

Lietzmann, Hans: *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe. An die Römer*. 4. Aufl. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr 1933.

Lightfoot, J.B.: *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries*. London: MacMillan 1904.

Lyons, John: *Semantics*. vol 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1977.

Moule, C.F.D.: *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1963.

Murray, John: *The Epistle to the Romans*. vol 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1959.

Newman, Barclay and Eugene Nida: *A Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans*. New York: American Bible Society 1973.

Nygren, Anders: *Der Römerbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht 1965.

Sanday, William and Arthur C. Headlam: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T and T Clark 1896.

Stowers, Stanley K.: *A Rereading of Romans*. New Haven and London: Yale Univ. 1994.

Stuhlmacher, Peter: *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Transl. S.J. Hafemann. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox 1994.

Torrance, Thomas F.: "One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith." *The Expository Times* 58 (1957) 111-114.

Vandeloise, Claude: *L'espace en français*. Paris: Editions du Seuil 1986.

Weiser, Artur: *Psalms*. Philadelphia: Westminster 1962.

Wilckens, Ulrich: *Der Brief an die Römer*. 2. Aufl. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukircher Verlag 1987.

C. Zelinsky-Wibbelt (ed): *The Semantics of Prepositions*. Berlin, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter 1993.

ALAN S. DUTHIE

## **"AND" AGAIN: A RESPONSE TO ETTIEN KOFFI**

The author teaches in the Department of Linguistics, University of Ghana, Legon.

I have the following comments on Ettiën Koffi's article "There is More to 'And' than Just Conjoining Words" [*BT* 49.3 (July 1998) 332-343].

I agree that the relatively surface structures of grammar may indeed have at least the sort of meaning known as "textual".

I also accept the conclusion on Col 2.1-2 where *you* should have replaced *they* in English versions; or perhaps better, *you and they* for extra clarity, and not to exclude *they*.

But I would rather stick to *Moses and Aaron*, imitating the Hebrew, and hoping that readers of translations would get the idea that Moses was the leader, then shift to *Aaron went with Moses*, because to me, a native speaker of English, it is not clear who the leader is; it could easily be Aaron (with Moses following him).

My main comment, however, relates to the subject-verb agreement patterns presented at the beginning of Dr. Koffi's article. If these are really *grammatical*, not *semantic*, patterns, then they must be *linear*; but the three patterns given in the article simply do not cover all the examples there offered.

**Pattern 1:** NP1 and NP2 together agree with the following *Verb*, as in Greek:

Acts 13.36 (3) *The Paul and the Barnabas said-3pl*

Jn 10.30 *I and the Father one are-1pl*

(Compare Jn 18.12, 35, where the last NP is plural before a plural verb).

**Pattern 2:** NP1 and NP2 where only the latter agrees with the *Verb*, as in Greek:

Jn 1.17b *the grace and the truth through Jesus Christ became-3sg*

(The only example I found in John).

**Pattern 3:** NP1 and NP2 where only the former agrees with the *Verb* (not in Greek).

But I would have to add the mirror image of Pattern 2:

**Pattern 4:** *Verb* agreeing with the immediately following NP1 despite the later NP2, as in Greek:

Jn 3.22 (1) *After these (things) came-3sg the Jesus and the disciples [of him]*

Jn 19.34 (2) *and out-came-3sg immediately blood and water.*<sup>1</sup>

Jn 1.35 *had-stood-3sg the John and [from the disciples of-him] two*

Jn 1.45c *whom wrote-3sg Moses in the law and the prophets (subj)*

Jn 2.2 *was-called-3sg both the Jesus and the disciples of-him to the wedding*

Jn 2.12 *down-went-3sg to Capernaum he and the mother of-him and the brothers and the disciples of-him*

Jn 4.53d *and believed-3sg he and the household of-him whole*

Jn 12.22c *comes-3sg Andrew and Philip*

Jn 18.15a *was-following-3sg...the Jesus, Simon Peter and another disciple*

and in Hebrew:

Ex 10.3 (4, 7) *and-came-3sg m Moses and-Aaron to-Pharaoh*

Num 12.1 (8) *and-spoke-3sg f Miriam and-Aaron against-Moses*

I would also add

**Pattern 0:** *Verb* with NO preceding or following subject NP in the same clause to agree with!

as in Hebrew:

---

<sup>1</sup> Greek regularly uses a singular verb with two or more neuter nouns, as here, as with neuter plural nouns (ed).

Ex 10.3 (4, 7) *and-said-3pl* to-him. This is NOT the same clause as the earlier part of example (4), but the unexpressed subject is evidently plural from the NPs in the preceding clause.

Num 12.1 (8) whom *took-3sg m*

and in Greek:

Jn 6.2b because *were-watching-3pl* the signs (plural subject understood from collective “crowd” in the preceding clause; compare 6.22a where “crowd” occurs before a plural verb; contrast 6.24a where “crowd” follows a singular verb, as in 6.2a).

Jn 12.22d and *say-3pl* to the Jesus (subject understood from previous clause)

Jn 20.3b and *were-coming-3pl* into the tomb (subject understood from previous clause)

Then there is the mirror image of Pattern I:

**Pattern 5:** *Verb* agreeing with all following NP1 and NP2 and...as in Greek:

Jn 4.12c and *he* from it *drank-3sg* and the sons [of-him] and the animals

Jn 4.36c so-that *the sower* together *should-rejoice-3sg* and the reaper

Jn 6.24b that *Jesus-not-is-3sg* there nor the disciples of-him

Jn 8.52d *Abraham died-3sg* and the prophets

Jn 9.3b neither *this-man sinned-3sg* nor the parents of-him

So, in conclusion, all the following patterns are found:

a plural Verb may agree with all preceding or following multiple singular NPs, as in Patterns 1 and 5;

a singular Verb may agree with only the last preceding, or only the first following, singular NP out of several NPs, as in Patterns 6 and 2, and 4 (the commonest in John); and

a Verb with no overt subject in its clause takes its number and gender from an NP in the preceding clause, as in Pattern 0.

IVER LARSEN

## VARIANT READINGS IN 2 CORINTHIANS

The author is a translation consultant with the Summer Institute of Linguistics, based in Nairobi, Kenya.

The main difference between the 4th edition of the UBS Greek New Testament (UBS4) and the 3rd edition (UBS3) is that the apparatus has been extensively revised. Part of this revision included a reconsidering of all the 1,438 sets of variants cited in the apparatus<sup>1</sup>. This re-evaluation of variant readings has implications for translation policy. It used to be a commonly accepted rule that if a particular variant reading was evaluated with an A or B rating, the translator (or consultant) would need to muster strong arguments if he or she preferred an alternate reading.