
(“spiritual being,” WV), jīngshén zhī tǐ 精神之體 (“spiritual being,” CPB), and chāo zìrán tǐ 超自然體 (“supernatural being,” HS). Shū lǐng (“spiritual”) is preferable here because it is most commonly used in today’s Chinese-speaking churches.

ψυχικόν (see also ψυχήν in v. 45) This term is clearly used in contrast to πνευματικόν. Ricci uses xìngxìng 形性 (lit. “pertaining to the form”) to refer to ψυχικόν and shénxìng (“pertaining to God”) to πνευματικόν.51 This is followed by two Catholic versions, WV and CNT, which have jù xìngtí zhě 具形體者 (“one pertaining to the form,” WV) and wùzhí de 物質的 (“pertaining to the substance”). Ricci’s contemporaries, Francesco Sambiasi (1582–1649) and Paul Hsü (1562–1633), use the transliterated term Yánímá 亞尼瑪 (from Latin anima) in the Ling yan li shao 靈言蠡勺, which is explained by línghún 灵魂 (“soul”) and língxìng 灵性 (“spiritual”).52 This is followed by BT and CRV, which have shū hún de 屬魂的 (“spiritual”). Basset, however, uses shū chù zhě 屬畜者 (“one belonging to the animals,” SL-MOR, followed by MOR, MAR). Over a dozen Chinese versions have yǒu xiěqì 有血氣 (“pertaining to life,” GÚ), (shū) xiěqì zhě (de) (屬)血氣者 (的) (“pertaining to life,” GO, BCV, GURY, TRNT, PK, JOHNM, SJ, UV, WANG, ZHU, LÚ, NCV), qiěqì zhī tǐ 血氣之體 (“living being,” HS), (yǒu/shū) xiēróu de (有/屬)血肉的 (“of flesh and blood,” HSC, TCV, CLB, RCUV), or xiēróu zhī tǐ 血肉之體 (“being of flesh and blood,” CPB). SB has shū shēnglíng de 屬生靈的 (“of the living spirit”). Here, shū xiěqì (“pertaining to life”) is preferable to the other terms because it is a closer lexical translation of the Greek.

51 Ricci, T’ien-chu Shih-i, 150, lines 142.
52 Sambiasi and Hsü, Ling yan li shao, 1.
οἶος ὁ χοῖκός, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ χοῖκοί, καὶ οἶος ὁ ἐπουράνιος, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ ἐπουράνιοι· καὶ καθὼς ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοῖκοῦ, φορέσομεν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου. (15:48-49)

如同那位属尘埃的人一样，属尘埃者也是如此；就像那位属天堂的人一般，属天堂者也将如此。我们既有了属尘埃之形，将来也必有属天堂之态。

Rútóng nàwèi shǔ hóngchén de rén yǐyáng, zhòng shǔ hóngchén zhē yěshì rúcī; jiù xiàng nàwèi shǔ tiāntáng de rén yībān, zhòng shǔ tiāntáng zhē yē jiāng wéi rúcī. Wǒmen jī yǒu-le shǔ chén zhē zhī xíng, jiānglái yě bì yōu shǔ tiān zhē zhī tài.

Just like that man of dust, so are those who are of the dust. Just as that man of heaven, so will be those who are of heaven. Just as we bear the image of the man of dust, we will also bear the image of the man of heaven in the future.

ἐφορέσαμεν (v. 49) Many Chinese versions use monosyllabic verbs such as yōu (“have,” PK, JOHN, JOHNM, SJ, UV, WANG, CRV, RCUV), dài 戴 (“wear,” GO), or fū 負 (“carry on the shoulder,” GURY) with the ο morpheme.53 A few others use the imperfective -zhe (e.g. CNT, HSC), which does not reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist. The perfective -le (ZHU, BT, LÜ, TCV, NCV) is preferable to the ο morpheme because it morphologically reflects the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form in Greek. It also provides a better contrast to the future form that follows.

φορέσομεν Auxiliary verbs such as bì/biáo (PK, JOHN, JOHNM, SJ, UV, WANG, CNT, LÜ, CLB, CRV, NCV, RCUV), huì (TCV), yào (MSV, ZHU, BT, HSC, SB), and jiāng (GO, DV) are necessary additions for conveying the expectation of the future form.

53 GURY adds the temporal adverb céng (“ever”) to the verb, which is acceptable but not absolutely necessary.
However, the  φ morpheme (GO, DV, PK, JOHN, JOHNM, SJ, UV, WANG, ZHU, SB, TCV, CLB, CRV, NCV) is preferable to the aspect marker -zhe (BT, CNT, HSC, LÜ).

Many translators follow Ricci by using the term tiān/tiāntāng 天/天堂 for ouéravós/επούράνιος. For example, shū tiān de 屬天的 (“of heaven,” PK, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, LÜ, CLB, NCV, RCUV), shū/yú tiān zhē/bèi 屬(於)天者/輩 (“of heaven,” SL-MOR, GO, JOHNM, SJ, CNT, CRV), tiānshàng rén de 天上人的 (“of the one from heaven,” HSC), shū/yú tiānshàng 屬於天上 (“of the heaven,” SB), and cóng tiānshàng lǎi de rén 從天上來的人 (“of the one from heaven,” TCV). Shū tiān zhē (“of heaven”) is preferable here because it is a closer lexical translation of the Greek.

7.2.4. Victory over Death (vv. 50–57) 死被勝利吞滅

Paul uses the aorist tense-form to lay down assumptions regarding the inheritance of the kingdom of God (v. 50), the transformation of the perishables (v. 53), and the defeat of death (v. 54). He employs the present tense-form to call attention to a number of significant details: the perishables exempt from God’s inheritance (v. 50), the introduction to the revelation of a mystery (v. 51), and thanksgiving to God’s grace (v. 57). He utilizes a perfect tense-form to introduce the Old Testament quotation to highlight God’s victory over death (v. 53).

Τούτο δὲ φημι, ὄδελφοι, ὡς σάρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσας οὐ
dúnatα, οὐδὲ ἡ φθορά τῆς ἀφθαρσίας κληρονομεῖ. ἵδοι μυστήριον ὑμῖν λέγω·
pántes οὐ κοιμηθεσίομεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησίομεθα, ἐν ἀτόμῳ, ἐν ῥιπή
ὁφθαλμοῦ, ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σάλπιγγι· σαλπίσει γὰρ καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθοῦνται
ἀφθαρτοί καὶ ἦμεις ἀλλαγησίομεθα. (15:50–52)

Ricci uses tiāntāng diyù 天堂地狱 to refer to “heaven and earth.” See Ricci, T’ien-chu Shih-i, e.g. 322, line 379.
弟兄姊妹們，我告訴你們說，血肉之體不能夠得著 神的國；凡必朽者也絕不永沒有朽者。聽好！我告訴你們一個秘密：我們不將長眠，而皆必轉化—在霎那、眨眼之間，號角末回吹響的時候。號角要響，死人將復活成爲不朽者，我們就會轉變。

 Dixiōng jiēmiemen, wǒ gào sū nǐmen shuō, xiēròu zhī tǐ bù nénggòu dé-zháo Shén de guó; fān bìxiū zhě yē juébù chéngxí bùxiū zhě. Tīng-hǎo! Wǒ gào sū nǐmen yīge mǐmī: wǒmen bù jiāng chángmiàn, ér jiē bì zhuànhuà—zài shàna, zhāyǎn zhǐjiān, hàojiāo mòhuì chuīxiǎng de shíhòu. Hàojiāo yào xiǎng, sǐrén jiāng fūhuó chéngwéi bùxiū zhě, wǒmen jiù huí zhuǎnbiàn.

 Brothers and sisters, I tell you, flesh and blood are unable to inherit the kingdom of God. This also means that the perishable are unable to inherit the imperishable. Listen! I (shall) tell you a secret. We will not be sleeping, but will be changed, in a flash, in the twinkling of an eye, at the sound of the last trumpet. The trumpet will sound, the dead will be raised imperishable, and we will be changed.

 κληρονομήσαι οὗ δύναται (v. 50) Here, the auxiliary verb néng (SL-MOR, MOR, MAR, GÜ, GO, BCV, GURY, MSV, PK, JOHN, JOHNM, BB, UV, UVW, UVB, ZHU, WANG, BT, WV, CNT, HSC, LÜ, SB, TCV, CLB, CRV, NCV, RCUV) is added to the main verb to translate the Greek catenative construction, δύναται + infinitive (see 5.3.1.4). RVCs such as zháo ("be on target," MSV) are preferable to the φ morpheme (e.g. sī "inherit," MAR, GO; huò "obtain," SL-MOR, MOR; chéng "carry," WV; dé "get," PK, JOHN, JOHNM, BB, SJ), because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect signaled by the aorist tense-form in Greek (cf. δεῖ...βασιλεύειν, v. 25).
κληρονομεῖ The disyllabic verb *chengxi* ("inherit") with the *∅* morpheme is preferable to less heavily marked monosyllabic verbs such as *dé* ("get," PK, JOHN, JOHN, BB, SJ) or *huò* ("obtain," SL-MOR, MOR, MAR, GŪ) for translating the Greek present tense-form. The MSV uses the RVC *zhāo* (*dé-zhāo*, "gain"), which is not preferable because RVCs express the perfective aspect. Here, it is not possible to express the imperfective aspect in Mandarin by using IDVCs such as *qī* or *qīlái*, because *bù qī* always has the perfective meaning of "cannot afford" when used in a negative clause with verbs that are associated with spending, lifting, getting, or, in this case, inheriting.55

Most versions add auxiliary verbs such as *néng* (DV, GO, BCV, GURY, PK, JOHN, BB, SJ, UV, UVW, UVB, ZHU, WANG, BT, WV, CNT, HSC, LŪ, SB, TCV, CLB, CRV, NCV) or *kē* (GŪ), even though the Greek verb is in the indicative mood. The only exceptions are SL-MOR, MOR, and MAR, which have *fū huò* 弗獲 ("do not obtain"). As noted in 4.2.2.2 above, in order to differentiate the present tense-form from the future form, it is preferable not to use an auxiliary verb for translating the Greek future-referring present tense-form into Mandarin.

𝑖δοū (v. 51) See also the discussions on John 19:5 (cf. *ἰδε* in John 18:21).

As noted in chapter 6, *tīng-hāo* ("Pay attention!" "Listen up!") is preferable to other expressions such as *kàn(na)!* ("Behold!" BT, SB, CRV) because it better reflects the discourse function of the Greek to prompt the attention of the listener or reader.56 A few other versions have (*qǐng)*zhūyì (請注意 ("[please] pay attention," ZHU, LŪ) and

55 See, for example, Liu 劉月華 et al., *Directional Verb Complements*, 326–29.
56 See, for example, Ellingworth and Hatton, *Handbook*, 321; Collins and Harrington, *First Corinthians*, 580; Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 800.
xiànhò (“now,” CNT, HSC), which may be acceptable. Most Chinese versions do not translate this word.

λέγω  Morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes, while grammatically acceptable, are not preferable in this context. Disyllabic verbs such as ǧaősì (“tell,” PK, UV, ZHU, CNT, HS, SB, LÜ, NCV, CPB, RCUV) or ժհդիան (“direct,” “advise,” MSV) are preferable to monosyllabic ones because they better reflect the more heavily marked present tense-form in Greek.

κοιμήθησόμεθα (See also v. 6). In order to render the expectation of the Greek future form, auxiliary verbs such as yào (PK, JOHN, UV, WANG, BT, CNT, LÜ, CRV, RCUV), bi (ZHU, WV), hui (CPB), or jiāng (GO) are preferable. Only SB and BB do not use an auxiliary verb. The ø morpheme (e.g. yào shuí 要睡 “will sleep,” JOHN) is preferable to RVCs such as qu (“go,” CPB) and wán (“end,” MSV), and to the stative aspect marker -zhe (LÜ). The addition of shí 是 before the verb (e.g. PK, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, LÜ, CRV) is redundant. Here, jiāng ճանգճաճ (“will sleep/die”) closely corresponds to the future form in Greek.

άλαγησόμεθα (vv. 51, 52) Like the previous verb κοιμήθησόμεθα, the future form is preferably translated by auxiliary verbs such as yào (PK, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, HSC, LÜ, SB, TCV, CRV, NCV), bǐxū (JOHN, JOHN, SJ, BB, WV), or jiāng (SL-MOR, MOR, MAR, CPB). All of these versions use some variations of the monosyllabic verb biàn 變 (“change”) with the ø morpheme. The DV does not use an auxiliary verb here (huà 化, “change,” with the ø morpheme). The CNT uses the passive construction formed by the particle shòu (yào shòu gáibiàn 要受改變, “will be changed”), which is an optional addition. The MSV uses -le (dōu yào huà-le qù 都要化了去, “we will all
change”) for the first occurrence of ἀλλαγῆσομεθα, which is not preferable not only because it signals the perfective aspect, but also because the expression is ungrammatical in Mandarin.

σαλπίσει (v. 52) Similarly, the future form here may be represented by auxiliary verbs such as bi/biyào (MOR, MAR, GÜ, PK, JOHN, JOHNMM, BB, SJ, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, LÜ, CRV), yào (MSV, UV, WANG, BT, NCV, CRV, RCUV), or jiǎng (GO, UVE). The ø morpheme is preferable to IDVCs (e.g. xiǎng-qi 響起, “sound,” CPB) or RVCs (e.g. chuī-xiǎng 吹響, “blow a sound,” NCV, RCUV) because the future tense-form does not grammaticalize either the imperfective or perfective aspect in Greek. The expression shì biyào fāxiàng de 是必要發響的 (“is necessary to sound,” HSC) is not preferable because the shi...de construction is reserved for translating periphrastic constructions in Greek.

ἐγερθήσονται (see also v. 15) Jiāng fūhuó (“will be raised”), biyào fūhuó (“must be raised,” CNT, SB), or yào fūhuó (“will be raised,” UV, WANG, BT, TCV, CLB, CRV, NCV, RCUV) with the ø morpheme are preferable to the same verb form, fūhuó (shēng) (SL-MOR, MOR, PK, JOHN, JOHNMM, SJ) without auxiliary verbs. ZHU, HSC, and LÜ use the IDVC qílái, which is not preferable for the future form in Greek. Similarly, the RVC guólái (lit. “come over,” MSV) is not preferable because it expresses the perfective aspect in Mandarin.

dei γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν. ὅταν δὲ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσηται ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσηται ἀθανασίαν, τότε γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος-
κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νῖκος. ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ νῖκος; ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον; τὸ δὲ κέντρον τοῦ θανάτου ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἢ δὲ δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ νόμος: τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις τῷ διδόντι ἤμιν τὸ νῖκος διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

(15:53–57)

這必朽者必須換上不朽的，這必死者要換上不死的。當這必朽者既換上不朽的，及此必死者換上不死的時候，經上記著的話「死被勝利給吞掉了」就應驗了。「嗎呼死亡！你的勝利何在？你的螫針又在何處呢？」死的毒螯就是罪，罪的權勢就是律法。感謝 神，仗著我主耶穌基督恩賜我們勝利。


This perishable one must put on imperishability, and this mortal body must put on immortality. When this perishable one puts on imperishability, and this mortal body puts on immortality, these words that are written in the scriptures will be fulfilled: “Death is swallowed up in victory. Where, O death, is your victory? Where, O death, is your sting?” The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law. Thank God, who graciously gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.57

δὲ ἐνδύσασθαι (v. 53) Most Chinese versions use auxiliary verbs such as dāng (SL-MOR, MOR), yào (UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, HSC), bǐ/biyào (PK, BB, CRV), bìxū (WV, LŪ, SB, NCV, RCUV), and yīnggāi (CNT, CPB) to translate the catenative construction,

57 Thiselton calls Paul’s thanksgiving in v. 57 a “classic illocutionary speech-act…a verbal equivalent to throwing one’s arm around someone in gratitude.” Thiselton, *Commentary*, 1303.
δεῖ + infinitive (see also v. 25; 5.3.1.4). The auxiliary verb *jiāngyào* (JOHNM) is not preferable here because it contains the character *jiāng* ("will"), which is primarily used for translating the future form in Greek. The perfective aspect of the aorist infinitive may be rendered by the RVC *shāng* (e.g. BT, CNT, HSC, LÚ, SB, CRV, NCV, CPB).

ένδυσσαται (v. 54; see ἐνδύσσασσαμ above) The verb *huàn* ("change") with the RVC *shāng* that is used to translate ἐνδυσσασσαμ may be used here for both occurrences of the Greek.

γεγραμμένος (cf. γέγρασσαται, v. 45; see also example (17) in 4.2.4.2.)

κατεπόθη Most Chinese versions use disyllabic verbs such as *xiāomiè* 消滅 ("destroy," DV, MSV, PK, JOHN, JOHNM, BB, SJ, UVE, TCV), *tānmiè* 改滅 ("annex," GURY, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CNT, WV, LÚ, SB, CRV, NCV, RCUV),58 *mínmiè* 民滅 ("annihilate," SL-MOR, MOR, MAR), or *dábài* 打败 ("defeat," HSC) with the φ morpheme. RVCs such as *diào* are preferable to the φ morpheme because they morphologically reflect the perfective aspect of the aorist tense-form in Greek. Also, the shift in tense-form from the perfect (γεγραμμένος) to aorist also justifies the use of a formally expressed perfective aspect morpheme. The passive construction formed by the particle *bèi* used in most Chinese versions (except the three wenli versions, GÜ, DV, SJ) is preferable here.59

διδόντι (v. 57) Morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes, while grammatically acceptable, are not preferable here. Some versions use RVCs (e.g. *dé-zháo* 得著, ZHU) or -le (SB), neither of which reflects the aspect of the Greek. Disyllabic verbs such as *ēncì* ("graciously give") or *shāngcì* 賞賜 ("bestow," CNT) with the φ

58 The NCV adds *yǐng* ("already") to the front of the verb.
59 See the commentary on σταυροθῇ (John 19:16a) in chapter 6.
morpheme are preferable to monosyllabic verbs such as *ci* (SL-MOR, MAR, DV, GO, GURY, MSV, JOHNM, BT, HS, LÜ, CPB, NCV) or *dé* (CLB, TCV, CRV, RCUV) because they better represent the more marked present tense-form.

7.2.5. Conclusion (v. 58) 結論

In his conclusion, Paul makes his appeals to the believers by using two present tense-forms. He uses one perfective tense-form to emphasize that the believers know their toil is not in vain.

"Ωστε, ἀδελφοὶ μου ἀγαπητοί, ἐδραίοι γίνεσθε, ἀμετακίνητοι, περισσεύοντες ἐν τῷ ἐργῷ τοῦ κυρίου πάντοτε, εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ κόπος ύμῶν οὐκ ἔστιν κενὸς ἐν κυρίῳ. (15:58)

故此，我亲爱的朋友們，你們應當堅毅，不動搖，常竭力主事；因為眾所周知，你們的勞苦在主裏不是徒然的。

Therefore, my beloved brothers and sisters, be steadfast, immovable, and always do your utmost for the Lord’s work, because as we all know, your toil is not in vain in the Lord.

γίνεσθε  The present imperative is translated by auxiliary verbs such as *dāng/yīngdāng* (Gǲ, DV, PK, JOHNM, JOHN, SJ, UVE, BB, Lǲ), *yào* (CNT, HSC, SB, TCV, CPB), *wùyào* (MSV, UV, WANG, ZHU, BT, CLB, CRV, NCV, RCUV), or *yì* (MAR, GO, GURY), all of which are suitable here. Formally expressed aspect morphemes are not an option here because auxiliary verbs cannot take aspect morphemes in Mandarin.  

60 See 5.2.2.1.b, pp. 239–41 above.
περισσεύοντες For the present participle, it is preferable to use disyllabic verbs with the φ morpheme such as jiéli ("do one's utmost," WANG) or qínáo 劳 (“labor hard,” HSC) rather than four-character phrases such as fā-fèn-miǎn-lì 努力 (“strive with determined effort,” SB) or rè-xīn-fú-wù 热心服务 (“serve with zeal,” CNT), because four-character phrases are reserved for translating perfect and pluperfect tense-forms in Greek. The verb phrase, fènwèi de duō zuò 分外多做 (“do beyond one's duty,” ZHU), is not preferable here because it uses more characters than necessary.

eidóte (cf. John 18:4) The four-character set phrase zhòng-suǒ-zhōu-zhī with the φ morpheme is ideal here because it marks frontgrounded prominence in Mandarin and reflects the stative aspect of the perfect tense-form in Greek. This is an example of the causal use of the participle (see 5.3.2.2.e.β).

7.3. Conclusion

Following the same format as Table 6.2, Table 7.1 is a compilation of all Mandarin aspect morphemes used in the five representative Mandarin versions and FOLEY (the author’s own translation provided in this chapter) to translate the Greek verb forms in 1 Corinthians 15. The rates at which the given Mandarin aspect morphemes are employed are as follows: for the aorist, PK (93%), UV (95%), SB (96%), LÜ (87%), NCV (92%); for the present, PK (89%), UV (87%), SB (80%), LÜ (96%), NCV (87%); and for the perfect, PK (86%), UV (64%), SB (57%), LÜ (36%), NCV (57%). The average rates for accuracy in translating aspect in the five representative versions are as follows: PK (89.3%), UV (82%), SB (77.7%), LÜ (73%), and NCV (78.7%).

61 See Table 6.2, p. 407.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PERFECTIVE</th>
<th>IMPERFECTIVE</th>
<th>STATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LÜ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLEY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1. Summary of Greek tense-forms with their corresponding aspect morphemes used in 1 Corinthians 15 in the representative Mandarin versions
Most of the representative versions, with the exception of PK, use Mandarin aspect morphemes at slightly lower rates in Paul’s exposition of the resurrection than in John’s Passion narrative. The perfect tense-form has the lowest percentage of Mandarin aspect morphemes, because, as in John 18–19, these versions tend to use the perfective aspect marker -le (esp. NCV) or IDVCs (esp. LÜ) to render the stative aspect in Greek. As for the aorist tense-form, all five versions use the formally expressed perfective aspect morphemes more frequently in the exposition than in the narrative. This increase is especially evident in the NCV, which employs 54% of the morphologically expressed perfective morphemes (vs. 27% in John 18–19). However, only LÜ and SB more frequently utilize the morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes to translate the Greek present tense-form in 1 Corinthians 15. The other three Mandarin versions, on the other hand, use only the ø morpheme.

The data presented in Table 7.1 indicates that there is only a slight difference in the frequency with which monosyllabic and disyllabic verbs are used to translate the Greek present tense-forms (esp. PK, UV, NCV). The heavily marked two-morpheme imperfective aspect compounds are never used. None of these versions utilizes four-character set phrases for translating the most heavily marked perfective tense-form. As observed in the previous chapter, the translators of these sample versions have either deliberately, or more likely inadvertently, ignored aspect in relationship to grounding and markedness—either in Greek or Mandarin—and their critical functions at the discourse level.

In conclusion, several points should be mentioned. First, this chapter further supports the claim that, generally, when the ø morpheme is used, a monosyllabic verb is preferable
for translating the less heavily marked aorist tense-form in Greek, whereas a disyllabic verb is preferable for translating the more heavily marked present, and a four-character set phrase is preferable for translating the most heavily marked perfect tense-forms.

Second, discourse prominence and verbal aspect in the original Greek may be indicated grammatically in Mandarin. In general, frontgrounded prominence, which is formally marked by the perfect (and pluperfect, although it does not occur in 1 Corinthians 15) tense-form in Greek, may be translated in Mandarin by four-character set phrases with the ø morpheme. In contexts where four-character set phrases are not available to the translator, four-character verb phrases or two disyllabic verbs may be used instead. Also, for stylistic reasons, the stative aspect marker -zhe may be used as an alternative. As Tables 6.2 and 7.1 demonstrate, the frequency with which the ø morpheme (86% in 1 Corinthians 15 vs. 83% in John 18–19) and -zhe (14% in 1 Corinthians 15 vs. 17% in John 18–19) are used for translating the Greek perfect tense-form in the two sample passages is quite similar.

Foregrounded prominence, on the other hand, which is indicated by the present (and imperfect, although it does not occur in 1 Corinthians 15) tense-form in Greek, may be reflected by two-morpheme imperfective aspect compounds. The rate at which these aspect compounds are used in the two sample passages is almost identical (7% in 1 Corinthians 15 vs. 6% in John 18–19). This indicates that, in practice, the contexts in which the imperfective aspect compounds can be utilized in Mandarin are rather limited. However, as noted above, this limitation is compensated by the use of the more heavily marked disyllabic verbs as opposed to the less heavily marked monosyllabic ones.
The formally expressed perfective morphemes occur more frequently in 1 Corinthians 15 than in John 18–19 (73% in 1 Corinthians 15 vs. 52.5% in John 18–19). This difference may be explained by the greater repetition of verbs and the more frequent shift in tense-form in the exposition. This explanation may also account for the differences in the frequency with which single aspect morphemes are used in 1 Corinthians 15 and John 18–19: -le (16% vs. 15%), -guò (9% vs. 5.5%), RVCs (44% vs. 28%), and verb reduplication (4% vs. 3%). Two-morpheme perfective aspect compounds (cf. 1% in the narrative) are not used in the exposition because there is no repetition of exact verb forms (one following immediately after the other; e.g. ἐγέρεται ἐγέρεται, John 19:15). Similarly, the absence of disyllabic verbs with the φ morpheme (cf. 12% in the narrative) in the exposition can be explained by the greater number of verbs in John 18–19 that have no monosyllabic equivalent in Mandarin (e.g. κατάφερε, 18:9, 32; 19:24, 36).

In comparison to perfective aspect morphemes, the rates at which morphologically expressed imperfective aspect morphemes occur in these two passages are relatively similar (31% in 1 Corinthians 15 and 41% in John 18–19). These two passages also share a commonality: monosyllabic verbs with the φ morpheme are never used to translate the present tense-form in Greek. Besides the two-morpheme aspect compounds already noted, the frequency at which single aspect morphemes are used in 1 Corinthians 15 and John 18–19 may be compared further: IDVCs (9% vs. 0%), -zhe (11% vs. 25%), and zài (4% vs. 10%). Again, the greater repetition of the present tense-form (e.g. ἐγέρεται/ἐγέρεται) as well as the more frequent shift in tense-form in the exposition can account for these small but noticeable differences.
Third, as noted at the conclusion of chapter 6, the same conditions for justifying the use of formally expressed perfective aspect morphemes (e.g. shift in tense-form) apply to exposition. Fourth, auxiliary verbs should be primarily reserved for translating the non-indicative moods (including the future form) in Greek. Auxiliary verbs may also be used for translating the Greek catenative constructions (e.g. δὲίν + infinitive). Fifth, Greek periphrastic constructions may be consistently rendered by shi...de in Mandarin. Sixth, in general, figurative speech is translated formally. Seventh, in general, the repetition of Greek verb forms may be consistently represented in Mandarin at both the lexical and grammatical level. This means that the same verb in Mandarin with the same aspect morpheme may be used for each occurrence of the same Greek verb. Finally, when encountering key biblical terms, such as ἀνάγεσθαι, πνεῦμα, and χάρις, the translator should follow the conventions used in today’s Chinese Christian churches and maintain consistency throughout the Bible.

This dissertation is the first monograph-length attempt to integrate three independent subjects—translation theory, Mandarin aspect, and Greek aspect—for the purpose of formulating a working theory applicable to translating the New Testament from the original Greek into Mandarin. Its potential contributions to scholarship are outlined below.

In re-evaluating Nida’s theory, this dissertation asserts that formal and functional equivalence are powerful tools whose applicational values in the practice of translation are diminished when understood as simply mutually exclusive categories. Translating figurative speech formally, for example, can in fact better fulfill the conditions required by the principles of functional equivalence. It is argued that categories such as these are
helpful insofar as they guide the translator to make crucial decisions in rendering the Bible into Chinese more accurately and meaningfully, while at the same time preserving the unique character of the biblical text. This dissertation applies Catford’s theory, especially his commentary on translation shifts and grammatical and lexical translation, and extends it to the level of discourse. It is argued that in translating aspect, grammatical translation is preferable to lexical translation.

Aspect is treated here as a grammatical category—as opposed to Aktionsart—and is described as the locutionary agent’s subjective viewpoint expressed morphologically by a verb. For this reason, Porter’s tripartite model of aspect in Greek, defined in terms of binary oppositions [±perfective], and [+imperfective] vs. [+stative], is adopted. In Mandarin, morphologically expressed aspect morphemes grammaticalize the perfective (-le, -guò, RVCs, verb reduplication), imperfective (zài, -zhe, IDVCs), and stative (-zhe) aspects. Operating on the linguistically based models of aspect in Greek and Mandarin, the proposed translation theory offers the translator a powerful tool applicable to the actual practice of translating.

This dissertation offers an indepth treatment of aspect morphemes in Mandarin and pertinent issues relating to markedness and grounding that have been ignored or misunderstood in past scholarship. The perfective -le (differentiated from the post-sentential modal particle le) is used as a foregrounding device in Mandarin discourse only when the verb form is already marked with other aspect morphemes. Heavily marked four-character set phrases are utilized as the frontgrounding device in Mandarin discourse because of their morphological bulk, animated semantic content, rigid grammatical
structure, and unique syntax. When the ø morpheme is used, disyllabic verbs are more heavily marked than monosyllabic ones.

The fundamental problem underlying the Chinese Bible has persisted to be the lack of theoretically sound principles to assist the translator in creating a translation that would meet Yan Fu’s criteria of excellence: faithfulness, conveyance, and elegance. It is the hope of the author that this dissertation will answer this need and provide the impetus for future generations of researchers to make a more accessible and authentic rendering of the Bible in Chinese.
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APPENDIX II.

MANDARIN TRANSLATION (FOLEY) of JOHN 18–19

耶穌被擄

耶穌被擄後，他的門徒一同逃走了。耶穌被大祭司們捉住後，他們告訴他們說：「你們在找那一位？」他們答道：「拿撒勒人耶穌。」他告訴他們說：「我就是。」他們就向後退下又仆倒在地上。然後他們說：「你所指證的我，我一個也沒有。」

耶穌在大祭司面前受審。说到这里，大祭司就問了耶穌有關他的門徒及所教的教訓。耶穌對他說：「自以為明正大、直言不諱；我也終在猶太人聚集的會堂及聖殿教授人。在暗地裏，沒有談論過什麼。」

耶穌被大祭司們封為大祭司，他們就向他說：「你誣蔑大祭司，你不是這人的門徒嗎？」耶穌答道：「你這樣在回答著大祭司嗎？」

耶穌被大祭司們捉住後，他們對他說：「你誣蔑大祭司，你不是這人的門徒嗎？」

他們問他：「你誣蔑大祭司，你不是這人的門徒嗎？」

耶穌被大祭司們捉住後，他們對他說：「你誣蔑大祭司，你不是這人的門徒嗎？」

他們問他：「你誣蔑大祭司，你不是這人的門徒嗎？」

耶穌被大祭司們捉住後，他們對他說：「你誣蔑大祭司，你不是這人的門徒嗎？」

他們問他：「你誣蔑大祭司，你不是這人的門徒嗎？」
彼得又否認耶穌。
此刻西門彼得仍是比肩而立地蹲著身。有人開了口對他說： "你不也是他的門徒嗎？" 他卻否認說： "我不是。" 一個大祭司的僕人，恰好是彼得削掉耳朵那人的親屬，就開起了口說： "我不是看見你同他在園子裏嗎？" 彼得又否認。隨即雞就啼了。

耶穌在彼拉多前受審。他們再來就拉著耶穌從該亞法那裡到總督官邸內。那時天還早。他們自己卻不進官邸，深怕萬一要受染了。不能夠吃到逾越節的筵席。彼拉多就到外頭來告訴他們說： "你們要拿個大祭司的僕人，恰好是彼得削掉耳朵那人的親屬，就開起了口說： "我不是看見你同他在園子裏嗎？" 彼得又否認。隨即雞就啼了。
當彼拉多聽了這話，就更加震驚。於是他再次進入官邸，問耶穌說：「你到底從那裏來的？」但是耶穌卻不給他回答。彼拉多這時就告訴他說：「你不能對我說你是誰？難道你這麼不知道好人嗎？本人既持有著放你走的權力，亦持有著把你釘上十字架的權力嗎？」耶穌答說：「要不是上天恩寵賜給你的，你早就沒持有著任何解我的權力了。因此把我交出來給你的那個地方，你就不是與親愛一家的了。」凡自稱為王的，即等於是在頂撞著執政。彼拉多就又問著把耶穌給放走的無奈猶太人嘆嘆著說：「你要放了這個殺人犯，就我將你們的君王釘死在十字架上嗎？」祭司長答著：「我們除親愛之外，沒擁有君王。」彼拉多於是把他交給了他們去釘十字架。
犹太人蓄意於安息日翻白天子架上，再說安息日是重要的節慶。猶太人就求彼拉多把耶穌被釘十字架時，見他已經命斷氣絕，就沒有把他的腿打斷。然而有一名士兵用長矛刺入他的肋旁，即刻淌出血液和水流出。這些事件發生了，其目的是在為聖經得以應驗；他的骨頭不會被打斷。總之，經上另有一句說道：他們將注視他們所刺透的那位。
第十五章
論基督復活
弟兄姊妹們，我向你們提起，我給你們傳過的福音，也就是你們所受的、靠它足夠
跟，並且因它而得救，要是你們仍堅守著我給你們傳過的道，除非你們徒然的信了。
我所傳給你們的，也是我所接受的：首要者，就是基督應經上所言，為我們的罪而死去，
且現於眾人面前，然後於十二使徒之前；之後，他現於五百多位弟兄姊妹之前，
其中有一大半至今還活著。到最後，他竟現於這個如同墮胎而生的我之前。

第廿章
論死人復活
如果基督死而復甦在神面前，他所賜我的恩寵，並非徒然。事實上，我比眾使徒更加勞累。但是，這不是靠我自己，倒是靠神的恩寵在我身邊。因此，不管是我，或是他們，我們這樣傳下去，你們也這樣信了。

我們還需要復活之事，果真死人不復活的話，那麼我們就被人指著說是神的僞證人，因為我們曾為神作過見證，說他叫他所沒有復活過來的基督復活過來。死人若不復活，基督也就沒有死而復甦了。

我們僅僅在此生對基督是眾望所歸的，我們豈不就比眾人更加可悲了？

如果我們僅僅在基督已死而復甦，並成為主懷安息者初熟的果實，就是說，死亡既出自一人，死人復活也同樣出自一人。因此，如同眾人對基督的眾望所歸的，我們豈不就比眾人更加可悲了？

然而基督早已死而復甦，並成為眾望所歸者初熟的果實。也就是說，死亡既出自一人，死人復活也同様出自一人。因此，如同眾人對基督的眾望所歸的，我們豈不就比眾人更加可悲了？

因為他使萬物都被制伏住的時候，就連神子自己也將被制伏於那位制伏了萬物的萬物之主。${\text{\textcopyright}}$

APPENDIX III.
MANDARIN TRANSLATION (FOLEY) of 1 CORINTHIANS 15
冒著險呢？《弟兄姊妹們》我天天都在冒死！此既我靠著我在主基督耶穌裏，為你們所誇的而發誓。我們又為何時刻在論詰問呢？有人會問：「死人是如何復活呢？是以什麼樣的體來呢？」糊塗人，你所預設的要不死去，就無法被救了起來。更何況你所預設的，不是復活那將來有的體，而不是子粒，說不定是麥子，或是其他穀類。凡肉體皆各有不同。人是一樣，獸又是樣，鳥是一樣，魚又是樣。這樣復活是樣，身體復活是樣，天復活是樣，地物復活是樣，但天體之體復活是樣，地物之體復活是樣，但天體之體復活是樣，地物之體復活是樣。此星和彼星的榮華，都有別。死人復活也是如此。所預設的必朽，所預設的則是不朽的；所預設的必濟，所預設的則是榮耀的；所預設的則是尊貴的肢體，所預設的則是尊貴的肢體。若有血氣之身，也有靈性之體。必朽者，我們就會轉變。這必朽者必須換上不朽的，這必死亡者要換上不死的。當這必朽者既換上不朽的，及此必死亡者要死的時候，經上記著的話「死被勝利吞滅了」。兄弟姊妹們，我告訴你們說，血肉之體不能夠得著神的國；凡必朽者也絕不承襲不朽者。聽好！我告訴你們，使徒們在宴那、眨眼之間，號角末回吹響的時候。號角要響，死人將復活成為不朽者，我們就會轉變。這必朽者必須換上不朽的，這必死亡者要換上不死的。當這必朽者既換上不朽的，及此必死亡者要死的時候，經上記著的話「死被勝利吞滅了」。死被勝利吞滅了。感謝神！仗著我主耶穌基督賜我們勝利。
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