

## To The Corinthians (A)

### Translation and notes for 1 Corinthians 16:22 from my full edition of *The Letters of Paul*

<sup>21</sup> This salutation is of Paul with my own hand. <sup>22</sup> If anyone does not love the Prince, he must be accursed, a rebel to be destroyed.<sup>271</sup> <sup>23</sup> The favor of the Prince, Yahshua Christ, is with you. <sup>24</sup> My love is with all of you in Christ Yahshua.

271. μαραναθά, or μαράνα θά, μαρὰν ἀθά; L & S: “a Syriac phrase” equivalent to “ὁ κύριος ἦκει” (lord, come). Thayer: “Chaldean words”, “our lord cometh” or “our lord will come”. Berry: “two Aramaic words”, “our lord cometh”, “R.V. margin”. Strong: “of Chaldean origin meaning ‘our lord has come’...[or] an exclamation of the approaching divine judgment.” Of these four only Strong’s second definition is close, and I wonder why he did not explain it further. Some A.V. editions leave this phrase, and ἀνάθεμα (331) which precedes it, untranslated. Others have changed this verse to reflect agreement with the aforementioned definitions. Thayer is the only lexicographer I have seen who writes the term as one word, and not two, and then his definition defies this. None of the lexicographers offer meaningful support to substantiate their supposed definitions. Strong and L & S write μαρὰν ἀθά, surely after the many late mss. cited by the NA27 which have the word this way. 𐤌 and other late mss. have the word as one. The NA27 has μαράνα θά, following *P*<sup>46</sup>, *N*, A, B, C, D, and others, but then labels the entire group as uncertain. How can they define a word (or words) they cannot parse? And why offer a definition that cannot be substantiated?

I cannot attempt to explain why none of these lexicographers endeavored, at least apparently, to define this term from Hebrew. From Strong’s “Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary”:

4754 “mara...to rebel...”

4784 “marah...to be bitter...to rebel...”

4751 and 4785 both marah, used as nouns with the same roots and meanings as 4754 and 4784 which are verbs. See also 4755 and 4785, used as nouns and proper names, mara and marah respectively, and both from 4751.

5421 “natha...to tear out:-break”

5422 “nathats...to tear down:-...destroy...”

Hence the Greek phrase here: ἦτω ἀνάθεμα μαρά ναθά:

ἦτω : Imperative 3rd person singular of εἶμί (1510) “he must be”

ἀνάθεμα : (331) “accursed”

μαρά : Read as a noun here, “a rebel”

ναθά : Read as an infinitive here, “to be destroyed”, the Hebrew tense and number not exactly known, but the infinitival form being apparent.

And so I purport a natural, literal translation which is entirely proper in context: “...he must be accursed, a rebel to be destroyed.” Although other interpretations may be possible, I will let these simple and natural forms speak for themselves.