Klaus Haacker

Bible Translation and Biblical Studies

I. General Reflections

1. In order to be a good Bible translator it is not necessary to be an exegete

If one looks at today's global work of Bible translation, one can safely assume that only a minority of translators are trained exegetes in the sense of academic biblical scholarship. Many are not even familiar with the original languages as our students of theology after passing the exams "Graecum" and "Hebraicum". (How long after, is another question, but they can revive it, if they become active as Bible translators.)[1]

A shining example of a non-theologian who earned his merits as a Bible translator, is Hermann Menge (1841–1939).[2] He was a classicist teaching in a school, since 1900 in early retirement, when he largely devoted himself to the translation of the Bible. After nine years, in 1909, his translation of the New Testament into modern German appeared, seventeen years later (1926) also the Old Testament. The latter is particularly noteworthy because Menge was not a Hebraist, but only a classical philologist. In my student days (in the 60s) the Menge Bible was regarded as the most reliable study Bible in German.

It is also interesting that several decades ago a new Bible translation was developed by national mandate in Sweden. In the commission for the New Testament, there was reportedly only one New Testament scholar, Harald Riesenfeld (1913–2008). The other members were either specialists in the original language or the target language.

However, these examples were new Bible translations in countries that already had a tradition of Bible translation. There you may have dictionaries in which the study of biblical languages has already been taken into account, sometimes even special dictionaries for the translation of the Bible. If several equivalents in the target language are eligible for a word in question, the references are already allocated to each matching category, at least in the dictionary of "Bauer-Aland"[3] and its counterparts in other modern languages. However, the use of such tools has to be learned!

The work of pioneer translators who give a first Bible translation to a language group, presents itself quite differently. In this field, I do not have enough knowledge, so I cannot cite any examples. Not even Martin Luther was such a pioneer, but had predecessors.[4] Nevertheless he became a classic - not only because he was a master of the German language, but also because he was an exegete, a professor for the interpretation of the Old and New Testaments! In his lectures, he also referred to details of the original languages.

2. Professional exegetes are not naturally the better translators

Translators are themselves always exegetes in a certain way because "exegesis" means exposition or interpretation, the effort to understand texts. In order to transfer a text into another

language, you must at first try to *understand* it while you read it as it is. Nevertheless, the academic experts of biblical interpretation are often not the best translators and this for various reasons:

a) They at any rate write their professional literature for students or educated people. Of course their translation is no linear translation in defiance of German syntax. However, they usually have the tendency of keeping as closely as possible to the source text, so that when reading the Greek text you can understand it faster with their help. For people who can read Greek this is legitimate, but for a wider audience it is not ideal.[5]

b) Secondly, exegetes as a rule are too familiar with traditions of Bible translation and distinctive church language. Thus they do not even notice it when their vocabulary differs from everyday language. For example, the Hebrew word *ḥoq* is often translated as "statute". This is misleading, because in modern terms a "statute" is a longer text with a number of paragraphs, while the Hebrew word stands for a single commandment (therefore often in plural). This is still a harmless case. More serious is the tradition to translate the Greek word *skándalon* as "offense". Today, this refers to something that triggers emotional resistance. This is dull compared to what is meant in the New Testament, and consequently, the meaning of important biblical texts is obscured. Paul's claim that the word of the cross is "a skandalon to the Jews" (1 Cor 1:23) does not refer to the fact that the Jews resent or take offense, but means that they regard it as highly dangerous. The word *skándalon* is in this context a metaphor which originally refers to a piece of wood, which can close the trap when touched by an animal. In the language of the Bible, it is used for seducing into idolatry and similar threats to religion. When Paul in Romans 14:13 writes (according to Luther's translation) that "no one should give his brother an offense or annoyance", he means

that one should not tempt fellow Christians to act against their own conscience. Ulrich Wilckens in his commentary on Romans still translates skandalon as "annoyance", although what is actually meant is properly clarified by his exegesis. The traditional translation is maintained, although the interpretation proves it to be misleading.[6]

c) Thirdly, scholars as translators sometimes succumb to the temptation to spread abroad a specific interpretation of which they are convinced, although the source text allows several interpretations. For example, the Einheitsübersetzung has inserted "laying on of hands" in Acts 14:23 where elders are appointed – without any justification from Luke's wording.[7]

In Romans 11:15 the frequent translation "their rejection" (not shared by Luther!) has to be replaced by "their loss".[8] It should, however, be left open whether according to Paul the Jews "have lost something" or "got lost". Sometimes of course there may be no word in the target language that is as "inaccurate" or broad as the term of the source language.[9]

3. Translators themselves are "exegetes" because they need to *understand* the source text before they can *make it understandable* in a target language

It does not make sense to translate the Bible by simply translating one verse after another. You have to be sensitive to the speech act in context, be it a narrative or an argument. You have to try figuring out the communication process with the addressees or readers which is intended by the author. It can be a mere information, but also an impulse to act or a way to exert an emotional influence. That will affect the wording and form of the translation.

Let us take, for example, the verb *parakalein*, which has a large range of meanings, namely "call in, send for, summon, invite, appeal to, exhort, encourage, comfort, console, excite,

demand, require, beseech, entreat".[10] What is preferable in a specific place results from the assumed relationship between the speaking subject and the person or group addressed in consideration of the situation, possibly from the aim of the speech act. When Paul in Philemon (v. 8f.) writes that he could very well "command what is proper" to the recipient, but then chooses *parakalein*, it is clear that he prefers to *ask for a favour*.

Therefore the translation of Rom 15:30 in the New English Bible ("I implore you ..." was better than today's New Revised Standard Version "I appeal to you". In Luther's Bible, the verse begins with an equvalent to "I exhort you ...". This is inappropriate because the concern of Paul is not a matter of duty, but his personal concern in view of his upcoming journey to Jerusalem. The word "exhort" today has a reproachful overtone which the word in Luther's time probably did not have. Thus, one should replace it elsewhere with something like "encourage" or "cheer up" or "persuade".[11]

Even if a German equivalent is recommended for a particular Bible passage in a specialized dictionary of the New Testament, we must not accept this uncritically. Take for example the verb *katargein*, for which Bauer-Aland distinguishes between a normal and a metaphorical meaning. As an example of the normal meaning only Lk 13:7 is mentioned, where the barren fig tree is said to "drain the country", for which not a single extra-biblical proof is cited. The "metaphorical" meaning is used everywhere else and is to be translated with "to put out of operation or validity, to refute, to destroy, eradicate, eliminate" or the like. Should all of this be derived from the basic meaning "to drain, exhaust"? Nonsense! The allegedly "transferred" meaning also fits Lk 13:7: The barren tree makes the piece of ground on which it stands, "ineffective", namely *unprofitable*, and should be removed in favor of better plants. Luther wrote: "Cut it off, why should it hinder the land?"[12] Luther's

Bible today (1984) and the Einheitsübersetzung offer: "to take the power from the ground". It is not about pity on the ground, but the yield which the owner is missing. Indeed, the tree is in a vineyard; another vine in its place would make more sense!

4. Translators depend on historical knowledge from Biblical studies

Difficulties arise from the fact that many words do not have a conceptual content, but denote historical realities, possibly realities which no longer exist today. Exegesis is not only about collecting lexical knowledge, but draws from historical sources about certain realities and facts.

When in Acts 16:6 we read that the Holy Spirit prohibited Paul and his team from evangelizing "in *Asia*", a literal translation would be irritating. Was Paul planning to travel to Persia, India or China? Here the clarification "province of Asia" is appropriate, if possible, with a footnote "the Western part of present-day Turkey", so that people should not think of entire Asia Minor.

Another example is the designation of the city of Philippi as a *kolônia* in Acts 16:12. Our modern word "colony" does not fit here, because it was re-coined in the modern era for an entire territory that is politically under foreign rule. (The seemingly "literal" wrong translation, which needs to be avoided here, is metaphorically labeled "false friends".) In the Roman Empire *coloniae* were cities in conquered regions where citizens from Italy were settled (e.g. veterans from the legions) in order to stabilize the local political situation and to represent the interests of Rome. As a translation, therefore, "veterans' base" could be suitable. One could also describe the character of the city as an "offshoot of Rome" or of a "city with a Roman upper class". Luther translated *colonia* as "a free city of the empire" and thus suggested an analogy with cities of his time which were independent from the rulers of surrounding territories.

Likewise the Latin term *praetorium*, which Paul uses in Phil 1:13, is not really understood if it is represented in German with "Prätorium". It appears in the context of a trial, which suggests the idea of a courthouse. However, if one looks closely the text refers to a group of people among others: "In the whole praetorium, and among all others it has been revealed that I am in prison for Christ's sake." A *praetorium* was not always a building but could also be used for local *troops*, like the English term "garrison".

A difficult problem arises at the beginning of the Christmas story in Luke 2:1. According to the Greek text, the Emperor Augustus had ordered that "*all the inhabited world* (*oik-ounene*) should be registered" (for taxation). In reality this can only refer to people within the Roman Empire. But the Romans used to describe their power sphere as "the inhabited world". In such a case you have to decide between a word which clearly denotes what is meant or to imitate the expression used in the original text. For a wider audience the latter is in this instance preferable, because otherwise the story of Luke 2 is placed into the category of fairy tale right at the beginning. In German we could use the term "Weltreich" as a viable solution.

5. Must translators deal with textual criticism, and if so, how?

A particularly difficult chapter of Biblical studies is textual criticism. In German theological faculties the relevant criteria are taught to undergraduate students, but a permanent competence rarely results from it. However, for Bible translators the question cannot be indifferent which source text has actually to be translated! And for evangelical translators, who often take on the pioneering work in new areas, the doctrine of inspiration only refers to the source text "*as originally given*". Translators who grew up as Christians often know texts of the Bible by heart from their childhood and youth. They are in danger of sticking to readings that have become questionable by new manuscript discoveries or methodological advances. Even the current edition of the Lutherbibel (1984/1999) does not consistently translate the present "standard text" of the two authoritative editions of the New Testament.

Below, I will confine myself entirely to the New Testament:

Foundational to the work of textual criticism is not the *age* of the manuscripts, but familiarity with *frequent errors*, which can lead to secondary readings. These may be technical mistakes in copying[13], but also deliberate deviations from an older manuscript which for various reasons is considered to be incorrect. The frequency of such detectable deviations in a particular manuscript can lead to the conclusion that this is a more or less trustworthy manuscript. In the course of time such conclusions have led to a classification of the existing manuscripts, which is explained in the introduction to the edition of *Nestle-Aland*[14] and in textbooks.[15]

For the work of Bible translators, the *Greek New Testament* edited by the United Bible Societies[16] is more helpful than *Nestle-Aland*. The Greek New Testament does not document such a vast number of variants, but a selection according to importance.

In addition, the textual differences documented in the apparatus are classified in categories A to D of which the categories C and D are particularly important: In these cases the opinion of the specialists is divided, so that it may be worth-while to think it over.

Moreover, only in this edition of the Greek New Testament, references to the text-critical decisions of selected modern translations are included. That is another signal for the need of a decision.

Unfortunately, there are considerations to continue Nestle-Aland alone as the hand edition of the Greek New Testament of future generations.[17] Bible translators and Bible societies should vehemently oppose any steps in this direction!

6. Are full-blown scholarly commentaries an aid in Bible translation?

This question is justified and implies doubts concerning the tradition of academic commenting. There are, roughly speaking, *two types of commentaries*: The *scholarly type* contains much that is irrelevant to the translation process, so that these books are too expensive, and the amount of work required in order to find what is really relevant, is often unacceptable. Indeed, the useful linguistic explanations are usually not found at the beginning of the exposition, but scattered in the course of extensive discussions. The *popular commentaries*, on the other hand, often provide a mere paraphrase enriched with useful information on the content or the message of the biblical text without any discussion of translation questions (or a reasoning for the provided own translation). My impression is that older commentators (such as Theodor Zahn) more often dealt with lexical or grammatical problems in the Greek text, because they could assume numerous high school graduates among their readers, who already knew Greek from school.

What are the issues of scientific exegesis, which take broad space in commentaries without being particularly profitable for translation? Firstly, there are the so-called *introductory questions* about the authors, the date of composition and the place of writing of biblical texts. Furthermore, there is the question of the addressees of the letters or the targeted audience of other writings. In all these questions there are no conclusive results except for some letters of Paul, but only more or less plausible hypotheses. They are controversial and debate often takes a lot of space. The *relevance* of these questions is based on the fact that modern biblical scholarship for almost 300 years endeavors to understand the biblical writings *historically*, that is: to understand them as targeted letters or works in very specific situations - as a *communication from human to humans*. This intention can only be affirmed and in the case of Paul's letters this path is particularly promising, because his letters contain clear references to Paul's life, his work and his churches. However, in other writings of the New Testament we have much less evidence, so that the pertinent efforts require an almost criminological nose (or serendipity!), and the opinions of scholars sway to and fro.

Another issue, which occupies much space in the commentaries, is almost irrelevant for translation work. This is the *historical-critical* question (in its strictest sense) concerning the *historical value* of narratives. Of course this question is linked with introductory questions regarding author and date of composition. The larger a period between the reported events and the drafting of a report is, the more the question arises: How can the author know the narrated content? This often leads on to the question of *sources* that the author may have used, whether written or oral. But the historical question also implies the task of distinguishing *literary genres*. A German text that begins with "There once was a man" is rightly spontaneously classified as a fairytale and not as a historical report. That the book of Job begins with this same phrase, deserves attention! The same is true of parables that begin like fairy tales, or directly or indirectly with "in the event that" (see, for example, Mk 4:26–29; Lk 11:5–8).

Doubts about historical details of biblical texts are often prompted by *miraculous content*, for which there is no analogy in present experiences – at least not in the horizon of many interpreters. This problem has no direct relevance for translation. Nevertheless, there

are "miracle stories" that narrate something amazing which does not violate the so-called natural laws. In Acts 20:9 we read about a young man who fell asleep during a sermon of Paul and then fell down from the third floor. In most translations we read something like: "When they picked him up, he was dead." The Luther Bible translates a bit more cautiously: "He was taken up dead." But then narrative goes on to say: "Paul went down, threw himself on him, covered him and said: Be not distressed: He lives!" No raising of the dead, but an all-clear! But what is the meaning of the end of v. 9? Answer: It is a case of "style indirect libre", that is: What sounds like a statement of fact by the narrator is a hidden quotation of what the persons involved think or feel.[18]

An important part of scholarly exegesis deals with the question from which *traditions* a Biblical author has taken his concepts, ideas or entire statements. This may be traditions from the Old Testament that have shaped the thinking of the author, as well as ideas from the environment, which the author takes up in order to address his non-Jewish readers effectively.

This *may* be relevant for translation, given the case that without knowledge of these traditions the meaning of a text term remains vague. A typical example of such cases is the term *ho christós* – "the anointed one". For non-Jewish contemporaries of the early Church the adjective *christós* had absolutely no meaningful connotations, like "oiled" or "smeared" for us. Depending on the capabilities of the target language and the educational level of the targeted audience, explanatory additions may be needed in the course of a translation. These additions should make it clear that the so-named person is a beacon of hope and a savior, reminding of the role of famous kings of Israel.[19] The same applies to the term "righteousness of God", which plays an important role in Paul. This concept is also rooted in Old Testament traditions which carry a special meaning. The language of the New Testament is in many ways a "sociolect", a special language of a community with many technical terms.[20]

For translators, a "**translation commentary**" on the whole New Testament would be desirable, which should evaluate existing translations, draw attention to conflicting options of exegesis and (possibly) plead for a particular rendering in the target language.

Translators with a good knowledge of English may profit from volumes of the series "*Helps for Translators*", published by the United Bible Societies. I have dealt more closely with one of these volumes: "A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans" by Barclay M. Newman and Eugene A. Nida, Stuttgart 1973. Yet, I am disappointed with this tool. The scholarly "authorities" consulted here are: William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (1905); Otto Michel, The Letter to the Romans (1955); C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (1957), next to the shorter commentaries by Denney, Dodd, Knox and Schmidt. Their opinions on the interpretation are frequently noted, even opinions without any consequences for the translation (!). However, I find far too few *philological arguments* for a particular translation. Besides I have the impression that this tool does not presuppose the possibility of a consideration of the Greek New Testament by its users. The quotations from selected *English* translations sometimes give useful impulses (if you are a *native speaker* of English or well familiar with English), also some examples of the equivalents of some Biblical terms in non-European languages. More important would be the most *accurate circumscription* of what is meant in the original text, based on which the translator could find adequate equivalents on the basis of his competence in the target

language. *The crucial process in translating is indeed that when you read (or re-read) the original text, a clear but silent idea of the meaning of the speech process arises before the "inner eye", for which you then search a wording in the target language.* A more or less mechanical assembly of lexical equivalents of individual words of the source text by imitation of its syntax does not lead to the goal of an adequate translation.

A translation from European Bible translations into a completely different sphere of language without looking at the original text is hazardous because it risks the multiplication of errors in the European reception history of the Bible and may end up in a "translation colonialism". The "interposing" of a translation from European languages can obstruct the chance to find optimal equivalents in direct transfer from the biblical source text into the target language.[21] As an aid for resorting to the Greek original text, a Greek New Testament could be edited *in transcription*, which would reduce the threshold of anxiety towards this ancient and additional foreign language.[22]

II. Translation Problems of Paul's Doctrine of Justification

1. Basic problems in translating genitive connections

Questions and controversies repeatedly arise with the interpretation and translation of genitive connections between two nouns. In Hebrew, a parallel phenomenon is the status constructus connection. In a constructus connection it is not the second noun that resembles our genitive (which does not exist in Hebrew), but rather the first noun appears in a modified or shorter form. In any case, such genitive (or status constructus-) compounds have the function that one term is clarified or narrowed down by the addition of the other word (in genitive or status constructus).

In German we have another way of adding precision by means of composed nouns, where the precision is added by the first part, and is spoken with emphasis. Similar expressions in English are not written as one word (cf. "house party" in contrast to other parties). Hebrew, with its preference for final stress, has the opposite order: First, the (shortened) generic term and appended thereto, the word which provides precision (e.g. *bet-leḥem* = "house of bread").

When interpreting and translating Greek genitive connections (which will be dealt with below), the question always is to be raised: In what sense does the specification take place? A genitive attribute may have entirely different functions![23]

In many cases, the genitive points to an owner (possessive genitive). But that is only a fraction of the possibilities. Instead of the owner, the genitive may point to the author of something. In Greek, the material of which things are made, may be noted in genitive. As for people, the genitive stands for the relationship, for example, sonship (see Luke 6,15-16: "James [son] of Alphaeus … Judas [son] of James). Briefly: The grammatical question of how the

genitive is to be understood thus leads to the semantic question for the type of word and the contents of the noun which "governs" it.

For example, "someone's house" can give the name of the owner but could also mean the house in which someone lives as a tenant. When other meanings of "house" (e.g. company, noble family) come into consideration, it is even more difficult.

In many cases we have to decide between "genitivus objectivus" or "genitivus subjectivus". That means: Suppose you transform the expression into a sentence and the governing noun into a verb. Will the noun in the genitive become the subject or object of this sentence?[24]

An easily comprehensible example for this option is the Greek term *agape theou*. If we translate it with "God's love", it is clearly the notion that God loves. But if instead we choose the German compound "Gottesliebe" ("God-love"), it means love *toward* God. The decision about what is meant in a particular case, depends upon the interpretation in context. When Paul says: "Nothing ... can separate us from the love of God" (Rom 8,38f), then it is clear that God's love toward us is meant. But what does 1 John 3:17 mean: "If anyone has this world's goods and sees his brother in need, yet closes his heart against him, how does God's love abide in him?"

Does this mean that God no longer loves us if we have no sympathy with troubled brothers and sisters? Or does it mean that lack of charity suggests a lack of love for God? (Remember that Jesus summarized the commandment to love God from Deuteronomy 6:5 and the commandment to love one's neighbor from Lev 19:18 into the double commandment of love.)[25] The answer comes from a comparison with 1 Joh 4:20f.: "If any one says, I love God, and hates his brother, he is a liar; for he who does not love his brother whom he has seen, cannot love God whom he has not seen. And this commandment we have from him, that he who loves God should love his brother also."

In the interpretation of Romans several such genitive compounds are the subject of ongoing controversy.[26] The most well-known is Luther's struggle with the concept of God's righteousness in Romans 1:17. In Romans 3:22, the term *pístis Christou Iesou*, traditionally translated as "faith in Jesus Christ", is exegetically controversial. Why? Because *pístis* can also mean "faithfulness" and hence it could refer to the "faithfulness of Christ". The next problem of this kind is a statement on the universality of sin in Romans 3:23, using the term "*dóxa theou*" (Luther: "For all have sinned and fall short of the glory they should have with God."). Then, in 3:28, the term "works of the law" follows, which is a storm centre of the discussion about the "new perspective" in Pauline studies. I postpone Rom 1:17 for now and start with Romans 3:22:

2. The discussion on the term *pístis (Iesou) Christou*

In printed editions of the Bible it is taken for granted that *pístis* with the genitive "Iesou" or "Iesou Christou" has to be translated with "faith in". But *pístis* can indeed also mean "faithfulness", and with God in the subsequent genitive this is preferable (at least in Romans 3:3: "Can their faithlessness possibly nullify the faithfulness of God?"). Hence it cannot be excluded that also with *Christ* in genitive his faithfulness is meant. This is the subject of a lively debate which has been going on for years, especially in the Anglo-Saxon language sphere.[27] But also the translation "Faith of Christ" has been advocated by J. Haussleiter in 1881 and 1895.[28] An impetus to translate *pístis* with "faithfulness" here was given by Karl Barth in his famous commentary on Romans from 1919 (p. 58), but in the sense of "faithfulness of God in Jesus Christ" (likewise also 1922). This could be correct dogmatically, but has to be discarded as a suggestion for translation. Debatable, however, is the modified

proposal by (his son) Markus Barth to think of the "faithfulness of Jesus Christ" (which is proven in his death).[29] Most sustainably, Richard B. Hays has argued for the adoption of a genitivus subjectivus.[30]

This understanding indeed is linguistically possible, and there are clear examples of *pístis* followed by Gen. subj. in Paul (e.g. 4:12.16: "Abraham's faith", not "faith in Abraham"). However, against both versions of this interpretation ("faith of Jesus" and "Jesus' faithfulness") we have to consider the fact that Paul nowhere mentions Jesus as the subject of *pisteuein* and never attributes the predicate *pistós* (faithful) to him.[31] It goes without saying that for the New Testament faith in a person can only refer to God or Jesus, therefore, all other personal genitives after *pístis* denote the subject of faith. However, it could be that our translation tradition ("believe in") allows too much reasoning about *fides quae creditur*[32], while the prepositional formulations (and their derived nouns in a genitive connection) rather have in mind the counterpart of trust or the foundation of confidence (*fides qua creditur*). (Probably the choice of words "*believe in*" from the beginning is a mere imitation of the Greek *pisteuein eis* and not an expression that was familiar previously in Germanic target languages.[33]

This whole debate is overlaid by the suspicion that the traditional understanding of the phrase as "Gen. obj.", given the "soteriological necessity" of faith according to Paul, makes a human attitude or even performance the condition of salvation.[34] Such competition between *sola fide* and *sola gratia* had not come to mind to Martin Luther; this suspicion probably has preaching traditions in mind which proclaim the call to faith not as encouragement and invitation ("you may believe") but rather as a demand ("you have to believe"). One indication of this type of legal tendencies in speaking of faith are translations that amplify the discourse about faith

emphatically, such as the "Bibel in heutigem Deutsch" (1982, now corrected) on Rom 1:17 ("*unconditional* trust") or the "Hoffnung für alle" (2002) on Rom 10:9 ("if you believe with *all* your heart").[35] The exegetical finding that the controversial genitive connection is about the faith *of people in Christ* does not prevent the realization that this belief is a gift, brought about by God or Christ or the Holy Spirit, through the Word of proclamation.[36] To me the hint from *Rusam* seems important, that Paul rarely connects the subject-matter or the counterpart of faith with a preposition (*eis*, *en* or *pros*); the genitive connection seems to be the substitute for it.[37]

In my opinion it is decisive that the context of substantival *pístis* + Gen. with the verb *pisteuo* speaks about believing *humans*. This is the case in Rom 3:22 as well as in the closest parallel passage Gal 2:16 (there with the addition of *eis Christón Iesoun*). Hence, the translation with "faith in Jesus (Christ)" rather does justice to the context of Rom 3:22.26.38.

The problem remains that in today's common German the risk of a flattening into a formal term of sociology of religion is given. "Christ faith" simply is not a synonym for "being Christian", but refers to a life of *confidence* based on the knowledge of Christ and the affiliation to him. R. Bultmann advanced the thesis that "the aspect of trustful hope retreats in the specifically Christian [*pistis*-] terminology".[39] This, however, does not hold up to an examination, but is based on downplaying the reference to the future in the New Testament discourse about faith.[40]

3. The expression *érga nómou* in Romans and Galatians

In this case an understanding of genitivus subjectivus can be discarded here from the outset, because the context of this term is not about the action or effects of the law, but whether people have to do something specific. The distinctively Pauline, but even with him rare

expression (only Rom 3:20.28; 9:32; cf. Gal 2:16; 3:2.5.10) has only one place and function in the discussion with Judaizers. It comprises what they demanded from gentile Christians: circumcision (if male) and the observance of other cultic or ritual rules of the Mosaic Law (cf. Gal 2:3; 5:2.6.11; 6:12f.15; 2:11 to 14:4.10). The early chapters of Romans are still related to this discussion, as the references to circumcision in 2:25–29; 3:1.30; 4:9–12 show. Circumcision was also the decisive point of the "unfitting actions" (from a non-Jewish point of view), which King Izates of Adiabene, who was sympathizing with Judaism, should rather avoid (Josephus, Ant 20:41). The same meaning of *érga* is presupposed by Josephus when he speaks of "foreign *érga*" which Jewish Hellenists practiced in the 2nd century BC by worshipping Zeus in Jerusalem (Antiquities 12:241). For *cultic* acts, namely the sacrifices in the temple, *érga* is also employed by Josephus in his rendering of Solomon's prayer at the consecration of his temple (Ant 8:111). It is interesting that this speech *downgrades* the material sacrifices to God in favor of words of gratitude towards God. This use of *érga* had been introduced by the Septuagint, where the plural *érga* often translates the singular *'abodah* (if it stands for "worship"; cf. Num 3–4 passim and 8:11.15.19).

The genitive connection with *nómou* could - like *érga Kyríou* in Num 8:11 (*'abodat YHWH*) and 3 Ezra 5:56; 7:9 – point to the law as the "address" of cultic performance.[41] But this genitive could also designate the authority by which the cultic rituals are required.[42] In any case, *érga nómou* as a term for distinctively Jewish actions prescribed by law must not be confused with "good deeds" in ethical perspective.[43] The Pauline devaluation of the "works of the law" is not about the relationship between faith and lifestyle, but pleads the case of equality between Jews and Gentiles in God's sight (and therefore also within the church). It is part of the argument beginning in Rom 1:16 which reaches its goal in 3:27–30.44.

4. *Doxa Theou* in Rom 3:23

In Romans 3:22 the Luther translation reads: "For all have sinned and fall short of the glory they should have with God."[45] The second half of the verse is certainly meant as reaffirmation of the first, but controversial in its statement, depending on the meaning of *dóxa* and on which understanding of the genitive *theou* is adopted.

According to the prevailing view of recent interpreters,[46] Paul alludes to the "glory of God", which the first humans shared as God's image but lost through sin. The Einheitsübersetzung even introduces this hypothesis into the translation. However, as translation of the present tense *hysterountai*, "they have lost" is unacceptable! Another problem of this exegesis is the fact that a rather rarely documented early Jewish idea is assumed as being known by Paul or even his Roman readers without being explicitly expressed.[47] Therefore, other interpreters understand this sharing God's glory as the eschatological destiny of man (mentioned in Romans 5:2; 8:18.30.48) which – for the time being - was forfeited by sin.

Primarily, however, an understanding should be sought, which is closer to *normal meanings* of the word *hysterein* c. Gen. ("lag behind", "fall below", "fail to obtain")[49] and which respects the *present tense* used by Paul. From this perspective, the translation of *doxa* as "honor", "acceptance" has much to recommend it, while *theou* can be understood both as a Gen. subj. ("acceptance by God"[50] as synonym for "justification"), as well as a Gen. obj. ("honoring God")[51].

In favor of "glory before God", etc. it is worth mentioning that a Hebrew status constructus connection may very well have the meaning "from the perspective of", for example, in the term which is translated as "an abomination to the Lord" (see e.g. Deut 27:15). Similarly, in 1 Corinthians 1:27 "the foolish things of the world" mean the foolish things "in the eyes of

the world" and "the weak things of the world" designate what is weak from the perspective of the world.

On the other hand, Paul according to Romans 1:21 sees the original sin of mankind in their refusal to give due honor to God. Similarly just before 3:23 Paul mentions the lack of reverence for God (3:11.18). That is why "honoring God", in my opinion, fits best into the present context. An allusion to an original or eschatological participation in God's glory (if Paul would have intended it) would demand too much of the addressees and all subsequent non-professional readers of this letter.

In my opinion, the three examples discussed show that it is a self-deception if we think it is "faithful" to reproduce a genitive connection of the Greek text with analogous genitive connections of a modern language. The fact that we use the same names for the Greek system of cases and ours today can lead astray.

5. The term "righteousness of God" in Paul[52]

My final example for an ambiguous genitive connection is not only due to the ambiguity of genitives. Here the very concept of righteousness poses a *semantic problem*. It leads us to a reflection on the importance of the Hebrew Bible for an understanding of the New Testament.

In Rom 1:16f Paul calls the gospel "a power of God that saves every believer". He substantiates this by noting that in it the "righteousness of God" is revealed or emerges. Luther translated *dikaiosýne theou* in this case and in Rom 10:3 as "the righteousness which is valid before God" and in Romans 3:22 with "righteousness before God". This stands in line with what I have just mentioned as being debatable in Romans 3:23 (the genitive meaning "from the perspective of").

Coming from the meaning of *dikaiosýne* in ordinary Greek (which was developed and

clarified in the theory of virtue of ancient philosophical ethics and largely corresponds to our popular conception of justice)[53] the idea of "salvation" is very far away. A combination with the idea of judgment (starting to be unfolded in v.18) suggests itself much more. Time and again, this problem has challenged the interpreters of Romans,[54] and since 1961 it is also the topic of a very lively debate[55]. (In it the semantic issues involved have often been blended with concerns of systematic theology, past or present).

A "splendid moment" in the history of interpretation that continues to resonate today, was Luther's famous "tower experience", his breakthrough to a new understanding of God's righteousness, which he describes in the preface to the first volume of his collected Latin writings in 1545 as follows:[56]

"I greatly longed to understand Paul's epistle to the Romans and nothing stood in the way but that one expression, 'the justice of God,' because I took it to mean that justice whereby God is just and deals justly in punishing the unjust. My situation was that, although an impeccable monk, I stood before God as a sinner troubled in conscience, and I had no confidence that my merit would assuage him. Therefore I did not love a just and angry God, but rather hated and murmured against him. Yet I clung to the dear Paul and had a great yearning to know what he meant. Night and day I pondered until I saw the connection between the justice of God and the statement that 'the just shall live by his faith'. Then I grasped that the justice of God is that righteousness by which through grace and sheer mercy God justifies us through faith. Thereupon I felt myself to be reborn and to have gone through open doors into paradise. The whole Scripture took on a new meaning, and whereas before the 'justice of God' had filled me with hate, now it became to me inexpressibly sweet in greater love. This passage of Paul became to me a gate to heaven …".

The discovery which Luther describes here gives us a good example of how a second meaning of a term ("righteousness") can come to the fore when we take heed to the context. The *range of meanings of a word* should not be reduced to definitions by philosophy or dogmatics.

It has been, however, a controversial question until today, whether the simple genitive connection *dikaiosýne theou* can on linguistic grounds be verified to be a succinct expression of the doctrine of justification. Or in other words: is Luther's distinction between *iustitia activa* and *iustitia passiva* philologically verifiable? The latter would today be called a case of the genitivus *auctoris*. It is striking that Luther himself when translating already does *not* interpret Rom 1:17 on the line described above, but instead speaks of the "righteousness which is valid before God" ("Gen. relationis" rather than "Gen. auctoris").[57]

In recent times – following an impulse by A. Schlatter – E. Käsemann, and particularly P. Stuhlmacher have been committed to understand *dikaiosýne theou* as an eschatological-soteriological concept of power, which does not vainly stand in parallel with *dýnamis* in Rom 1:16f and is connected with *apokalýptetai* (which indicates the entry of the previously unseen and restrained reality of God into history; cf. 3:21).[58] It is characteristic of this approach that the idea of the *righteousness of God* and its impact on and final victory in the world has been emphasized against an individualistic narrowing of soteriology, a concern which can be supported by Rom 10:3. (The non-believing Jews "have not submitted to the righteousness of God".) However, against this approach, R. Bultmann, H. Conzelmann, G. Klein and E. Lohse defended the traditional Lutheran understanding of *dikaiosýne theou* as the gift of justification[59], and in doing so, particularly referred to Phil 3:9 where the opposite of "own" justice "from the law" is the *ek theou dikaiosýne* mediated

by faith in Christ – without doubt an expression of justification.

A rigid either-or of "power" and "gift" for *dikaiosýne theou* does not hold water because for both aspects evidence can be found. More recent contributions to this discussion allow for a certain convergence of perspectives by refraining from defining the Pauline usage as a narrowly fixed *concept* of the righteousness of God.[60] However, that does not mean that the semantic problem of this phrase has been sufficiently clarified.

Let me draw your attention to some more aspects which, in my opinion, are important for the understanding of Romans 1:17:

1. The use of words of the root *dik-* in Jewish[61] and Christian writings to some extent differs so significantly from that of profane Greek that reasons for this must be sought in the bilingualism of the authors. Hence we have "translation Greek" or "borrowed loanwords" which in deviation from the ordinary language absorbed the meaning from words in a foreign language which they translated.[62]

2. The use of the word family *dik-* in the Septuagint in most cases translates Hebrew words from the root *ṣ-d-q*,[63] so that the meaning of the Hebrew words in question influenced the use of the Greek equivalents and extended or shifted their meaning (though only within a certain circle of tradition or language environment).[64]

3. Hebrew words from the root *ṣ-d-q* cover a wide range of meanings that cannot be reduced to one clear "concept". Attempts of a definition as "behavior respecting the community"[65] fall short of the variety of uses that do not always imply a moral judgment.[66] However, the basic meaning of the word group can be established - independently from any further statement

on the designated subject - as *positive evaluation* by the one who uses the word in question for something or someone. So neither the correspondence with a *certain* ideal standard nor the accordance with a presupposed understanding of community, but the consent of the speaker (or writer) to a thing or a person or group is the regular function of the word group *ṣ-d-q*. In varying areas of life it obtains more specific accents and "color" from the context and these can produce familiar connotations in the word usage; but they do not condense into one lexical "meaning".

4. In Jewish-Christian translation Greek *dikaiosýne* stands predominantly for *ṣedeq* and *ṣedaqah* and therefore takes on functions of these two words.[67] Yet, a structural difference between the Hebrew originals and the normal Greek use of *dikaiosýne* raises problems: While *dikaiosýne* (like the German "Gerechtigkeit") is consistently an abstract noun, *ṣedeq* and *ṣedaqah* can also be *nouns of action*, designating specific actions so that these words can be used in the plural (as the German equivalents of "injustice" or "tenderness"!).[68]

5. The close textual connection with *sotería* and *apokalýptetai* allocates the use of *dikaiosýne theou* in Rom 1:17 to a particular tradition in which this term describes the *saving work of God*, which is praised by the authors as a blessing or success of God. See especially Ps 98:2: "The Lord has made known his salvation; he has revealed his righteousness in the sight of the nations." (ESV) and Is 56:1b: "For close is my salvation to come, and my righteousness to be revealed."[69] Hence this is a genitivus subjectivus: God is the subject of the "really good action" of helping or saving his people. The idea of justice completely retreats into the background or only appears marginally.[70]

With the soteriological use of the term *dikaiosýne theou*, Paul follows the language of *Palestinian* Judaism in contrast to the more *Hellenized* diaspora[71] and thus proves himself to be a "Hebrew" (cf. 2 Cor 11:22; Phil 3:5; Acts 6:1).

This semantic incongruence between the common meaning of *dikaiosýne* and the term *ṣedaqah* of God intended in v.17a raises the question whether our term "righteousness" can be used for the translation of this verse. However, to resort to paraphrases, for which several new translations and interpretations opt,[72] destroys the lines of key words by which Paul likes to play with words from the root *dik-* and even uses different meanings of the term *dikaiosýne* alongside. Our wish for accuracy of terms obviously is in tension with the language of Paul, for whom (in analogy to the importance of recurring roots in Hebrew texts) the consistency of a certain word stem contributed to the persuasiveness of a speech.[73] To stick to "righteousness" as translation of *dikaiosýne theou* is not worse than Paul's own use of this word, which may have sounded puzzling already for the first readers. To follow his example makes the translation dependent on an accompanying explanation of this technical term of distinct biblical-ecclesiastical language.[74] Some assistants of Paul who delivered his letters may have been able to explain what Paul meant after reading them to the congregation. The confidence that "Scripture interprets itself" (*scriptura sacra sui ipsius interpres*), although true in principle, has to come true in lifelong learning. More than ever before, we need to be committed today to assist *beginners* to reading the Bible in their understanding. They give up too quickly if too much is baffling at first reading. If the necessary explanations are given, preferably by reference to parallel passages, this encourages to read further and to penetrate deeper and deeper into its wealth.

ENDNOTES

1 For such a "revitalization" I recommend the *Moravian Daily Watchwords* in the original Biblical languages. My Hebrew owes its "revival" to them.

2 Cf. P. Olbricht, *Der Bibelübersetzer Hermann Menge: Sein Leben und sein Schaffen*, Berlin 1939; F. Schmidt-König, *Hermann Menge: Vom Gymnasialdirektor zum Bibelübersetzer*, Gießen/Basel 1956, 2. ed. Lahr-Dinglingen 1983.

3 *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur* von Walter Bauer, 6. completely newly reworked edition in the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung/ Münster under special assistance of Viktor Reichmann ed. by Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, Berlin / New York 1988.

4 Cf. W. Kurrelmeyer, *Die erste deutsche Bibel*, 10 vols., Tübingen 1904–1915.

5 Goethe did not have a high opinion of translations attempting to imitate the original text poetically. They "really serve only for the conversation of scholars among themselves." Thus in *Aus meinem Leben: Dichtung und Wahrheit*, 3,11. (Werke, Hamburger Ausgabe in 14 vols., 2. ed. 1957), vol. 9, 494.

6 Cf. U. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Zürich etc. / Neukirchen-Vluyn, vol. 3, 1982, 89f. This trivialising translation of the word stem *skandal-* is responsible for the fact that the word of Jesus in Mt 18:6 par. Mk 9:42 and Lk 17:2 traditionally is not applied to the seduction of children. The present Lutheran translation of this verse as "seduce to apostasy", reads something into the text which distracts from the usual case of seduction of children. Here and in Mt 5:29 the wording of the Einheitsübersetzung "to seduce toward evil" is closer to the basic meaning of this metaphor, "to expose to great danger".

7 Embarrassingly, in the 6th edition of the dictionary by Bauer-Aland (see above note 3) – in deviation from the 5th edition! – this meaning has been assigned for the verb *cheirotonein* used here for Acts 14:23, probably under the influence of the Einheitsübersetzung! The verb originally designates the stretching out of the hand when giving a vote at an election and later received the extended meaning "to appoint (to office)" (also with God as subject, of course without a physical gesture).

8 See my discussion of this verse in *Versöhnung mit Israel: Exegetische Beiträge* (Veröffentlichungen der Kirchlichen Hochschule Wuppertal vol. 5), Wuppertal / Neukirchen-Vluyn 2002, 209–216. Rumours say that a correction of this passage is planned in course of the current revision of the Luther Bible.

9 Below I will present an example for illegitimate precision from the letter to the Romans (Rom 3:23).

10 Cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon: With a Supplement*, Oxford 1968,1311.

11 Also in 2 Cor 5:20 "to encourage" fits better than "admonish", because in the same breath Paul speaks of "entreating".

12 According to my gardening experience, to "cut off" is not precise enough for this action: the Greek *ekkoptein* with the prefix *ek* signals that you have to cut out the stem and also some roots with an axe in order to get space for a new planting.

13 For example the skipping of a line of the original, especially when, for example, two lines were ending with the same word, or the skipping of several words, when in one sentence the same word recurs.

14 Most recent edition: *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Begründet von Eberhard und Erwin Nestle. Herausgegeben von Barbara und Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger. 28. revidierte Auflage. Herausgegeben vom Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung Münster/ Westfalen, unter der Leitung von Holger Strutwolf, Stuttgart 2012, 2. korrigierter Druck 2013.

15 With more detail in K. Aland und B. Aland, *Der Text des Neuen Testaments: Eine Einführung in die wissenschaftlichen Ausgaben sowie in Theorie und Praxis der modernen Textkritik*, Stuttgart 1982; B. M. Metzger, *Der Text des Neuen Testaments: Eine Einführung in die neutestamentliche Textkritik*, Stuttgart etc. 1966.

16 Most recent edition: *The Greek New Testament*. Edited by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger. Fifth Revised Edition prepared by the Institute for New Testament Textual Research, Münster/Westphalia under the direction of Holger Strutwolf, Stuttgart 2014. One should note the identity of the responsible persons, - the reason for the fact that the edited text (without the footnotes in the "apparatus") concurs and is designated as today's "standard text".

17 See my objections in: „Kooperation und Konkurrenz: Zwei revidierte Neuauflagen des griechischen Neuen Testaments," *Th Beitr* 46 (2015): 182–186.

18 The same solution can explain the paradox that Paul according to Acts 19:1 found some "disciples" (i.e. in Luke: Christians), who had never heard anything about the Holy Spirit and who had not received Christian baptism either. Translated into plain language: He found people he considered to be Christians at first sight, but he was mistaken. Cf. my study „Einige Fälle von ‚erlebter Rede' im Neuen Testament," *NT* 12 (1970) 70–77. Definition of terms and examples, among others, under https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erlebte Rede (accessed on 7.2.2016).

19 But caution: The notion is not restricted to a "royal" line! Also prophets could be designated as "anointed" (cf. Is 61:1). The decisive aspect is the (outstanding!) election and commissioning by God.

20 Not to confuse with the term "Jewish Greek"in the sense of a special Jewish dialect also in everyday language.

21 Cf. K. W. Pahlen, „Bibelübersetzung ohne Urtext? Textgrundlage und Sprachkompetenz von Bibelübersetzern in Afrika," in: *Wortlaute. Festschrift für Hartmut Günther*, ed. W. Schillhahn und M. Schaetzel, Groß Oesingen 2002, 13–19.

22 Here the problem of different pronunciation traditions needs attention. Originally, the Greek of the New Testament certainly did not sound the way it is mostly spoken in Germany (due to the influence of Erasmus). The "Cyrenius" of the Christmas story was originally called Quirinius and this example proves that already at that time the letter *Eta* was pronounced as a long *i*. And in the mouth of Paul *euangelion* certainly did not sound like "oiangelion" (which is the German pronunciation)!

23 Cf. H. von Siebenthal, *Griechische Grammatik zum Neuen Testament: Neubearbeitung und Erweiterung der Grammatik Hoffmann / von Siebenthal*, Gießen / Basel 2011, 234–251. Most Germans are probably not aware of the fact that the same is also true for German.

24 This pair of terms is sometimes used in an inaccurate way, where other alternatives are concerned.

25 Cf. Mk 12,28–31 Parr.

26 As for what follows I refer to my argument in: *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, Theologischer Handkommentar 6, Leipzig, (1. Aufl. 1999), 4., erneut überarbeitete Auflage 2012.

27 Cf. K. F. Ulrichs, *Christusglaube, Studien zum Syntagma pistis Christou und zum paulinischen Verständnis von Glaube und Rechtfertigung*, Tübingen 2007; G.M. Taylor, "The Function of [PISTIS CHRISTOU] in Galatians," *JBL* 85 (1966): 58–76; G. Howard, "On the 'Faith of Christ'," *HTR* 60 (1967): 459–465; A. J. Hultgren, "The Pistis Christou Formulation in Paul," *NT* 22 (1980): 248–263; S. K. Williams, "Again Pistis Christou," *CBQ* 49 (1987): 431–447; M. D. Hooker, "[PISTIS CHRISTOU]," *NTS* 35 (1989): 321–342; R. B. Hays, "PISTIS and Pauline Christology: What is at Stake?," in E. E. Johnson und D. M. Hay (Hrsg.), *Pauline Theology*, vol. 4, *Looking Back,*

Pressing On, Atlanta 1997, 35–60. A good overview in the German language and good arguments are given by R. Rusam, „Was versteht Paulus unter [pistis Iesou Christou] (Röm 3,22.26; Gal 2,16.20; 3,22; Phil 3,9)?", *Protokolle zur Bibel* 11 (2002): 47–70.

28 Cf. J. Haussleiter, „Der Glaube Jesu Christi und der christliche Glaube: ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des Römerbriefes", *NKZ* 2 (1881): 109–145.205–230; idem, „Was versteht Paulus unter christlichem Glauben? Eine Untersuchung der Formel [pistis Christou]", in *Greifswalder Studien: Theologische Abhandlungen Hermann Cremer zum 25jährigen Professorenjubiläum*, Gütersloh 1895, 161–181.

29 Cf. M. Barth, "The Faith of the Messiah," *Heythrop Journal* 10 (1969): 363–370.

30 Cf. R. B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1 – 4:11*, Chicago 1981.

31 Cf. Rusam (see above note 27) 53.

32 That means, the mere affirmation of creeds.

33 According to Grimm's dictionary of the German language the Gothic Bible translation of Wulfila points in this direction.

34 Cf. L. Keck, "'Jesus' in Romans", *JBL* 108 (1998): 443–460, here 454: "At stake here is emancipation from a subjectivist reading of justification, according to which its basis is either 'works' or our believing".

35 Italics by K.H. – R. B. Matlock has rightly objected to this theological overload of the debate, cf. R. B. Matlock, "Detheologizing the [PISTIS CHRISTOU] Debate: Cautionary Remarks from a Lexical Semantic Perspective", *NT* 42 (2000): 1–23; idem, "Even the Demons Believe: Paul and [pistis Christou]", *CBQ* 64 (2002): 300–318, here 311–318.

36 D. Rusam (see above note 27) arrives at a juxtaposition of Gen. obj. and Gen. auctoris, because he presupposes a meaning regarding the Pauline counter term *erga nomou* in the line of Gen. auctoris (or Gen. originis). His conclusion (p. 70) is: "Although the issue … certainly is human faith, Paul – by his

use of the genitivus auctoris – nevertheless underlines that God's justification is God's achievement." The risk of his argument is that he tries to explain a debated term through another debated term. We still could understand, that the issue is faith is demanded by Christ – just as the law demands certain actions – while it is a gift of God.

37 Cf. Rusam 52f, R. B. Matlock, "[PISTIS] in Galatians 3.26: Neglected Evidence for 'Faith in Christ'?", *NTS* 49 (2003): 433–439 has pointed toward the variant reading of Gal 3:26 in P46 which teaches that the Genitive and the prepositional construction (from the view of the copyist) have the same meaning. In the line of "Gen. obj." are, for example, also Phil 1:27 (*pistis tou euangeliou*); Col 2:12 (*pistis tes energeias theou*) and 2 Thess 2:13 (*p. aletheias*).

38 Cf. especially A. J. Hultgren, "The Pistis Christou Formulation in Paul", *NT* 22 (1980): 248–263.

39 Cf. *ThWNT* VI: 209,33f.

40 Cf. K. Haacker, „Glaube II - Altes und Neues Testament" *TRE* 13 (1984): 277–304, here 290 and 297.

41 For "zeal for God" and "zeal for the law" as meaning the same phenomenon in Acts 21:20; 22:3; Rom 10:2; cf. Gal 1:14).

42 In this sense, various authors of antiquity speak of the "works" of Aphrodite (=Kypris), where the (erotic) actions are concerned which are demanded by the goddess of love; cf. Antipatros, Epigr 43, similarly Bion 10 line 11. The cultic sense of the term is most clearly in Musaios, Hero and Leander 141f: "You are the priest of Kypris: fall to the works of Kypris: come and initiate me in the marriage customs of the deity."

43 Even in the contrary position of James, the Biblical example for the necessity of "works" as confirmation of faith is not a "good work" in the sense of ethics, but the – ethically rather questionable – cultic action of preparing Isaac for sacrifice (cf. James 2:20–24), and the "works" of Rahab from Jericho (James 2:25) consist – in her betrayal

of her country in favor of the Israelites (cf. Joshua 2)! To supplement faith by "works", therefore, is something quite different from faith which operates in love (Gal 5:6).

44 Cf. especially J. D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul", *BJRL* 65 (1983): 95–122, here 107: "By 'works of the law' Paul intended his readers to think of particular observances of the law like circumcision and the food laws." 110: "What he denies is that God's justification depends on 'covenantal nomism', that God's grace extends only to those who wear the badge of the covenant." (Cf. reprint in idem, *The New Perspective on Paul*, Tübingen 2005, here 98 and 101.) On this, remarkable evidence has been added by the letter 4QMMT ((edited only rather late!) where the term ma.asê ha-torah stands for cultic demands, on which the author (the "teacher of righteousness") advances special concerns of his group; cf. most recently J. D. G. Dunn, "4QMMT and Galatians", *NTS* 43(1997): 147–153, and M. Bachmann, „4QMMT und Galaterbrief: [Ma.asê ha-torah] und [ERGA NOMOU]", *ZNW* 89 (1998): 91–113.

45 Only slightly deviating from Luther's original version.

46 Thus C. E. B. Cranfield, J. D. G. Dunn, O. Michel, E. Käsemann, H. Schlier, W. Schmithals, U. Wilckens, D. Zeller; J. Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*, Göttingen 1960, 180f with reference to Apk Mos 21,6 (Adam towards Eve: "O evil woman, what have you wreaked among us? You have alienated me from the glory of God."); Greek Apk Bar 4,16.

47 The more common notion of a special glory (or position of honor) of Adam is sometimes unaffected by the problem of the fall into sin; cf. Sir 49,16.

48 Thus the commentaries by O. Kuss, H. Lietzmann, A. Nygren, A. Schlatter, H. W. Schmidt and an alternative translation of the Luther Bible 1984 (allegedly "literal"!).

49 Cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, 1905 and Josephus,

50 Thus Luther, also Zahn with reference to Rom 2:7.10.29; 1 Cor 4:5 and Joh 12:43.

51 Cf. Rom 3:7; 4:20 et al.

52 On the following, see also my recent article "Justice, Justification, Righteousness", in *Oxford Encyclopedia of Bible and Theology* I (2015): 581–587.

53 Cf. G. Schrenk, *ThWNT* II: 194f.; A. Dihle, „Gerechtigkeit" *RAC* X: 233–360; K. Grünwaldt, „[dikaiosyne]", *TBLNT²* I: 729–739.

54 An overview on "the righteousness of God in the exegesis of Paul" has been provides by U. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, vol. I, 223–233 at the end of his excursus "righteousness of God" (202ff).

55 Cf. W. Grundmann, „Zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion um das Verständnis der Gerechtigkeit Gottes in der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft", *ThJb* 1970: 99–117; M. T. Brauch, "Perspectives on 'God`s Righteousness' in Recent German Discussion", in E. P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 523–542; P. Stuhlmacher, „Die Gerechtigkeitsanschauung des Apostels Paulus", in ders., *Versöhnung, Gesetz und Gerechtigkeit: Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie*, 1981, 87–116, esp. 105f.

56 Cf. WA 54, 185f (Latin original text, corresponds to Clemen 4, 427f). Translation quoted from Roland H. Bainton, *Here I Stand. A Life of Martin Luther*, softcover edition by the New English Library, p. 49-50.

57 The linguistic possibility of this translation results from the comparison with the Genitive *tou kosmou* = "in the eyes of the world" in 1 Cor 1:27f.

58 Cf. E. Käsemann, „Gottesgerechtigkeit bei Paulus," *ZThK* 58 (1961): 367–378, also in idem, Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen II, Göttingen 1964, 181–193; Chr. Müller, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk: Eine Untersuchung zu Römer 9–11*, Göttingen 1964; P. Stuhlmacher, *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus*, Göttingen

Ant 15:200.

1965.

59 Cf. R. Bultmann, „[DIKAIOSYNE THEOU]", *JBL* 83 (1964): 12–16, also in idem, *Exegetica*, Tübingen 1967, 470–475; H. Conzelmann, Grundriß der Theologie des Neuen Testaments, München 1967 and more often, § 25, II; G. Klein, „Gottes Gerechtigkeit als Thema der neusten Paulusforschung", *VF* 12,2 (1967): 1–11, also in idem, *Rekonstruktion und Interpretation*, München 1969, 225–236; E. Lohse, „Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes in der paulinischen Theologie", in idem, *Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments*, Göttingen 1973, 209–227.

60 Cf. P. Stuhlmacher (see above note 58); Wilckens I, 203–208; K. Kertelge, *„Rechtfertigung" bei Paulus: Studien zur Struktur und zum Bedeutungsgehalt des paulinischen Rechtfertigungsbegriffs*, Münster 1967 (2. ed. 1972) and idem, „[dikaiosyne] etc.", *EWNT* I: 784–796.

61 Cf. on this especially M. J. Fiedler, „[Dikaiosýne] in der diasporajüdischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur", *JSJ* 1 (1970):120–143; J. A. Ziesler, The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry, Cambridge 1972, 52–111.

62 A similar contemporary loanword of meaning is "Evidenz" for "evidence" (i.e. empirical or textual proof), whereas "Evidenz" (in German) used to mean only an attribute of something.

63 Cf. G. Quell, *ThWNT* II: 176f; J. A. Ziesler (see above) 58.

64 Cf. D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms*, Cambridge 1967, 82-162.

65 Along this line numerous authors following H. Cremer, *Die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre im Zusammenhang ihrer geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen* (2. ed. 1900); cf. K. Koch, „ṣdq gemeinschaftstreu / heilvoll sein", *THAT* II: 507–530.

66 Cf. N. H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, New York 1964, pp.

51-78; cf. e.g. Judg 5,11 (ṣedeq for „heroic deed" or similarly); Is 41,2 (for „victory" or „success").

67 In LXX according to G. Quell, *ThWNT* II: 176 81times for ṣedeq and 134times for ṣedaqah.

68 Cf. Judg 5,11; 1 Sam 12,7; Micah 6,5.

69 See also Is 46:13: "I will bring near my righteousness, it is not far, and my help does not stay away. …". Is 51:5: "My righteousness is near, and my salvation comes forth." Further parallelisms of "righteousness" and "salvation" may be found in Is 45:8; 59:17; Ps 71:15; 40:11. On these texts and the tradition witnessed by them – also in view of the problem discussed above under point 3 – cf. the methodically exemplary study by F. Crüsemann, „Jahwes Gerechtigkeit (ṣedaqa/ṣädäq) im Alten Testament", *EvTh* 36 (1976): 427–450.

70 This argues against the accentuation of E. Käsemann and P. Stuhlmacher.

71 Cf. M. J. Fiedler (see above note 58).

72 Cf. J. Zink (1971), *Die Gute Nachricht* (1971), *BhD* (1982), *Hoffnung für alle* (1983).

73 Cf. M. v. Albrecht, *Meister römischer Prosa*, Tübingen / Basel, 3. ed. 1995, 134: "Return of the same word in different function was less avoided in antiquity than today."

74 That it is a Biblical technical term, could be signaled through quotation marks in the printed version.

Klaus Haacker (Prof. Dr.), Berlin, formerly Professor of New Testament at Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal. His main areas of research are the life and thought of the apostle Paul, the message of Jesus and Luke-Acts. He published several books and numerous articles and served as editor of the periodical *Theologische Beiträge* and the new edition of *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*.