
TEOLOGIA HISTÓRICA E SISTEMÁTICA





LUTHER ON GREEK GRAMMAR¹

Lutero sobre a gramática grega.

Matthew Oseka²

ABSTRACT

The present paper examines Luther's command of Greek grammar in the context of grammatical compendia and lexica which were at his disposal. It also studies how Luther utilised grammatical insights of the church fathers and of the 15th- and 16th-century exegetes.

Keywords: *Martin Luther. History of Greek grammar. History of biblical scholarship. Reformation hermeneutics.*

RESUMO

O presente artigo examina o domínio de Lutero da gramática grega no contexto de compêndios gramaticais e léxicos que estavam à sua disposição. Também estuda como Lutero utilizou percepções gramaticais dos pais da igreja e dos exegetas dos séculos XV e XVI.

Palavras-chave: *Martim Lutero. História da gramática grega. História da erudição bíblica. Reforma hermenêutica.*

¹ Artigo recebido em 17 de abril de 2018, e aprovado pelo Conselho Editorial em reunião realizada em 23 de novembro de 2018, com base nas avaliações dos pareceristas *ad hoc*.

² Matthew OSEKA, Th. D. (Christian Theological Academy, Warsaw / EU), lecturing at Concordia Theological Seminary, Kowloon, Hong Kong. E-mail: matthew.oseka@yahoo.com.

1 HISTORICAL SETTING

Since Luther established his reputation as a Bible translator, his real competence in Greek grammar was seldom studied by scholars except for those grammatical topics, which emerged in the controversy about the Lord's Supper. However, from a contemporary perspective, it appears that the arguments brought forward in this controversy were primarily hermeneutical, not grammatical. It should be noted that a distinction between grammar, hermeneutics and philosophy was not sharp in the 16th century.

Luther's command of Greek grammar originated from textbooks available to him, which can be identified easily. At that time, all grammars were either composed by the Byzantine literati living in West Europe³ or based on their works⁴. These tools were sufficient to parse the Greek original of the Christian Scriptures but were not adequate to explore the syntax⁵. Among ancient and mediaeval disquisitions on Greek, which are extant, only opuscles of Dionysius Trax⁶ and of Roger Bacon⁷ correspond to our notion of a textbook designed for non-native speakers, yet their works remained unpublished in the 16th century. In the age of the Reformation, the textbook by Theodorus Gazes had a favourable reception because Erasmus translated it into Latin and recommended as a bilingual

³ CHRYSOLORAS, Emanuel. **Quaestiones grammaticae**. Paris: Wechelus, 1539; LASCARIS, Constantinus. **Grammatices graecae epitome**. Venice: [s. n.], 1495; THEODORUS GAZES. **Introductio grammatica**, Vol. 1-4, Trans. ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS. Basel: Ex officina Valderiana, 1541.

⁴ BOLZANIO, Urbano. **Institutiones graecae grammatices**. Paris: Gourmont, [1510]; OECOLAMPADIUS, Johannes. **Graecae literaturae dragmata**. Basel: Cratander, 1518; MELANCHTHON, Philipp. **Grammatica graeca integra**. In: BRETSCHNEIDER, Karl Gottlieb and Heinrich Ernst BINDSEIL (Ed.). **Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus reformatorum)**, Vol. 20. Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1854, p. 3-180.

⁵ BOTLEY, Paul. **Learning Greek in Western Europe (1396-1529)**: Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2010, passim; CICOLELLA, Federica. **Donati Graeci: Learning Greek in the Renaissance**. Leiden: Brill, 2008, passim.

⁶ DIONYSIUS THRAX. **Ars grammatica**. In: FABRICIUS, Johann Albert (Ed.). **Bibliotheca Graeca**, Vol. 7. Hamburg: Felginer, 1727, p. 26-34.

⁷ BACON, Roger. **The Greek Grammar of Roger Bacon and a Fragment of His Hebrew Grammar**, Ed. Edmond NOLAN and S. A. HIRSCH. Cambridge: University Press, 1902; BACON, Roger. **Compendium philosophiae**. In: BREWER, John S. (Ed.). **Opera quaedam hactenus inedita**. London: Longman, 1859, p. 432-519 [VI-XII].

standard Greek grammar. In the first half of the 16th century, Greek - Latin lexica⁸ were also launched but they were very basic as compared to the later monumental project undertaken by Stephanus⁹. Until 1594, there was no concordance to the Greek original of the Christian Scriptures¹⁰, while the Latin concordance to the Vulgate was released in 1526¹¹.

All grammars existing in Luther's time drew on the legacy of the Byzantine scholars who had a command of Greek as a living language handed down from generation to generation. Nonetheless, we shall not presume that native speakers' comprehension of their own language must be flawless. For instance, *Attic Nights* written by a Roman thinker, Aulus Gellius, abound with various Graeco-Latin philological meditations (upon lexis, syntax, phonetics, etymology, word formation etc.)¹², which challenged the author of *Attic Nights* but which are trivial to us. To be born into a specific language does not even guarantee a lexical omniscience. This is evident from Origen's flawed insights into the adjective ἐπιούσιος in the Lord's Prayer¹³ or from his explanation of the anarthrous θεός in John 1.1¹⁴. Paradoxically, it seems that native speakers may fall prey to their own native language, while non-native speakers can be more attentive to phenomena, which are taken by native speakers for granted and thus ignored.

Luther's overall competence in Greek grammar must be reconstructed from his grammatical comments, which were scattered throughout his writings. While reading the Greek original of the Christian Scriptures, the Wittenberg

⁸ CRASTONUS, Johannes. **Dictionarium graecum cum interpretatione latina omnium quae hactenus impressa sunt copiosissimum**. Venice: In aedibus Aldi, 1524; CURIO, Valentinus. **Dictionarium graecum ultra Ferrariensem editionem locupletatum locis infinitis**. Basel: Cratander, 1519; Αα - ωρ. In: **Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine**. Alcalá: In Academia Complutensi, 1514.

⁹ STEPHANUS, Henricus. **Thesaurus Graecae linguae**, Vol. 1-4. Paris: Stephanus, 1572.

¹⁰ STEPHANUS, Henricus. **Concordantiae Testamenti Novi Graecolatinae**. Geneva: Stephanus, 1594.

¹¹ CONRADUS HALBERSTADENSIS. **Concordantiae Maiores Sacrae Bibliae**. Strasbourg: Cnoblochus, 1526.

¹² AULUS GELLIUS. **Noctes Atticae**, Vol. 1-2. Zweibrücken: Ex Typographia Societatis, 1784, passim.

¹³ ORIGENES. *Libellus de Oratione*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Graeca, Vol. 12. Paris: Migne, 1857, p. 505-522 [§ 27].

¹⁴ ORIGENES. *Commentaria in Evangelium Joannis*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Graeca, Vol. 14. Paris: Migne, 1862, p. 107-110 [II, 2].

Reformer utilised commentaries of the eminent scholars of that period (Erasmus¹⁵, Jacobus Faber Stapulensis¹⁶, Laurentius Valla¹⁷), yet he, to a considerable degree, relied on his own linguistic intuition.

2 ARTICLE

The grammars of Luther's time did not scrutinise the article's function. Chrysoloras and Lascaris confined themselves to the article's declension, whereas Theodorus noticed that the article could render an item definite (δῆλον) or could refer to an item mentioned previously (προεγνωσμένον). Melancthon added that some languages used the article (e.g. Greek) or articles (e.g. German) but other did not (e.g. Latin), and he remarked that the function of the article(s) would be peculiar to a specific language. Although in some instances Latin could render the Greek article by means of the demonstrative pronoun (hic, haec, hoc), there was no correspondence between the Greek article and German articles.

Luther¹⁸ rejected Zwingli's¹⁹ explanation of John 6.63 (ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν) according to which the article (ἡ) with σὰρξ referred to the noun mentioned previously in John 6.55 (ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ μου ἀληθὴς ἐστὶν βρῶσις). Zwingli maintained that the Greek article could either specify an item or refer back to an item mentioned previously, and he adduced certain passages (Mark 6.3; John 1.4, 1.14) to highlight these functions of the article in Greek²⁰. Moreover, Zwingli

¹⁵ ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS. *Novum Testamentum cum annotationibus*. In: **Opera**, Vol. 6. Basel: Froben, 1541; ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS. **In Novum Testamentum annotationes**. Basel: Froben, 1527.

¹⁶ STAPULENSIS, Jacobus Faber. **Epistolae divi Pauli apostoli cum commentariis**. Paris: Regnault, 1517; STAPULENSIS, Jacobus Faber. **Commentarii in epistolas catholicas**. Basel: Cratander, 1527.

¹⁷ VALLA, Laurentius. **In Novum Testamentum annotationes**. Basel: Cratander, 1526.

¹⁸ LUTHER, Martin. *Bekenntnis vom Abendmahl Christi (März 1528)*. In: WALCH, Johann Georg (Ed.). **Sämtliche Schriften**, Vol. 20. St. Louis: Concordia, 1890, p. 972-981 [I].

¹⁹ ZWINGLI, Ulrich. *Christliche Antwort (1527)*. In: **Werke**, Vol. II/2. Zürich: Schulthess, 1832, p. 86-90 [Von dem Wort „Das Fleisch ist gar nichts nutz“].

²⁰ From a contemporary perspective, the function of the article in the passages adduced by Zwingli is susceptible of various interpretations. In Mark 6.3 it seems that the predicate nominative (ὁ τέκτων) retained the article for the sake of emphasis. In John 1.4 both the subject (ἡ ζωὴ) and the predicate nominative (τὸ φῶς) were articular which might

appealed to the church fathers (Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom) and to Erasmus but actually none of them dealt with the articular σὰρξ in John 6.63.

Zwingli insisted that the Greek article and the German definite article might be equated with the demonstrative pronouns, and he used John 6.63 taken out of Luther's German Bible (*das Fleisch ist kein nütze*) to vindicate his claim. Furthermore, the Zurich Reformer was reluctant to be engaged in the contextual exegesis of this passage, which was requested by Luther who asserted that the contrast between flesh and spirit (σάρξ - πνεῦμα) must be examined in the light of all passages of the Christian Scriptures treating of this subject matter.

In response to Zwingli's argumentation, Luther discussed the significance of the article's presence and absence in Greek, Latin and German, emphasising that the article's use ought to be construed as exclusive to a language employing it. To prove that there was no transition from Greek to German in terms of the article's function, Luther juxtaposed selected passages from the Greek original of the Christian Scriptures (Matthew 1.1, 1.23, 1.24, 3.3 [= Mark 1.3; Luke 3.4]; John 1.6) with their rendition in his German Bible.

Luther favoured the contextual interpretation both of the Greek article and of the German articles, assuming that the precise function of the article(s) might be discovered only in the light of the context notwithstanding some latitude in their use. In view of Galatians 5.17 (ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός), Luther labelled the article with σὰρξ in John 6.63 as generic, albeit the standard grammars of that time neither recognised nor explained the generic function of the article. For the Wittenberg Reformer, σὰρξ both in John 6.63 and in Galatians 5.17 denoted the abstract category of human sinfulness as opposed to the abstract category of human being as a new, spiritual creature (πνεῦμα)²¹. Luther, however, went as far as to question any demonstrative, referential or relative function of the article, and from a contemporary perspective, such a stance is untenable. In addition, the Wittenberg Reformer defended his German translation of John 6.63 and clarified that in German abstract concepts usually entailed the definite article though he considered the omission of the

imply their equivalence, while in John 1.14 the articular λόγος indicated that λόγος was the subject, while the anarthrous σὰρξ functioned as the predicate nominative.

²¹ Apart from John 6.63, Zwingli argued that the meaning of σάρξ - πνεῦμα depended on the context. In 1 Timothy (3.16) and 1 Peter (3.18) it appears that σάρξ denoted Christ's state of exinanition, whereas πνεῦμα - his state of exaltation.

article (Fleisch ist kein nütze) possible.

3 SYNTAX

Lecturing upon the meaning of ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν θεόν in Galatians 1.10, Luther²² recapitulated views of the major commentators and he articulated his own opinion, which was implemented both in his German Bible and in the Protestant Vulgate²³. Four traditional interpretations could be distinguished. Two of them (no. 1-2) were related to plausible meanings of the verb πείθω which, according to the dictionaries of that time, denoted either “to persuade” (suadeo) or “to confide, to confide in / to” (confido).

Pursuant to the first interpretation which was propounded by Jerome²⁴ and Augustine²⁵, Paul persuaded humans by the Gospel but did not persuade God who needed no persuasion from human beings. Thus, persuading humans by the Gospel was a contrast to pleasing humans and indeed, such a persuasion would please God who commanded to preach the Gospel. This interpretation derived from the use of πείθω attested in Acts 28.23 and in 2 Corinthians 5.11.

Pursuant to the second interpretation, which was presented by

²² LUTHER, Martin. *Commentarium in Epistolam S. Pauli ad Galatas*, Vol. 3, Ed. Johann Konrad IRMISCHER. Erlangen: Sumtibus Caroli Heyderi, 1844, p. 165-167 [Galatians 1.10].

²³ Luther supervised the Wittenberg revision of the Vulgate. An emended, Protestant version of the Vulgate was published in 1529 and it contained certain books of the Hebrew Bible (the Pentateuch, the Book of Joshua, the Book of Judges and the Book of Kings) and the Christian Scriptures. KAULEN, Franz. *Geschichte der Vulgata*. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1868, p. 318-327 [XIII]. ALAND, Kurt and Barbara ALAND. Praefatio in editionem secundam recognitam. In: ALAND, Kurt and Barbara ALAND (Ed.). *Novum Testamentum Latine*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1998, [s. p.].

²⁴ HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS. *Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina*, Vol. 26. Paris: Migne, 1845, p. 321-322 [Galatians 1.10]. HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS. In *Epistolam ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina*, Vol. 30. Paris: Migne, 1846, p. 807 [Galatians 1.10].

²⁵ AUGUSTINUS HIPONENSIS. *Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina*, Vol. 35. Paris: Migne, 1845, p. 2109 [Galatians 1.10].

Stapulensis²⁶, Paul confided himself not to humans but to God alone and he did not please human beings but God alone (1 Thessalonians 2.4). Consequently, confiding oneself to humans would correspond to pleasing human beings, while confiding oneself to God could be equated with pleasing God. For Chrysostom, in this context verbs *παίθω* and *ἀρέσκω* were almost synonymous²⁷, while the passage treated of human responsibility to God for the message, which was to be proclaimed. Likewise, Theophylact of Ohrid explained that *ἀνθρώπους παίθω ἢ τὸν θεόν* was about the accountability either to God or to humans for the doctrine, which was to be communicated to the people²⁸. A similar idea was attributed to Ambrose (Ambrosiaster²⁹) whom, by misapprehension, Luther counted among proponents of the first interpretation. Ambrosiaster wrote that in this context *παίθω* meant “to satisfy” and translated the passage as follows: “*Modo enim hominibus satisfacio, aut Deo?*” (Am I now satisfying humans or God?). To the contrary, Erasmus³⁰, who knew Theophylact’s commentary, criticised Stapulensis’ exposition, arguing that *παίθω* only with the dative, but never with the accusative case, could denote “to confide (oneself), to confide in / to” or “to trust in”.

Pursuant to the third interpretation which was implied by Valla³¹, articulated by Erasmus³² and upheld by Luther, the exact meaning of *παίθω* was not decisive but rather a metonymy, which connected *παίθω τὸν θεόν* to preaching

²⁶ STAPULENSIS, 1517, p. XXVIr [Galatians 1.10]. Ibidem, p. CXXr-CXXIr [Galatians 1.10].

²⁷ CHRYSOSTOMUS, Joannes. In *Epistolam ad Galatas commentarius*. In: MONTFAUCON, Bernard de (Ed.). **Opera omnia quae exstant**, Vol. 10/II. Paris: Gaume, 1838, p. 795-797 [Galatians 1.10]. See: BENGEL, John Albrecht. **Gnomon of the New Testament**, Vol. 2, Trans. Charlton T. LEWIS and Marvin R. VINCENT. Philadelphia: Perkinpine and Higgins, 1860, p. 342 [Galatians 1.10].

²⁸ THEOPHYLACTUS. In **D. Pauli Epistolas commentarii**, Ed. Augustine LINDSELL. London: E Typographeo Regio, 1636, p. 444 [Galatians 1.10].

²⁹ AMBROSIASTER. In *Epistolam beati Pauli ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina**, Vol. 17. Paris: Migne, 1845, p. 342 [Galatians 1.10].

³⁰ ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS, 1527, p. 506 [Galatians 1.10].

³¹ VALLA, 1526, p. 267 [Galatians 1.10]: “*Nescio an melius, ut graece est, per accusativum transferatur, homines suadeo, sive persuadeo, an Deum: non dico, ut idem significet, quod per Deum, sed, suadeo humana an divina*”. Luther misquoted Valla’s remark as Erasmus’: “*placet tamen magis Erasmi sententia, qui id, quod in graeco accusandi casu: >Homines suadeo, an Deum?< interpretatur: Modo humana suadeo, an divina?*”.

³² ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS, 1527, p. 506 [Galatians 1.10].

about God (1 Corinthians 1.23), did matter. Furthermore, Luther perceived Galatians 1.10 as parallel to Galatians 1.11 in the sense that Paul was preaching in the service of God, not of human beings, the message not of human origin (humana) but rather revealed by God (divina). Therefore, Paul's persuasion pleased God, not humans. Luther's remark, that the verb "suadeo" was "absolute" (verbum absolutum), is equivocal because Priscian defined the absolute verb as a verb which would govern no case³³ so that neither Greek *πείθω* nor Latin "suadeo" might be considered absolute.

Luther's German Bible adopted the third interpretation: „Predige ich denn jetzt Menschen oder Gott zu Dienst?“ (Am I now preaching in the service of humans or of God?). In the Wittenberg Vulgate these words were translated similarly: “Modo enim hominibus studeo demereri aut Deum?” (Am I now striving to be obliged to humans or to God?). Nevertheless, in that rendition the verb “demereo” could easily be misunderstood because it might also denote “to merit”.

Pursuant to the fourth interpretation, which was formulated by Calvin³⁴, a clue to Galatians 1.10 was not the verb *πείθω* but the accusative case (*τὸν θεόν*) which he expounded as the accusative of respect corresponding to the preposition *κατά* (secundum). Therefore, Calvin translated the passage as follows: “Nunc enim suadeone secundum homines, an secundum Deum?” (Am I now persuading in accordance with humans or in accordance with God?). In his view, the message proclaimed by Paul accorded with God's revelation but not with human expectations (Galatians 1.11). Calvin's elucidation demonstrated a high level of grammatical expertise because the grammars of that period only mentioned that the accusative case could indicate the direct object.

Working on Galatians 5.13b (*μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῆ σαρκί*), Luther addressed the issue of ellipsis³⁵ which left the noun (*τὴν ἐλευθερίαν*) entirely unattended because no verb from the context could be supplied. Such a rhetorical device was called by the Wittenberg Reformer “reticentia” which was

³³ PRISCIANUS CAESARIENSIS. *Institutiones grammaticae*, Vol. 1, Ed. Martin HERTZ. Leipzig: Teubner, 1855, p. 390 [VIII, 23].

³⁴ CALVIN, Jean. In *Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas commentarius*. In: **In omnes Pauli apostoli epistolas atque etiam in Epistolam ad Hebraeos commentarii**, Vol. 1. Halle: Gebauer, 1831, p. 540-542 [Galatians 1.10].

³⁵ LUTHER, 1844, p. 393 [Galatians 5.13].

the Latin equivalent of Greek ἀποσιώπησις³⁶. Indeed, the ellipsis was discussed in the ancient³⁷ and Renaissance³⁸ manuals. Contemporary handbooks distinguish between the ellipsis and the aposiopesis (ἀποσιώπησις), and claim that the former meant the intentional omission of the word(s), whereas the latter denoted the interrupted utterance³⁹. Probably, for Luther, both terms were synonyms.

Jerome supplemented the sentence with the verb “detis” (“but do not give freedom into an occasion for / to the flesh”) and this solution was commonly adopted in different Latin translations (Erasmus, the Complutensian Polyglot, Stapulensis, Luther, Calvin). In his commentary on Galatians Jerome admitted that the verb was missing and therefore it must be supplied in one way or another⁴⁰. Moreover, he stated that Clement of Alexandria suggested to supply the verb παρέχω (to hand over)⁴¹ and pointed to Origen’s commentary on Galatians⁴² of which extant fragments, however, do not appertain to this passage⁴³.

Theophylact proposed to supply the verb ἔχω (to have)⁴⁴, while Valla resorted to the verb δουλεύω (to serve) from the next part of the sentence⁴⁵ which would be the most natural supplement in terms of ellipsis, yet δουλεύω could not govern the accusative case except for the idiomatic phrase δουλεύω δουλείαν. In his German Bible Luther paraphrased the Vulgate rendition (“in order that you might not give way to the flesh through freedom”), while in his commentary, he embraced Jerome’s “detis”.

Luther struggled with the syntax of 1 Timothy 4.3 (κωλύοντων

³⁶ QUINTILIANUS. *Institutio oratoria*, Vol. 2, Ed. Eduard BONNELL. Leipzig: Teubner, 1854, p. 102-103 [IX, 2, 54-74].

³⁷ QUINTILIANUS, 1854, p. 102-103 [IX, 2, 54-74].

³⁸ THEODORUS GAZES, 1541, Vol. 4, p. 258-259 [Ellipsis].

³⁹ DEBRUNNER, Albert and Friedrich BLASS. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Trans. Robert W. FUNK. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1961, p. 253-255 [§ 479-482].

⁴⁰ HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS, 1845, p. 406 [Galatians 5.13].

⁴¹ CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS. *Stromata*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). *Patrologiae cursus completus*: Series Graeca, Vol. 8. Paris: Migne, 1857, p. 1143-1146 [III, V].

⁴² ORIGENES. In *Epistolam ad Galatas*. In: LA RUE, Charles de and Carl Heinrich Eduard LOMMATZSCH (Ed.). *Opera omnia*, Vol. 5. Berlin: Haude and Spener, 1835, p. 261-270.

⁴³ HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS, 1845, p. 405-406 (n. “d”) [Galatians 5.13].

⁴⁴ THEOPHYLACTUS, 1636, p. 483 [Galatians 5.13].

⁴⁵ VALLA, 1526, p. 171 [Galatians 5.13].

γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων)⁴⁶ in which the infinitive ἀπέχεσθαι was linked to the participle κωλύοντων. In his opinion, it made no sense because the context implied that those persons did not forbid to abstain from certain foods but rather commanded to abstain. Such a feature Luther called ἀναπόδοτον (alternatively, ἀνανταπόδοτον) which was a figure of speech consisting in the intentional omission of the apodosis⁴⁷.

Surprisingly, Luther attributed this rhetorical phenomenon to the concept of the biblical inspiration, which, in his opinion, allowed biblical authors to break the laws of grammar. To be precise, the construction in question was not ἀναπόδοτον but rather the zeugma (ζεύγμα) - a sort of elliptical parallelism in which the opposite verb was to be supplied⁴⁸. Actually, the category of zeugma was known to the ancient grammarians⁴⁹.

Translating 1 Timothy 4.3, Stapulensis, Erasmus and Calvin⁵⁰ inserted the Latin verb “jubeo” (to command) as the lexical opposite of the verb κωλύω (to forbid) so that those persons would “forbid to marry [and command] to abstain from certain foods”. Theophylact proposed to supplement the sentence with the verb συμβουλεύω (to advise)⁵¹. For Bengel, κωλύω communicated “praecipio ne” (to command not to) which helped to visualise the parallelism: “command not [A] to marry” - “command [-A] to abstain”⁵².

For no obvious reason, in his German Bible Luther attempted to imitate the Greek zeugma though this figure of speech was not applicable to German.

⁴⁶ LUTHER, Martin. Vorlesung über den 1. Timotheusbrief (1528). In: **Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe**, Vol. 26. Weimar: Böhlau, 1909, p. 72-74 [1 Timothy 4.3].

⁴⁷ Index of Technical Terms. In: BENDEL, John Albrecht. **Gnomon of the New Testament**, Vol. 2, Trans. Charlton T. LEWIS and Marvin R. VINCENT. Philadelphia: Perkinpine and Higgins, 1860, p. 936 [s. v. Anantapodoton].

⁴⁸ Ibidem, p. 957-958 [s. v. Zeugma]. DEBRUNNER and BLASS, 1961, p. 253 [§ 479 (2)].

⁴⁹ JULIUS RUFINIANUS. De schematis lexeos. In: RUHNKEN, David and Karl Heinrich FROTSCHER (Ed.). **Publius Rufilius Lupus, De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis libri duo item Aquilae Romani et Iulii Rufiniani de eodem argumento libri**. Leipzig: Schaarschmidt and Volekmar, 1831, p. 246 [III].

⁵⁰ CALVIN, Jean. In Priorem Pauli ad Timotheum commentarius. In: **In omnes Pauli apostoli epistolas atque etiam in Epistolam ad Hebraeos commentarii**, Vol. 2. Halle: Gebauer, 1831, p. 261 [1 Timothy 4.3].

⁵¹ THEOPHYLACTUS, 1636, p. 771 [1 Timothy 4.3].

⁵² BENDEL, Johann Albrecht. **Gnomon Novi Testamenti**. Berlin: Schlawitz, 1860, p. 539 [1 Timothy 4.3].

Furthermore, his comments about grammatical errors as possible side effects of the biblical inspiration appear to be inconsistent with his concept of language⁵³. In Greek, the zeugma is not an error but rather a common figure of speech.

Luther observed that the Vulgate (actually, certain versions thereof) tried to facilitate the syntax of 1 Timothy 2.6-7 as far as τὸ μαρτύριον is concerned⁵⁴. Based on our textual knowledge, it seems that the Vulgate variant (cujus testimonium temporibus suis confirmatum est) mirrored the Greek manuscript labelled as D* (οὗ τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίους ἐδόθη)⁵⁵.

Since Erasmus' Greek New Testament and the Polyglot delivered the text τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίους, the Wittenberg Reformer assumed that the Vulgate offered the interpretative translation of this passage in order to connect ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίους by the relative clause so that 1 Timothy 2.6-7 might communicate: "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and human beings, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all, whose testimony was given in due time".

Luther did not reject the Vulgate variant and he was inclined to accept the objective function of "cujus" (about whom the testimony was given in due time) which surfaced in his German Bible: "der sich selbst gegeben hat für alle zur Erlösung, dass solches zu seiner Zeit geprediget würde" (who gave himself for all as a ransom in order that this might be preached in due time). Similarly, the Wittenberg Vulgate spoke of the testimony unveiled (palam factum est) in due time. To the contrary, the exposition attributed to Jerome opted for the subjective function so that Christ might bear testimony to humankind through his holy life⁵⁶.

Stapulensis perceived τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίους as the opening (caput) of the next verse (εἰς ὃ ἐτέθη ἐγὼ κήρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος) so that the relative pronoun ὃ (v. 7) could refer to τὸ μαρτύριον, and therefore rendered it thus: "Christus Jesus qui dedit semet ipsum redemptionem pro omnibus. Ad quod testimonium propriis temporibus positus sum ego [...]" (Christ Jesus who gave himself as a ransom for all. For such a testimony in due time I was appointed

⁵³ STOLT, Birgit. *Martin Luthers Rhetorik des Herzens*. Tübingen: Siebeck, 2000, p. 44-45 [II, 2] and p. 47-49 [II, 3b].

⁵⁴ LUTHER, 1909, p. 39-41 [1 Timothy 2.6].

⁵⁵ Besides, the codex 8 read: „καὶ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίους“.

⁵⁶ HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS. In *Primam Epistolam ad Timotheum*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina*, Vol. 30. Paris: Migne, 1846, p. 878 [1 Timothy 2.6].

[...])⁵⁷.

Erasmus proposed the interpretative translation of 1 Timothy 2.6-7: “ut esset testimonium temporibus suis” (in order that the testimony might happen in due time)⁵⁸, which was also adopted by Calvin⁵⁹. Moreover, the Dutch Humanist contended that Greek evidences unanimously supported τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίαις, whereas “testimonium temporibus suis” was attested by some Latin codices such as an unidentified Codex Constantiensis⁶⁰.

As Erasmus recalled, Chrysostom⁶¹ and Theophylact⁶² expounded this passage in a more simple way. In their opinion, τὸ μαρτύριον was appositive to ἀντίλυτρον because Christ’s suffering (πάθος) as a ransom for humankind was the testimony in due time. Consequently, Jesus’ passion became the ultimate proclamation and display of the heavenly truth. In other words, they considered τὸ μαρτύριον to be the double accusative like ἀντίλυτρον to which τὸ μαρτύριον was said to be appositive (“Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all, namely, as the testimony in due time”).

4 TENSES

Reading 1 John 1.10 (ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν), Luther realised that a verb in the perfect tense in the clause subordinate to the protasis in the conditional sentence of the third class (according to the contemporary classification⁶³) might relate to the present moment⁶⁴. Another textual variant ἡμάρτομεν (Ind. Aor. II Act.) attested by some minuscules (no. 322, 323, 945, 1241, 1739, 1881 and 2298) was unknown at that time.

⁵⁷ STAPULENSIS, 1517, p. CLIXr [1 Timothy 2.6] and p. XLv [1 Timothy 2.6].

⁵⁸ ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS, 1541, p. 345 [1 Timothy 2.6].

⁵⁹ CALVIN, 1831, Vol. 2, 247 [1 Timothy 2.6].

⁶⁰ ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS, 1527, p. 598 [1 Timothy 2.6].

⁶¹ CHRYSOSTOMUS, Joannes. In Epistolam primam ad Timotheum commentarius (Homilia VII). In: MONTFAUCON, Bernard de (Ed.). **Opera omnia quae exstant**, Vol. 11/II. Paris: Gaume, 1838, p. 660 [1 Timothy 2.6].

⁶² THEOPHYLACTUS, 1636, p. 757 [1 Timothy 2.6].

⁶³ The Byzantine grammars were silent about different types of conditional sentences.

⁶⁴ LUTHER, Martin. Vorlesung über den 1. Brief des Johannes (1527). In: **Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe**, Vol. 20. Weimar: Böhlau, 1898, p. 629 [1 John 1.10].

Luther called ἡμαρτήκαμεν “verbum praeteriti temporis” (the verb in the past tense). The official Latin term for the perfect tense was “praeteritum perfectum”, however the imperfect (praeteritum imperfectum) and the pluperfect (praeteritum plusquamperfectum) were called “praeteritum” too⁶⁵. For Luther, “verbum praeteriti temporis” (i. e. the verb in the perfect tense) could refer to current events to the same extent as “verbum praesentis temporis” (e.g. the verb in the present tense). This coincided with the Byzantine handbooks, which acknowledged that in Greek the perfect tense usually indicated the accomplished action with the ongoing result(s).

For the Wittenberg Reformer, the statement οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν (1 John 1.10) was parallel to ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν (Ind. Pres. Act.) from 1 John 1.8 and therefore embraced not only past sins but also present sins. A similar comment was made by Augustine⁶⁶ (though with reference to the Vulgate⁶⁷) and by Stapulensis⁶⁸. Furthermore, Luther equated the Greek perfect tense with the Hebrew one, which is absolutely unintelligible.

5 INFINITIVE

In Galatians 1.6-7 (καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ) Luther alleged that μεταστρέψαι was “the future infinitive” (infinitivus futurus)⁶⁹ instead of the infinitive aorist (I) active. With the aid of the grammars at his disposal, the Wittenberg Reformer should have parsed μεταστρέψαι properly and determined the complementary function thereof⁷⁰. It is not probable that Luther’s “infinitivus futurus” was meant to cast light on the bearing of the infinitive’s tense because at that time grammarians did not realise that in non-

⁶⁵ THEODORUS GAZES, 1541, Vol. 4, p. 290-291 [De verbo].

⁶⁶ AUGUSTINUS HIPONENSIS. In Epistolam Joannis ad Parthos. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina, Vol. 35. Paris: Migne, 1845, p. 1982-1983 [I, 6 (1 John 1.10)].

⁶⁷ Suffice it to say that the Greek perfect tense and the Latin perfect tense did not function in the same way.

⁶⁸ STAPULENSIS, Jacobus Faber. **Commentarii in epistolas catholicas**. Antwerp: Gymnich, 1540, p. 223-224 [1 John 1.10].

⁶⁹ LUTHER, 1844, p. 162 [Galatians 1.6-7].

⁷⁰ THEODORUS GAZES, 1541, Vol. 4, p. 315-316 [Infinitivus].

indicative moods the aorist tense would express the unitary aspect of action, whereas the present tense - the durative aspect thereof.

Lecturing on Galatians 4.18, Luther examined the infinitive ζηλοῦσθαι⁷¹ which was articular (τὸ ζηλοῦσθαι) in Erasmus' Greek New Testament and in the Polyglot. The Wittenberg Reformer criticised the Vulgate translation of this passage, which was quoted as follows: "Bonum aemulamini in bono" (Emulate good in what is good!). He agreed with Stapulensis and Erasmus who advocated different Latin translations of Galatians 4.18. The former rendered it: "Bona est zelatio in bono semper" (The zeal for good is always good), while the latter: "Bonum autem est aemulari in re bona semper" (To emulate in a good thing is always good).

Luther appealed to the Greek original of Galatians 4.18, claiming that ζηλοῦσθαι was not the imperative (Latin "aemulamini") but rather the infinitive (Latin "aemulari"). The Wittenberg Reformer followed Stapulensis⁷² and Erasmus⁷³ interpretations which he epitomised thus: "To emulate in a good thing is always good, namely, the emulation in a good thing is always good". This paraphrase resembled Valla's⁷⁴ statement though Luther did not mention him at all.

Luther's argumentation derived from Valla, Stapulensis and Erasmus who were in favour of the infinitive ζηλοῦσθαι and who proposed the interpretations which the Wittenberg Reformer applied to the Protestant Vulgate (autem est aemulari) and to his German Bible (Eifern ist gut, wenn's immerdar geschieht um das Gute [To strive is good if it is always about good]). Erasmus pointed out that although ζηλοῦσθαι (Inf. Pres. Med.-Pass. of ζηλόω) and ζηλουεσθε (Imperat. Pres. Med.-Pass. 2 Pl. of ζηλόω) might sound alike, the article (τὸ) could accompany the infinitive, not the imperative. Moreover, the Dutch Humanist recalled that in his commentary on Galatians Augustine preferred the infinitive⁷⁵.

Nowadays, it is known that certain manuscripts (x, B, 33) contained

⁷¹ LUTHER, 1844, p. 339-340 [Galatians 4.18].

⁷² STAPULENSIS, 1517, p. XXVIIv [Galatians 4.18] and p. CXXIVv [Galatians 4.18].

⁷³ ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS, 1527, p. 521 [Galatians 4.18].

⁷⁴ VALLA, 1526, p. 270 [Galatians 4.18].

⁷⁵ AUGUSTINUS HIPONENSIS. *Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina, Vol. 35. Paris: Migne, 1845, p. 2131 [Galatians 4.18].

ζηλουσθε in place of ζηλοῦσθαι. Therefore, Jerome endorsed “aemulamini” in the Vulgate⁷⁶ and in his commentaries⁷⁷. Some Greek evidences retained ζηλοῦσθαι, yet abandoned the preceding article (τὸ). This, however, did not change the function of the infinitive, which regardless of the article acted as a noun and was the subject of the omitted linking verb, while καλὸν functioned as the predicative nominative.

6 PARTICIPLE

Theodorus Gazes ascertained that the participle was a sort of bridge between the noun and the verb, and that it could modify either the noun⁷⁸ or the verb but he did not specify how the verb might be modified by the participle⁷⁹. In Galatians 3.1 Luther was confronted by complex textual (= T), syntactic (= S) and lexical (= L) questions⁸⁰. As regards the text, the Byzantine manuscripts (whence Erasmus’ edition and the Polyglot) added the words τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πειθεσθαι (that you should not obey⁸¹ the truth) after ἐβάσκανεν and inserted ἐν ὑμῖν (in / among you) before ἐσταυρωμένος.

These readings were mirrored in the text of the Vulgate, which was evasive as far as the precise meaning of προεγράφη is concerned. The latter was translated as “descriptus” (described), “proscriptus” (proscribed) or “praescriptus” (prescribed). The absence of ἐν ὑμῖν (= T1) or the presence thereof (= T2) played a significant part in the interpretation. According to Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas, Jerome⁸² admitted that the words τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πειθεσθαι were missing

⁷⁶ RANKE, Ernst (Ed.). **Codex Fuldensis**: Novum Testamentum Latine interprete Hieronymo. Marburg and Leipzig: Elwert, 1868, p. 254 [Galatians 4.18].

⁷⁷ HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS, 1845, p. 383-385 [Galatians 4.18]. HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS. In Epistolam ad Galatas. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina, Vol. 30. Paris: Migne, 1846, p. 816 [Galatians 4.18].

⁷⁸ A participle could also be substantival, namely, might act as a noun.

⁷⁹ THEODORUS GAZES, 1541, Vol. 4, p. 319-323 [De participio].

⁸⁰ LUTHER, 1844, p. 253-255 [Galatians 3.1].

⁸¹ Calvin discussed whether πειθεσθαι ought to be translated as “oboedire” (the Vulgate) or as “credere” (Erasmus’ translation). CALVIN, 1831, Vol. 1, p. 560-561 [Galatians 3.1].

⁸² HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS, 1845, p. 348 [Galatians 3.1]: “Legitur in

from the manuscripts treasured by Origen but this fragment of the commentary could be spurious.

The above fragment of *Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas* was cited in the commentaries on Galatians ascribed to Claudius of Turin⁸³ and to Rabanus Maurus⁸⁴. Both of them were Carolingian theologians of the 9th century. Although the fragment was copied verbatim in their commentaries, it contains no words about Origen's manuscripts, which might be *argumentum e silentio* against their authenticity. Moreover, this dubious fragment of Jerome's commentary read "non credere veritati" which did not conform to the Vulgate (*non oboedire veritati*), albeit such a wording was found in the commentary on Galatians composed by Primasius of Hadrumetum⁸⁵ in the 6th century.

The participle *ἔσταυρωμένος* could be either circumstantial or attributive, whereas the prepositional phrase (in the case of T1) or phrases (in the case of T2) might modify either the verb (*προεγράφη*) or the participle (*ἔσταυρωμένος*) which could establish several relationships within the sentence:

T1	Participle	Prep. Phrase (1)	Prep. Phrase (2)
	<i>ἔσταυρωμένος</i>	<i>κατ' ὄφθαλμοῦς</i>	-
S1a	modifies the verb	modifies the verb	-
S1b	modifies the verb	modifies the participle	-
S2a	modifies the subject	modifies the verb	-
S2b	modifies the subject	modifies the participle	-

and

T2	Participle	Prep. Phrase (1)	Prep. Phrase (2)
----	------------	------------------	------------------

quibusdam codicibus: >Quis vos fascinavit non credere veritati?< Sed hoc quia in exemplaribus Adamantii [= Origenis] non habetur, omisimus".

⁸³ CLAUDIUS TAURINENSIS. *Enarratio in Epistolam D. Pauli ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina, Vol. 104. Paris: Migne, 1864, p. 866 [Galatians 3.1].

⁸⁴ RABANUS MAURUS. *Expositio in Epistolam ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina, Vol. 112. Paris: Migne, 1878, p. 283 [Galatians 3.1].

⁸⁵ PRIMASIIUS ADRUMETANUS. *Epistola B. Pauli Apostoli ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina, Vol. 68. Paris: Migne, 1866, p. 589 [Galatians 3.1].

	ἔσταυρωμένος	κατ' ὀφθαλμούς	ἐν ὑμῖν
S1aI	modifies the verb	modifies the verb	modifies the verb
S1aII	modifies the verb	modifies the verb	modifies the participle
S1bI	modifies the verb	modifies the participle	modifies the verb
S1bII	modifies the verb	modifies the participle	modifies the participle
S2aI	modifies the subject	modifies the verb	modifies the verb
S2aII	modifies the subject	modifies the verb	modifies the participle
S2bI	modifies the subject	modifies the participle	modifies the verb
S2bII	modifies the subject	modifies the participle	modifies the participle

The editors of the Polyglot and Erasmus in his Greek New Testament with annotations⁸⁶ placed the comma in such a way (προεγράφη, ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσταυρωμένος) that it would connect ἐν ὑμῖν to ἔσταυρωμένος, making ἐν ὑμῖν a modifier of ἔσταυρωμένος. Some versions of the Vulgate and some Western church fathers (e.g. Ambrosiaster⁸⁷) introduced the conjunction “et” between προεγράφη and ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσταυρωμένος to the same effect. Stapulensis remarked that “et” was superfluous and that it was not attested by any Greek evidence⁸⁸. Luther accepted this position.

The semantic fields of προεγράφη, ἔσταυρωμένος and ἐν were complex. In a compound verb προ-γράφω the preposition προ could be either of temporal nature (to write prior to [= L1a]) or of spatial nature (to write in front of [= L1b]). Besides, this verb might denote “to announce, to set forth, to proclaim, to present, to describe, to depict” (= L1c), “to advertise an auction” (= L1d) or “to proscribe” (= L1e). The Polyglot lexicon rendered προγράφω by Latin “prae-scribere” and “ante-scribere”. The participle ἔσταυρωμένος could refer either to Christ’s physical crucifixion which took place in Jerusalem (= L2a) or to Christ’s continual spiritual crucifixion (= L2b) which was said to be perpetrated by unbelievers (Hebrews 6.6). Finally, the preposition ἐν in this setting meant either “within” (= L3a) or “among” (= L3b).

Lecturing on Galatians 3.1, Luther summarised different explanations

⁸⁶ ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS, 1541, p. 308 [Galatians 3.1]. In editio princeps no comma was inserted there. ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS (Ed.). **Novum instrumentum omne**. Basel: Froben, 1516, p. 78 [Galatians 3.1].

⁸⁷ AMBROSIASTER, 1845, p. 352 [Galatians 3.1]: „proscriptus est et in vobis crucifixus”.

⁸⁸ STAPULENSIS, 1517, p. CXXIIIr [Galatians 3.1].

offered by the church fathers (Jerome, Ambrose [actually, Ambrosiaster], Augustine) and by Stapulensis and Erasmus. There are two extant commentaries on Galatians attributed to Jerome but their authorship is dubious⁸⁹. These commentaries already existed in the 9th century because their portions were recalled in the writings, which could be traced back to that time⁹⁰.

According to *Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas* which was mentioned by Luther, προεγράφη appertained to the prophets of the Hebrew Bible who, by the divine inspiration, predicted the Saviour's coming and described beforehand (= L1a) his physical crucifixion (= L2a)⁹¹. To the contrary, according to *In Epistolam ad Galatas*, προεγράφη meant to be proscribed (proscriptus) in legal terms (= L1e), namely, meant to be sentenced (sententiam damnationis accipere)⁹². The same commentary explicated ἐν as «apud» (among [= L3b]) and interpreted ἐσταυρωμένος as a historical event (= L2a).

Luther alluded to Ambrose's (actually, Ambrosiaster's) statement that προγράφο denoted to impose a legal penalty of proscription (= L1e) entailing the deprivation of civil rights, confiscation of property, exile or even death⁹³. Thus, Χριστὸς προεγράφη would communicate that Christ was put to death for the salvation of humankind. In fact, a Roman⁹⁴ historian, Cassius Dio, used προγράφο to describe the proscription⁹⁵. However, he also employed this verb to speak of an advertisement of auction (= L1d)⁹⁶. To this meaning of προγράφο Calvin⁹⁷ referred

⁸⁹ Compare *In Epistolam ad Galatas* attributed to Jerome with the commentary penned by Sedulius Scotus, an Irish theologian of the 9th century. SEDULIUS SCOTUS. In *Epistolam ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina**, Vol. 103. Paris: Migne, 1864, p. 185 [Galatians 3.1].

⁹⁰ CLAUDIUS TAURINENSIS, 1864, p. 866 [Galatians 3.1]. RABANUS MAURUS, 1878, p. 283 [Galatians 3.1].

⁹¹ HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS, 1845, p. 348 [Galatians 3.1].

⁹² HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS. In *Epistolam ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina**, Vol. 30. Paris: Migne, 1846, p. 811 [Galatians 3.1].

⁹³ AMBROSIASTER, 1845, p. 352 [Galatians 3.1].

⁹⁴ Cassius Dio and Marcus Aurelius represented those Roman literati who adopted Greek as their written language.

⁹⁵ CASSIUS DIO. **Historiae Romanae**, Vol. 2, Ed. Friedrich Wilhelm STURZ. Leipzig: Kühn, 1824, p. 478-479 [XLVII, 3].

⁹⁶ CASSIUS DIO, 1824, Vol. 3, p. 12-13 [LI, 4].

⁹⁷ CALVIN, 1831, Vol. 1, p. 560-561 [Galatians 3.1].

in his commentary on Galatians 3.1 when he cited a cognate noun πρόγραμμα which in Cassius Dio denoted an edict (announcement)⁹⁸. Ambrosiaster assumed that in Galatians 3.1 the crucifixion signified a spiritual rejection of Jesus by unbelievers (= L2b) who futilely attempted to save themselves instead of receiving the eternal life won by Christ on the cross.

Luther's reference to Augustine's explanation of Galatians 3.1⁹⁹ is a riddle to us because the Wittenberg Reformer maintained that Augustine rendered προεγράφη as "praescriptus"¹⁰⁰ but in the extant text of *Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas* προεγράφη was translated as "proscriptus". Moreover, Augustine worked on the assumption that προεγράφη denoted "proscriptus" (= L1e). Consequently, the Galatians belonged to Christ as long as they believed in him, while by their unbelief Jesus lost them. In other words, Christ was deprived of them due to their unbelief in the same way as one's property would be confiscated by virtue of proscription. It appears that Luther learnt about Augustine's interpretation of Galatians 3.1 from Erasmus' annotations¹⁰¹, which contained extensive quotations from *Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas*.

Marius Victorinus, a Roman grammarian of the 4th century, to whose commentary Luther did not refer, translated Χριστὸς προεγράφη as "Christus proscriptus est" and contended that spiritual goods given by Jesus to the Galatians through the Gospel were torn asunder and vended due to their false religious ideas¹⁰². Thus, Christ endowed the Galatians with his treasure of salvation, which was confiscated and plundered because of their unbelief in a way resembling the proscription.

The Wittenberg Reformer recalled Stapulensis' proposition that προεγράφη meant "descriptus" (= L1c)¹⁰³. Thus, Christ was described, namely,

⁹⁸ CASSIUS DIO, 1824, Vol. 3, p. 170-171 [LIII, 2].

⁹⁹ AUGUSTINUS HIPONENSIS. *Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina, Vol. 35. Paris: Migne, 1845, p. 2116-2118 [Galatians 3.1].

¹⁰⁰ The verb "praescribere" might denote "to demur" in legal terms, which was not akin to the legal sense of "proscribere". QUINTILIANUS, 1854, p. 33 [VII, V, 3].

¹⁰¹ ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS, 1527, p. 515-516 [Galatians 3.1].

¹⁰² MARIUS VICTORINUS. In *Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina, Vol. 8. Paris: Migne, 1844, p. 1166-1167 [Galatians 3.1].

¹⁰³ STAPULENSIS, 1517, p. XXIVr [Galatians 3.1] and p. CXXIIIr [Galatians 3.1].

portrayed before Galatians' very eyes (*ante oculos in pictura representatus*), so there was no excuse for their reliance on the Law in lieu of Jesus' perfect righteousness. In Luther's opinion, Erasmus' insights coincided with Stapulensis' interpretation. Erasmus recapitulated views of Jerome, Ambrose (actually, Ambrosiaster), Augustine and Theophylact. Moreover, the Dutch Humanist translated *προεγράφη* as "depictus" (= L1c)¹⁰⁴ and clarified that Christ crucified was depicted among (*inter* [= L3b]) the Galatians¹⁰⁵.

Luther did not refer to Chrysostom who connected the participle *ἐστρωμένος* with the subject and who linked both prepositional phrases to the verb (= T2 S2aI). Chrysostom argued that since Jesus' physical crucifixion took place not in the land of the Galatians (*ἐν τῇ Γαλατῶν χώρᾳ*) but rather in Jerusalem (= L2a), the passage treated of the Crucified who was presented to the Galatians (= L1c) and who was received by their eyes of faith, namely, through faith in the message which they heard¹⁰⁶. Later, the Galatians were said to exchange their Redeemer for the Law and thus, were said to disown him. Theophylact summarised Chrysostom's comments, emphasising that the Crucified was clearly presented to the Galatians through the proclamation of the Gospel¹⁰⁷.

Luther knew how difficult it was to elucidate Galatians 3.1 and he hesitated to impose his own views. The dictionaries at his disposal did not help to understand various aspects of the meaning of both *προγράφη* and *ἐν*. The Wittenberg Reformer could not identify other passages in the Christian Scriptures containing the verb *προγράφη* (Romans 15.4; Ephesians 3.3; Jude 1.4) because no Greek concordance was available at that time and Latin concordances were useless granted that only in Jude 1.4 *προγράφη* was translated as "praescribere"¹⁰⁸. In Luther's view, *προεγράφη* signified the utmost manifestation (= L1c) because

¹⁰⁴ ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS, 1541, p. 308 [Galatians 3.1].

¹⁰⁵ ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS, 1527, p. 515-516 [Galatians 3.1]. ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS. In *Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas Paraphrasis*. In: **In omnes epistolas apostolicas summa**. Antwerp: Steelsius, 1540, p. 134v-135v [Galatians 3.1].

¹⁰⁶ CHRYSOSTOMUS, Joannes. In *Epistolam ad Galatas commentarius*. In: MONTFAUCON, Bernard de (Ed.). **Opera omnia quae exstant**, Vol. 10/II. Paris: Gaume, 1838, p. 824 [Galatians 3.1].

¹⁰⁷ THEOPHYLACTUS, 1636, p. 460 [Galatians 3.1].

¹⁰⁸ In Romans 15.4 *προγράφη* was rendered by "antea scribere", while in Ephesians 3.3 - by "supra scribere". In Jude 1.4 the Protestant Vulgate changed "praescribere" into "proscribere".

Christ was most plainly manifested before Galatians' very eyes (in oculis manifestissimum est). Despite this ultimate demonstration of the Gospel, they resolved to perish by holding to the righteousness of the Law, as Luther claimed.

As regards the Protestant revision of the Vulgate, Luther endorsed "praescriptus" and while lecturing upon Galatians 3.1, he explained its meaning thus: "to be placed in front of" (coram positus), "to be demonstrated" (monstratus) either by word or by picture, "to be clearly depicted and written before" (clarum depictum et antescriptum). The latter term is relevant because the Latin preposition "ante", a part of the compound verb "ante-scribere", could be either temporal (prior to) or spatial (in front of) like the Greek preposition *πρὸ* which was a part of the compound verb *προ-γράφω*. Therefore, it seems that "antescriptum" imitated *προεγγραφή* in both temporal and spatial terms. To this verb Luther linked the prepositional phrase *κατ' ὀφθαλμούς* (before eyes).

The Wittenberg Reformer explicated the participle *ἐσταυρωμένος* in the light of the prepositional phrase *ἐν ὑμῖν* and claimed on the basis of Hebrews 6.6 that whoever rejected Jesus extinguished his / her faith and thus crucified Jesus in¹⁰⁹ himself / herself. Consequently, the Galatians chose the observance of the Law as their way of salvation and thus denied their Saviour.

Luther noticed that the Vulgate (some versions thereof, to be precise) added the conjunction "et" (equivalent to Greek *καὶ*) between the verb (*προεγγραφή*) and the participle (*ἐσταυρωμένος*) in defiance of the Greek text which did not attest such a reading. For him, *ἐσταυρωμένος* described Christ who was presented to the Galatians and who was crucified in them, namely, who was spiritually rejected by them. Therefore, in Luther's opinion, *ἐσταυρωμένος* was the attributive participle modifying *Χριστὸς*.

In his lectures on Galatians Luther translated the Greek preposition *ἐν* (in the prepositional phrase *ἐν ὑμῖν*) by the Latin preposition "in" which might denote "among" but which usually meant "within". However, in his German Bible Luther interpreted *ἐν ὑμῖν* as "among you" (= L3b), though the tools at his disposal did not list other meanings of *ἐν* such as «among» or «by» (agency). Similarly, commenting upon Galatians 3.1, Calvin expounded *ἐν ὑμῖν* as «inter eos» (among

¹⁰⁹ In his lectures on Galatians Luther interpreted Hebrews 6.6 thus: "they crucify in themselves (in semet ipsis) the Son of God afresh", though in his German Bible he translated *ἑαυτοῖς* as "to / for themselves" (sich selbst) and the Protestant Vulgate did not emend Jerome's rendition (sibimet ipsis).

you)¹¹⁰.

The Wittenberg Reformer did not realise that most of the non-Byzantine evidences did not contain ἐν ὑμῖν. Surprisingly, the Vulgate edition printed by Gutenberg omitted «in vobis» which probably reflected the Greek variant underlying this reading of the Vulgate. Luther's interpretation of Galatians 3.1 could be classified as T2 S2aII according to the proposed visualisation and it was applied to his German Bible: "welchen Christus Jesus vor die Augen gemallet war, und jetzt unter euch gekreuziget ist!" (to whom Christ Jesus was portrayed before very eyes and is now crucified among you!). In view of different interpretations of Galatians 3.1, Calvin supposed that by his instruction, Paul depicted Christ as crucified among the Galatians.

CONCLUSION

A study of Luther's comments on Greek grammar proves that although the Wittenberg Reformer had at his disposal grammatical tools of limited quality and quantity, he laboured to understand the Greek original of the Christian Scriptures, thus enacting the sola Scriptura principle, which stimulated development of such tools. In the age of the post-Reformation, Lutheran hermeneutical and exegetical instruments culminated in Salomon Glass' *Philologia sacra*¹¹¹, which was completed in 1636. Deficiencies of early 16th-century philological tools remind us that every knowledge is provisional and evolving, while the expertise in the biblical languages accumulated through the centuries owes much to the Reformation emphasis on the study of the Scripture.

REFERENCES

¹¹⁰ CALVIN, 1831, Vol. 1, p. 560-561 [Galatians 3.1].

¹¹¹ GLASS, Salomon. **Philologia sacra**, Ed. Johann Gottfried OLEARIUS. Leipzig: Gleditsch, 1705.

- Αα - ωρ. In: **Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine**. Alcalá: In Academia Complutensi, 1514.
- ALAND, Kurt and Barbara ALAND. Praefatio in editionem secundam recognitam. In: ALAND, Kurt and Barbara ALAND (Ed.). **Novum Testamentum Latine**. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1998.
- AMBROSIASTER. In Epistolam beati Pauli ad Galatas. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina, Vol. 17. Paris: Migne, 1845.
- AUGUSTINUS HIPPONENSIS. Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina, Vol. 35. Paris: Migne, 1845.
- AUGUSTINUS HIPPONENSIS. In Epistolam Joannis ad Parthos. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina, Vol. 35. Paris: Migne, 1845.
- AULUS GELLIUS. **Noctes Atticae**, Vol. 1-2. Zweibrücken: Ex Typographia Societatis, 1784.
- BACON, Roger. Compendium philosophiae. In: BREWER, John S. (Ed.). **Opera quaedam hactenus inedita**. London: Longman, 1859.
- BACON, Roger. **The Greek Grammar of Roger Bacon and a Fragment of His Hebrew Grammar**, Ed. Edmond NOLAN and S. A. HIRSCH. Cambridge: University Press, 1902.
- BENGEL, Johann Albrecht. **Gnomon Novi Testamenti**. Berlin: Schlawitz, 1860.
- BENGEL, John Albrecht. **Gnomon of the New Testament**, Vol. 2, Trans. Charlton T. LEWIS and Marvin R. VINCENT. Philadelphia: Perkinpine and Higgins, 1860.
- BOLZANIO, Urbano. **Institutiones graecae grammaticae**. Paris: Gourmont, [1510].
- BOTLEY, Paul. **Learning Greek in Western Europe (1396-1529)**: Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2010.
- CALVIN, Jean. In Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas commentarius. In: **In omnes Pauli apostoli epistolas atque etiam in Epistolam ad Hebraeos commentarii**, Vol. 1. Halle: Gebauer, 1831.
- CALVIN, Jean. In Priorem Pauli ad Timotheum commentarius. In: **In omnes Pauli apostoli epistolas atque etiam in Epistolam ad Hebraeos commentarii**, Vol. 2. Halle: Gebauer, 1831.
- CASSIUS DIO. **Historiae Romanae**, Vol. 2-3, Ed. Friedrich Wilhelm STURZ. Leipzig: Kühn, 1824.
- CHRYSOLORAS, Emanuel. **Quaestiones grammaticae**. Paris: Wechelus, 1539.
- CHRYSOSTOMUS, Joannes. In Epistolam ad Galatas commentarius. In: MONTFAUCON, Bernard de (Ed.). **Opera omnia quae exstant**, Vol. 10/II. Paris: Gaume, 1838.
- CHRYSOSTOMUS, Joannes. In Epistolam primam ad Timotheum commentarius (Homilia VII). In: MONTFAUCON, Bernard de (Ed.). **Opera omnia quae exstant**, Vol. 11/II. Paris: Gaume, 1838.
- CICCOLELLA, Federica. **Donati Graeci**: Learning Greek in the Renaissance. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- CLAUDIUS TAURINENSIS. Enarratio in Epistolam D. Pauli ad Galatas. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Latina, Vol. 104. Paris: Migne, 1864.
- CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS. Stromata. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus**: Series Graeca, Vol. 8. Paris: Migne, 1857.

- CONRADUS HALBERSTADENSIS. **Concordantiae Maiores Sacrae Bibliae**. Strasbourg: Cnoblochus, 1526.
- CRASTONUS, Johannes. **Dictionarium graecum cum interpretatione latina omnium quae hactenus impressa sunt copiosissimum**. Venice: In aedibus Aldi, 1524.
- CURIO, Valentinus. **Dictionarium graecum ultra Ferrariensem editionem locupletatum locis infinitis**. Basel: Cratander, 1519.
- DEBRUNNER, Albert and Friedrich BLASS. **A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature**, Trans. Robert W. FUNK. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- DIONYSIUS THRAX. *Ars grammatica*. In: FABRICIUS, Johann Albert (Ed.). **Bibliotheca Graeca**, Vol. 7. Hamburg: Felginer, 1727.
- ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS. In *Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas Paraphrasis*. In: **In omnes epistolas apostolicas summa**. Antwerp: Steelsius, 1540.
- ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS. **In Novum Testamentum annotationes**. Basel: Froben, 1527.
- ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS (Ed.). **Novum instrumentum omne**. Basel: Froben, 1516.
- ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS. *Novum Testamentum cum annotationibus*. In: **Opera**, Vol. 6. Basel: Froben, 1541.
- GLASS, Salomon. **Philologia sacra**, Ed. Johann Gottfried OLEARIUS. Leipzig: Gleditsch, 1705.
- HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS. *Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina**, Vol. 26. Paris: Migne, 1845.
- HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS. In *Epistolam ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina**, Vol. 30. Paris: Migne, 1846.
- HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS. In *Primam Epistolam ad Timotheum*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina**, Vol. 30. Paris: Migne, 1846.
- Index of Technical Terms. In: BENDEL, John Albrecht. **Gnomon of the New Testament**, Vol. 2, Trans. Charlton T. LEWIS and Marvin R. VINCENT. Philadelphia: Perkinpine and Higgins, 1860.
- JULIUS RUFINIANUS. De schematis lexeos. In: RUHNKEN, David and Karl Heinrich FROTSCHER (Ed.). **Publius Rutilius Lupus, De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis libri duo item Aquilae Romani et Iulii Rufiniani de eodem argumento libri**. Leipzig: Schaarschmidt and Volckmar, 1831.
- KAULEN, Franz. **Geschichte der Vulgata**. Mainz: Kirchheim, 1868.
- LASCARIS, Constantinus. **Grammatices graecae epitome**. Venice: [s. n.], 1495.
- LUTHER, Martin. Bekenntnis vom Abendmahl Christi (März 1528). In: WALCH, Johann Georg (Ed.). **Sämtliche Schriften**, Vol. 20. St. Louis: Concordia, 1890.
- LUTHER, Martin. **Commentarium in Epistolam S. Pauli ad Galatas**, Vol. 3, Ed. Johann Konrad IRMISCHER. Erlangen: Sumtibus Caroli Heyderi, 1844.
- LUTHER, Martin. Vorlesung über den 1. Brief des Johannes (1527). In: **Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe**, Vol. 20. Weimar: Böhlau, 1898.
- LUTHER, Martin. Vorlesung über den 1. Timotheusbrief (1528). In: **Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe**, Vol. 26. Weimar: Böhlau, 1909.
- MARIUS VICTORINUS. In *Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.).

- Patrologiae cursus completus:** Series Latina, Vol. 8. Paris: Migne, 1844.
- MELANCHTHON, Philipp. *Grammatica graeca integra*. In: BRETSCHNEIDER, Karl Gottlieb and Heinrich Ernst BINDSEIL (Ed.). **Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus reformatorum)**, Vol. 20. Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1854.
- OECOLAMPADIUS, Johannes. **Graecae literaturae dragmata**. Basel: Cratander, 1518.
- ORIGENES. *Commentaria in Evangelium Joannis*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus:** Series Graeca, Vol. 14. Paris: Migne, 1862.
- ORIGENES. *In Epistolam ad Galatas*. In: LA RUE, Charles de and Carl Heinrich Eduard LOMMATZSCH (Ed.). **Opera omnia**, Vol. 5. Berlin: Haude and Spener, 1835.
- ORIGENES. *Libellus de Oratione*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus:** Series Graeca, Vol. 12. Paris: Migne, 1857.
- PRIMASIIUS ADRUMETANUS. *Epistola B. Pauli Apostoli ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus:** Series Latina, Vol. 68. Paris: Migne, 1866.
- PRISCIANUS CAESARIENSIS. **Institutiones grammaticae**, Vol. 1, Ed. Martin HERTZ. Leipzig: Teubner, 1855.
- QUINTILIANUS. **Institutio oratoria**, Vol. 2, Ed. Eduard BONNELL. Leipzig: Teubner, 1854.
- RABANUS MAURUS. *Expositio in Epistolam ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus:** Series Latina, Vol. 112. Paris: Migne, 1878.
- RANKE, Ernst (Ed.). **Codex Fuldensis:** Novum Testamentum Latine interprete Hieronymo. Marburg and Leipzig: Elwert, 1868.
- SEDULIUS SCOTUS. *In Epistolam ad Galatas*. In: MIGNE, J.-P. (Ed.). **Patrologiae cursus completus:** Series Latina, Vol. 103. Paris: Migne, 1864.
- STAPULENSIS, Jacobus Faber. **Commentarii in epistolas catholicas**. Basel: Cratander, 1527.
- STAPULENSIS, Jacobus Faber. **Commentarii in epistolas catholicas**. Antwerp: Gymnich, 1540.
- STAPULENSIS, Jacobus Faber. **Epistolae divi Pauli apostoli cum commentariis**. Paris: Regnault, 1517.
- STEPHANUS, Henricus. **Concordantiae Testamenti Novi Graecolatinae**. Geneva: Stephanus, 1594.
- STEPHANUS, Henricus. **Thesaurus Graecae linguae**, Vol. 1-4. Paris: Stephanus, 1572.
- STOLT, Birgit. **Martin Luthers Rhetorik des Herzens**. Tübingen: Siebeck, 2000.
- THEODORUS GAZES. **Introductio grammatica**, Vol. 1-4, Trans. ERASMUS ROTERODAMUS. Basel: Ex officina Valderiana, 1541.
- THEOPHYLACTUS. **In D. Pauli Epistolas commentarii**, Ed. Augustine LINDSELL. London: E Typographeo Regio, 1636.
- VALLA, Laurentius. **In Novum Testamentum annotationes**. Basel: Cratander, 1526.
- ZWINGLI, Ulrich. *Christliche Antwort (1527)*. In: **Werke**, Vol. II/2. Zürich: Schulthess, 1832.

