AN EVALUATION AND ALTERNATE SUGGESTIONS

Regarding Questioned Translations in the Second Edition of

GOD'S WORD - NT

by David P. Kuske

Mequon, Wisconsin

May 1995

To: The Recipients of this Packet of Materials
From: D. Kuske   May, 1995

At your request I am sending you a copy of all the suggestions that I have sent in to GWN Bible Society since February of this year in regard to the 1st edition of GW.

This note will give you a brief explanation of what occasioned this packet. A letter (toward the end of this packet of materials) which I sent to H. Otten in February will give you a quick overview of what happened with the GWN NT translation in 1993-94. In December of 1994 I was sent a copy of the NT text that had been submitted to World Publishing. When Pastor Michael Hackbardt, the director of GWN Bible Society, called and asked me about my thoughts on the GW translation, I basically told him I thought that it was unuseable by conservative Lutherans because of the doctrinal unclarities and inaccuracies that it contained (cf. the Otten letter for specifics).

Not long after that telephone conversation, Pastor Hackbardt called again to say that a second edition of GW was going to be printed in late 1995. In working on the production of a concordance for the GW translation, GWN and World Publishing agreed that some revisions would have to be made in the 1st edition for concordance purposes. Pastor Hackbardt indicated that if I sent in suggestions where the translation could be improved, they would be considered for inclusion in the 2nd edition.

Since February I have been sending in suggestions (the enclosed packet with the suggested changes and special documentation in the form of articles or letters) as I rapidly worked through the NT for the umpteenth time in this translation process which began back in the 1970's. I shared these suggestions with Prof. Brug and Pastor Curtis Jahn for their reactions. You will note that Pastor Jahn's reactions are included in what I sent in. Pastor Jahn had served on the editing committee for the OT. Whether or not these suggestions will be included in the 2nd edition that will come out later this year remains to be seen. At least we tried to help make the 2nd edition useable.

Please feel free to share any part of this packet with anyone you know might be interested. Perhaps the suggested improvements can be of some help to anyone who would like to "adapt" the GW for use in Bible class etc.

Letter: February 11, 1995
To: H. Otten

I received your 2/2/95 inquiry regarding the changes made in the GWN NT after the 1988 2nd edition. I'm taking time to write today since I feel as a representative of the Beck family (in safeguarding the doctrinal integrity of the translation), you are owed an overview of what happened. I also assumed, wrongly I now find, that you and Reu Beck were aware of at least some of the changes. I'm answering your note by sending a copy of everything to Reu also.

Please do not place this letter in Lutheran News. I'm concerned that at times letters you have printed in LN have been people's biased opinions of what has transpired instead of being factual. If you want to say in a brief article about the GWN NT that several WELS people who have worked on GWN from its inception are not in agreement with everything that has been done in revising the 1988 2nd edition, I have no objection to your stating that.

I tried to avoid some of the changes that were, in my judgment, not only changes in wording to simplify things, but also changes in substance which either did not say all that the inspired text says or even in some instances were doctrinally objectionable. I don't agree with Jack Cascione's article if what he means to say is that we must retain certain words in order to maintain purity of doctrine. But if what he means to say is that if we substitute words we must be sure they say what scripture says and means by these words, then what he is saying is what I tried to basically say in all this correspondence.

For example, the word "approved" does express the dual idea of <u>a forensic statement</u> in regard to <u>a person's status</u> before God. If people understand "approval" this way, it does express the idea of the Greek word better than using two words "justified" (which connotes "vindication" in contemporary English) and "righteous" (which has only a moral connotation in contemporary English) neither of which communicates well to people today (cf. the attached article "Justification in Contemporary English Translations). Personally, I still prefer Sig Becker's suggestion of using "acquit" and "acquitted," but I lost out in the GWN decision in that regard. The one problem with "acquit, acquittal" is that it doesn't work in every passage like "approved" does, so then one would have to go back to using two words again.

But while "approved" does work quite well, other substitutions used in the last revision of GWN either do not reflect the substance of the Greek word fully or actually lead people astray. Several examples are:
1. "Kindness" or "favor" does not fully express "grace." "Undeserved kindness" would be the equivalent, but "kindness" or "favor" are not full equivalents.
2. "Regarded as God's approval" does not express "credited" fully since it does not capture the idea of one's account, his legal status before God.
3. "Change the way you think" can be very misleading as a substitute for "repent," especially in those passages where "repent" is used in the wider sense of both contrition and faith.
4. "Moses Teachings" will be misleading as a substitute for "law" since it can easily lead the Bible reader (especially in Acts and the epistles after Christ's death) to think that the Mosaic law is still in effect.
5. "Because of faith" instead of "by faith" or "through faith" can mislead as easily as "made righteous' in the original AAT.
6. "Confidence" instead of "hope" does not point to heaven + so omits a key point in a key word of Scripture.

In working on the 1988 edition with P. Giessler and R. Hoeber as the final editing committee, we were always extremely conscious of Lutheran theology and tried to use simple language without losing the substance of what the inspired word says and means. How did the latest revision come about? After Giessler left the project, the OT team developed some guidelines for the five men to follow so their work would be as uniform as possible. One guideline was that sentences should be kept under 15 words if at all possible.

Since there were passages in the NT which exceeded this guideline, I was asked to do a revision of the NT with this guideline primarily in mind. I worked through the whole NT, sent my suggested changes to Dr. Hoerber who added some of his own, and submitted this revision to the office in Cleveland. I thought that this was the end of revising the NT.

However, when World Bible Publishers came into the picture, another revision of the NT was undertaken to put the NT into language the way people speak English today. This required someone fulltime because World Bible Publishers had set a deadline of late 1994 for having a finished manuscript. I was asked whether I objected to Dr. Moke doing the revision and my serving as the primary reviewer of his work. I responded by suggesting that he do one book and then I could judge better where this whole thing was headed since at the time I was not sure exactly what was being envisioned. Dr. Moke was asked to begin this revision. He had been made a NT editor to replace Dr. Hoerber. I was

invited to Cleveland in the early summer of 1993 for three days of discussion with Dr. Moke and the editing committee in Cleveland on the first two books that Dr. Moke had revised.

I was not given a copy previous to my arrival in Cleveland and so I was at a great disadvantage in the discussion that ensued. As we began working through Colossians, I struggled to react quickly to each verse as we went along. It was obviously more than a minor revision, and I had not had a copy to look at prior to the meeting. As a result I repeatedly asked why a certain change was made. When I felt the change did not reflect the full substance of the Greek sentence, I argued that the doctrine of inspiration was being shortchanged in the revision. Dr. Moke took this as personal attack on his orthodoxy. After a very tense day of review which took us only through the first two chapters of Colossians, the consultation was broken off because Dr. Moke's health prevented him from being present. Pastor Hackbardt in a private conversation explained to me the necessity of the revision in the light of the new objective for GWN (to put everything into contemporary English), and I agreed to continue to review Dr. Moke's work.

Late in August I received a note (coped also to others - whether you and Reu got a copy I do not know) indicating that Dr. Moke and I had both been removed from the final NT editing and that Steinmann, Bunkowske, and Hackbardt would be the final editing committee. Pastor Hackbardt called me and said that he hoped that I would continue to help the editing committee because he knew I had some doctrinal concerns. He said he did not want the translation to become one which would receive doctrinal criticisms. He urged me to express openly any concerns I had. I continued, therefore, to send in suggestions and to have phone conferences with the men in Cleveland regarding the concerns I had.

In one way I was very pleased with the simplicity of Dr. Moke's revision. For example, I think that Colossians, Phiippians, and Ephesians (except for the Old Adam, New Man passages) are very well done. In another way I was very concerned. When I received the Galatians revision, it was obvious that a number of doctrinal matters were involved. When I received the Romans revision, I was even more concerned. But I began to feel that my concerns were not being given a good hearing simply because of the press of time to meet the publication date. So I began sending copies of my letters to Bunkowske also. That led to a number of lengthy phone meetings. Some items were resolved as a result, others were not (e.g. the translation of "Moses Teachings" for "law").

In spite of reminding the office in Cleveland several times that I had not received copies of the books of the NT from Hebrews on, I never did receive them and so never had a chance to review them before publication. I learned later that this was the result of some turmoil in the GWN headquarters, not the least of which was the dropping of Dr. Steinman (the head of the OT/NT editing commitee) from the translation team about a month before the deadline when the manuscript had to be submitted. I did receive a copy of what was sent to World Bible Publishers as the final text. In reading it, I am truly disappointed, especially with Romans and Galatians. To the numerous WELS pastors who have asked me about the GWN publication that was to come out this month, I have simply replied that I don't think it will be useable because of a number of doctrinal aberrations involving the two main doctrines of scripture, law and gospel.

I hope this letter demonstrates a least a little how I tried my best to avoid having the latest NT revision become doctrinally unclear or even misleading. What to do now? I am truly disappointd because I began working with Dr. Becker on this way back when in the hope that with years of effort we could have a truly faithful translation for Lutherans to use - if not for worship, at least for laypeople to use in their private devotions. That hope seems gone now.

Whether printing just a NT is practical or not, I don't know. Perhaps, the 1988 GWN edition, or the subsequent revision I made in consultation with Hoerber (shortening the sentences, confer above) could be shared with our the LCMS and WELS pastors and laypeople who are interested in having a NT that is faithful to the inspired text and Lutheran theology. I at least would like to be able to share a copy of the revision of the 1988 GWN edition with my students here at the seminary for use in their teaching and preaching in the ministry.

I said it before several times, but I will repeat it again in closing. I regret my inability to convince Cleveland that some of the changes made in the NT were doctrinally inadequate or even misleading. I assumed, that you and Reu were aware of the new objective set once World Bible Publishers became involved (and of Hoerber's and my removal from the final editing committee.) Perhaps GWN will be willing to listen to some corrections that would make the translation serve the initial purpose that we who have worked on it so long had in mind.

cf, 1st sheet, 3rd paragraph for a subsequent development which was the reason for the items contained in this packet.

This letter is in response to the item you sent me about a week ago (9 pages) with the subject heading: Passages Using "Because."

The following are the reasons I do not think that the author of this document makes a case for the use of "because."
1) <u>The author seems to see dogmaticians as people who have a personal paranoia that produces an issue where there isn't any issue.</u> He speaks of "over zealous Lutheran dogmaticians" having "a fear of the misunderstanding of faith" that is due to "a personal doctrinal bias" (fourth page). He speaks in a disparaging way of theologians who "come up with their own twists based on whatever expertise they envision themselves to have" (fifth page). He implies that seminary professors want to speak in a "churchy language" and "theological jargon" which forces the laity to listen to them for the "official" interpretation (end of page 8 to page 9).

I don't know what he has against dogmaticians and seminary professors, but to attack the motives of people the way this author does, without clearly showing where they err, reveals just a bit of a personal paranoia on his part. The issue of "because of faith" is not a recent matter that Lutheran dogmaticians in the Missour Synod have dreamed up in order to have something new to talk about. In the post-Reformation period, as it became clearer that some Reformed denied objective justification, the dogmaticians of the Lutheran church in the 17th century began to warn against speaking of justification in terms of "because of faith." It is also true in the Missouri Synod of the late 1800's and the 1900's that the men who wrote theological (Walther) or dogmatics texts (Pieper, Mueller) and those who wrote articles for the theological journals of the LC-MS (e.g the Concordia Theological Monthly) also warned agains this terminology. They spoke not only from a theological viewpoint but also because of the problem this translation presents in English (cf. #4 below). They wrote not only to warn against Reformed doctrine, but also against such a prominent Lutheran theologian as Dr. Lenski (the author of the Lenski commentaries) who denied univeral (objective justification).

Anyone who is serious about doing good Bible translation should pay careful attention to what conservative Lutheran dogmaticians say. Not because they are so much better theologians than anybody else is, but because their work demands the constant application of the "analogy of faith." Dogmatics (i.e proper Lutheran dogmatics) is the study of all the passages in Scripture on a given subject (e.g. justification and faith). It functions with the principle that sets Lutheran theology completely apart from all other churches, namely, Scripture alone interprets Scripture (Sola Scriptura). Finally, it also involves polemics, showing how the interpretation of other churches have gone astray from the "analogy of faith." If Lutheran dogmaticians have done their work carefully and in humble obedience to the analogy of faith, and if they have said for several centuries that to translate "because of faith" can mislead souls and supports the errors of some churches, shouldn't Lutheran Bible translators listen at least a little bit to what they have to say? The author of this document seems to want to just dismiss centuries of theological writings on the basis of his obvious dislike for some present day dogmatician(s) whom he suspects of having a personal doctrinal bias and of trying to keep the laity in their place.

Translation can't ever be done in isolation from the "analogy of faith" or from doctrinal issues being debated in the present theological world. If the translation of any word in the Bible undermines the first and adds to the problem of the second, it is at best poor translation and at worst false doctrine simply because it underminess the analogy of faith and gives aid and comfort to a doctrinal error that some churches are teaching.

2) <u>The author doesn't seem to realize that the underlying issue (has been for several centuries and still) is the doctrine of univeral (objective) and personal (subjective) justification.</u> Nowhere in this document does he ever mention this doctrine as being the central issue. Instead he refers (third page) to the concern about "because of faith" perhaps being "a vestige of the election controversy indicating an objection to the *intuitu fidei* approach of the concept of faith." The election controversy is a whole separate matter. The nine passages under discussion have to do with justification, not election. If he doesn't understand the real issue, then that is also undoubtedly part of the reason why he sees no problem with using "because of faith."

If "because of faith" is read by a person to mean that this is the condition that needs to be filled before a person is justified (and this is a basic meaning of "because" in English, cf. #4 below), then for this person the doctrine of universal justification will be a conundrum. He understands "because of faith" to be saying we aren't justified until we believe. One might argue that on the basis of the passages that teach universal justification, he should see that in his understanding of "because of faith" he is taking "because" in the wrong way. But what if his church (either Reformed or Lutheran) by its teachings beclouds those other passages for him? Should we as Lutheran translators just say, "Well, that is his problem, not mine!" - or should we translate in a way that does not contribute to a possible misunderstand-

ing on the part of some (many)? Obviously, we can't twist a Greek word to make it say something other than it actually does in order to avoid this possibility. But as the next several points will show, the author of this document is wrong in arguing that to translate in some other way than "because of faith" is not being faithful to the Greek.

3) The author's contention that taking εκ πιστεως as instrumental is "an utter absurdity" (third page, bottom) is the result of his failure to read carefully the sources he cites. At the basis of his failure to read carefully is apparently his failure to note that the word "causal" can have a variety of meanings in English (cf. #4 which follows).

He cites Robertson's grammar as saying that εκ can mean "cause" but fails to note carefully that Robertson links "cause" with "occasion." He also does not mention that that Robertson begins his comments on εκ meaning "cause or occasion" by saying that this meaning is closely allied to the meaning of origin or source discussed in the previous paragraph. Thus a careful reading of Robertson shows that he is saying that εκ can mean causal only in a narrowly defined sense of origin, source, or occasion.

Next he cites Blass-Debrunner-Funk as speaking of the causal use of εκ. What he fails to note is that BDF adds that this causal sense is like that of υπο or απο discussed in paragraph 210. Reading paragraph 210 indicates that the causal sense of υπο is agency and that of απο is origin or source. A careful reading of BDF, therefore, reveals that again the causal sense of εκ is defined in the rather narrow sense of agency, origin, or source.

The citation of Nigel Turner says that Turner gives examples of εκ in a causal sense. What is not mentioned is that Turner describes its causal sense as a "peculiarity" and adds that the causal sense of εκ makes it an equivalent of υπο. And then he adds on page 260 that "the instrumental use is similar." Thus Turner also gives the causal sense of εκ the rather narrow meaning of agency or instrumental.

The citation from Moule also fails to quote carefully. Moule begins his discussion by saying that the prepositions εκ and απο can be taken together because the meaning of the latter is absorbing the former and the two frequently overlap. He then lists their causal and instrumental usage together, not in the sense that that causal and instrumental are two separate meanings, but that the causal sense of these two prepositions flows out of the instrumental sense. Thus Moule also gives εκ a rather narrow definition, namely, that it means essentially the same thing as απο and that its causal sense is restricted to the instrumental domain.

In the next three citations from BAG, LSJ and Cuncliffe, it is not of minor importance that "cause" is listed with "origin, motive, reason" (BAG), "instrument, means" (LSJ), and "source, origin, motive, in general = proceeding from, from" (Cutcliffe). Again one must note that "cause" is given a rather narrowly defined meaning by the other words with which it is linked to make sure that the causal sense is understood in only a narrow way.

The reference to Louw and Nida fails to mention that the meaning "because of" is immediately qualified by putting "reason" in parentheses after it and that the reference for this meaning (89.25) lists εκ in this sense being in the same semantic field as απο, οθεν, and παρα. Louw and Nida also give means, instrument, manner, source and derivation as other semantic fields for εκ. The quotation from Smyth also fails to mention that this grammar gives the basic meaning of εκ as "out, out of, from, from within" and lists the meaning "cause" (which is narrowly defined as the "ground of judgment") along with "instrument and means."

To read these citations carefully, therefore, does not support the contention that the preposition εκ has no instrumental sense. All of them do say this if what they write is reflected fully. On the other hand, to say that they support the causal sense in every sense of the word is not what they say if what they write is reflected fully. They all carefully limit the causal sense to a narrow semantic range, namely, origin/source, occasion, or instrumental/means/agency. It is the duty of the translator, then, to make sure that the word he uses in English is the closest natural equivalent. If the phrase in a Greek context suggests the causal sense of εκ, the translator has to reflect this in a way that conveys to the English reader the particular shading idea that context gives: origin/source, occasion, or instrumental/means/agency. This leads to another consideration which is taken up next, namely, the many ways that the English language conveys a causal idea.

4) The author fails to take into account the fact that a causal clause in English can express different shadings of meaning that are quite distinct from one another. The document never clearly delineates between the meanings that the English word "cause" can have. He seems to suggest that this distinction exists only in the minds of picky dogmaticians. However, I have in front of me Webster's International Dictionary which gives no less than eight different shadings: efficient cause, final cause, formal cause, material cause, first cause, immanent cause, transient cause, and

occasional cause. This isn't a dogmatics text, but an English dictionary. This dictionary sees such a distinct meaning between each of these that it does not attempt to define the shading of meaning under "cause" but tells the reader to look each of them up under a separate listing. It also gives a number of distinct synonyms for cause (reason, determinant, occasion, and antecedent) and carefully shows how the word cause can take on the particular shading of each of these synonyms.

The point is simply this that just as the Greek grammars and lexicons carefully narrow the causal meaning of εκ, so the translator needs to make sure that he/she chooses a way of translating into English that properly represents the meaning of the Greek. Thus the question comes whether "because" is the best translation. Does "because" clearly say what the Greek says with εκ (when it used with "faith" in a context dealing with justification), or could it give a sense of cause in English that is not meant by the Greek? But this question dare not be isolated from the "analogy of faith" question. Does the use of "because" (to translate εκ when it is used with "faith" in a context that deals with justification) say something that will undermine or contradict what the other passages dealing with faith and justification say? And the question of the contemporary theological world also needs to be considered because a translation is not read (especially by those who are already Christians) in a theological vacuum. Will the use of "because" give aid and comfort to an error taught in some contemporary churches, and can we just blithely say that such an error is their problem not ours. As the nest paragraph will show, it is because of the doctrine of universal and personal justification that objections can be raised on all three counts (not just the second and third items) against the translation "because of faith" in a context where Scripture speaks of our being approved by God.

What does the translation "because of faith" used together with God's approval mean in English? It can have one of several meanings. It can convey the meaning that a person is not justified without faith (faith is the condition or determinant of a person's approval by God). Or it can mean that faith is what a person does in order to be justified (faith is the reason why a person is approved by God). Or it can mean that a person who is included in God's universal approval is personally approved by God because he now believes (faith is the occasion of his personal approval.) There may also be other ways it can be understood, but the first two ways "because of faith" can be understood in English create real problems. Unfortunately these two are the most likely way a person reading English will understand this phrase since in English the word "because" is used in these two ways far more than the third. One problem these two understandings present is that they are not what the Greek εκ πιστεως means according to the narrow meaning of εκ (cf. grammars and lexicons quoted under #3 above). Secondly, these two understandings mean something that violates the analogy of faith. And thirdly, these two meanings are errors taught by many churches in our day.

What does the translation "by faith" or "through faith" mean? Again a glance at an English dictionary is helpful. In both cases the dictionary links a causal idea together with the idea of agency, means, or instrumental. This is exactly what the Greek grammars and lexicons cited above say. This is exactly what Lutheran dogmaticians for centuries have stressed is the proper way to express the relationship of faith and justification. This is the conclusion to which a study of the relationship of faith and God's approval according to the analogy of faith leads. And while those churches whose teaching about God's approval can twist this meaning to their own purposes, this translation makes it much easier to show their error (especially to people who don't know Greek) than the translation "because of faith" does.

Thus the author's contention that "there is nothing inherently wrong (with) translating εκ by 'because of' [third page]" is true only if one takes the English "because of" in the sense of occasion, agency, means or instrumentality. His assumption that it is "a particular preconceived English spin on the word 'because' . . . that makes it seem to be theologically or theoretically false [third page]" and that "the whole problem appears to be a presupposition of dogmatic belief [fourth page]" is off target. It fails to take into consideration four factors in this matter which every good translator has to consider: the semantic domain of the Greek word, the English equivalent that best reflects this semantic domain, the English equivalent that best fits into the analogy of faith, and the best way to avoid giving aid and comfort to contemporary theological errors.

5) The author's contention that δια πιστεως and εκ πιστεως don't express the same idea but show an aspect of justifying faith from different angles is very debateable. In at least two instances Paul uses δια πιστεως and εκ πιστεως interchangeably when speaking of God's approval. In Romans 3:30 and Gal 2:16 it takes a real stretch to say that when Paul uses these two phrases in parallel clauses he is saying something different or even speaking of different aspects of the same thing. In view of these two verses, isn't just as plausible, or even more plausible for that matter, to argue that Paul uses δια πιστεως to indicate or to underscore that he wants εκ πιστεως to be understood in an instrumental sense rather than a causal sense? Isn't this possibility enhanced by the fact that Paul never uses δια πιστιν anywhere in a context of justification? Δια with the accusative expresses cause while δια with the genitive expresses means/instrumentality. The fact that Paul always uses the latter and not the former has to be significant in any discussion about faith and its meaning in a context that speaks of God's approval.

An article in the January, 1994, *The Bible Translator* has an interesting assessment of how the word "justification" is handled in contemporary English translations. The four translations used for this article were the Revised English Bible (a 1989 revision of the New English Bible), the New Revised Standard Version (1990), the New Jerusalem Bible (1985), and the NIV (latest revision, 1984).

The article shows how often each version translates the Greek word *dikaios* (and its cognates) with "righteous" or with "justified." Then it takes these translations to task on two counts.

The author faults these translations for following a practice of English translations for more than six centuries, namely, using two words in English (justified, righteous) for one word in the original (*dikaios*). Using two words prevents the English reader from realizing that the same base word is used in the original. Furthermore, each English word is considerably narrower in its range of meaning than is the Greek word. And what is worst of all in the author's view is that the two English words do not have the same meaning as each other.

"Righteous" is a rare word in everyday English today, but when it is used it has only a moral connotation. "Justifed" connotes "vindicated" when used in contemporary English. Neither of these English translations is what Paul means when he uses *dikaios* in the forensic sense.

The only way the contemporary English reader would be able to understand these words is if he is told they have a technical sense. The author says that this, too, is inappropriate in view of the fact that the original author used a Greek word that was non-technical. Although Paul gave the word a special nuance in speaking of God, yet he was using everyday language.

The article asserts that in the passages dealing with righteousness or justification, these four translations are "completely unintelligible" from "the viewpoint of everyday idiomatic English." The only way they are intelligible is if the reader learns to understand them in a theologically technical sense. This, the author says, is a serious matter "if we accord the doctrine of 'justification by faith' anything like the central role Luther gave it." A sobering thought for us, to say the least!

What does the article suggest as a solution? It recomends the approach of the latest revision of the TEV which uses the word "right" in various forms to translate the *dikaios* word family. Romans 3:21 of the TEV is cited as an example: "God's way of putting people right with himself." The author admits that this is not precisely what Paul meant in this verse. But, he argues, it is better to give the English reader something which "at least makes some sense of what Paul is saying" rather than something that is "nonsensical except to (possibly!) specialists."

Although the article raises a serious point, it obviously does not have a real good suggestion to replace the long-standing use of "righteous" and "justified" in English translations. Certainly, if there were a single word in contemporary English that is the exact equivalent of *dikaios*, it would have been used long ago.

It may be of interest to know that the latest revision of the NET (New Evangelical Translation, also known earlier as the GWN) is using the word "approved" for *dikaios*. Thus Galatians 3:24 is translated: "Christ came so that we could receive God's approval by faith." Though it may not be the perfect equivalent, it is everyday English. At the same time it does also convey the key idea of the positive status we have in God's sight as the result of Jesus' saving work. Though the forensic sense of the Greek word is not necessarily obvious to the English reader, yet it will be as easy, if not easier, to teach this point with the word "approved" than it is with the words "righteous' or "justified."

David Kuske

Item: the translation of νόμος with and without the article when referring to the Mosaic or moral law

As the attached two sheets from NT grammars show, the lack of the article in Greek does not make the noun indefinite as is often the case in English. If a noun in Greek is definite by context but does not have the article, then the quality (or character or essence) of the noun itself is being emphasized as much if not more than the identity of that noun.

The word νομος in Paul's epistles is, with only a few exceptions, definite by context since Paul is either speaking of the Mosaic law (the special law God gave to set apart Israel as his special people until the Savior would come) or the moral law (God's law for all people of all time). Paul rarely speaks of law or Roman law or law codes in general, but almost always is referring to the keeping of the Sinaitic covenant or to what God requires of all people in order to have his verdict of approval.

When νομος with the article is used to refer to the Mosaic law, it stresses the identity of that law (i.e. as a special law for God's OT people). When it is used without the article to refer to the Mosaic law, it stresses its character as law (i.e. that it demands that certain things be done or not done by Israel under penalty of punishment). As some of the attached suggested revisions attempt to show, the translation "Moses Teachings" for νομος is weak in conveying the former and does not convey the latter at all. The translation "Moses' law" is used several times in Galatians. This is better, but then one has to make exegetical decisions whether the Mosaic law is meant or not. In at least one occasion it is very questionable that the NET interpretation is correct in taking it as Mosaic law.

When νομος with the article is used to refer to God's moral law, it stresses the identity of that law (i.e. that it is God's will for all people of all time). When it is used without the article to refer to God's moral law, it stresses its character as law (i.e. that God requires that things be done or not done by all people under penalty of punishment). As some of the attached suggested revisions attempt to show, the NET loses these points by translating with such expressions as "some law" or "some code of law" or "laws." This can easily lead the reader to think of law in general and so in the contemporary setting of the state and federal laws of our country. This misses Paul's point and hides what he is really saying. One of things Dr. Bunkowske stressed quite often was to avoid any translation that had an amibuous meaning.

Translating νομος precisely is an important point in all of Paul's epistles. It is really fundamental to his proclamation of law in these letters. Thus any unclarity on this point in the NET will bring criticism. I must confess that when I began teaching Galatians and Romans in exegetical courses 18 years ago, I was a bit frustrated in trying to get a good grasp on Paul's usage of νομος in these two letters until I gained this insight about the Greek article. The fact that νομος without the article can be definite by context, and that it then refers to the character of law, helps immensely in translating and interpreting many NT passages.

A number of possibilities suggest themselves as far as translation is concerned:
1) Simply use "law" for all the verses where νομος occurs and "obeying" or "doing" the law when νομος is used with ἔργων or with the prepositions ἐν or ἐκ; or
2) Use "Moses' law" when νομος refers to the Mosaic law and "God's law" when νομος refers to the moral law. These two options would work whether the Greek has the article with νομος or omits it. The problem is that then one has to make interpretative decsions in each case whether the context refers to the Mosaic law or the moral law. If some don't agree with the interpretative decision, they will criticize.
3) Use "God's requirements" or "what God requires" for νομος, and "doing what God requires" when νομος is used with ἔργων or with the prepositions ἐν or ἐκ.

Perhaps option 3 is best because it can be used whether νομος has the article or not and can be used whether νομος refers to the Mosaic or moral law. In this way one would have a consistent translation for all the passages where νομος occurs rather than resorting to four to six different translations according to context. This translation parallels the NET's pattern of using paraphrases for technical theological terms. And translating "law" as "what God requires" also provides a rather natural counterpart to translating "righteousness" as "God's approval."

Subject: GW translation of χαρις as "kindness", "good will", or "favor"
From: D. Kuske - 2/28 1995
Status: Sent to GWN

There are a number of reasons why the translations of "kindness" or "good will" or "favor" are inadequate as a translation for χαρις:

1. χαρις speaks not only of an attitude but also of an action. It is true that in classic literature χαρις can be either an attitude or an act of undeserved kindness. However, in NT usage (which is mostly Pauline) exhaustive lexicons such as Kittel's show that χαρις is used to refer to God's *action* of undeserved kindness in saving us through the redeeming work of Christ. Only one of the three words used in GW conveys this primary idea of action fairly well, namely, "kindness." "Good will" conveys only attitude. "Favor" can convey action, but usually only when it is combined with the verb "do" (e.g. "Will you do a favor for me?"). Otherwise it's emphasis is also on attitude more than action. So two of the three translations are inadequate to convey the primary idea of action to the reader. The only one that does so clearly is "kindness." In and of itself this point would not be significant, but when points #2 and #3 that follow are considered, it does become quite significant.

2. Even more importantly than point #1, "kindness" alone does not convey the whole meaning of χαρις. The idea of something undeserved, unmerited, unearned is also basic to this word. Consider Paul's definition in Romans 11:6 where he says that χαρις isn't χαρις anymore if it is earned in any way. Or consider the emphatic point Paul makes about χαρις in Eph 2:8 - "you had nothing to do with it" and "it's not the result of anything you've done." This point (undeserved, unmerited, unearned) is at the very heart of the gospel. If it is missing in GW (as it is in all three words used to translate χαρις), to that degree the translation fails to speak the gospel clearly. Adding the word "undeserved" to "kindness" would capture the whole thought of the word and also let its gospel message shine brightly for all to see.

3. Using three different translations for such a key word of scripture does a number of things. First, it does not let the reader see how often this word is repeated, especially in the Pauline epistles. As a result the reader fails to see from constant repetition that this theme is a central truth of scripture. Second, when in the same context (i.e. a few verses, part of a chapter, a chapter, or several consecutive chapters) two or three different words are used to translate this key word of scripture, the reader fails to see that this is a key thought that the inspired writer is emphasizing in a particular context. With a key word such as δικαιος GW deliberately went from two translations (justified, righteous) to one (approved). Isn't it counterproductive in translating another key word of Scripture for GW to go from one translation (grace) to three (good will, favor, kindness)? If only one translation were used consistently, it would help the reader see that this is a key truth of Scripture. Although this point is less important than #2 above, it does have much the same effect, namely, a muting of a key word which expresses the clear gospel message of Scripture.

Suggestion: translate χαρις regularly with one translation = "*undeserved kindness*" and footnote it with *Or "grace"*

N.B. In a passage such as Eph 2:8 it might be argued that the idea of "undeserved" is obvious from the surrounding clauses ("you had nothing to do with it" and "it's not the result of anything you've done.") But just the opposite is true. In this verse Paul is emphasizing this basic truth of scripture by stating it with the word χαρις and then using the context to underscore the wonderful truth this word contains. He wants this truth to be clear and unequivocal. This truth is so vital that it cannot be overstated or overemphasized.

N. B. The simple translation "*kindness*" might be sufficient for the second or third time that χαρις is used in consecutive verses. (e.g. if "undeserved kindness is used in Ephesians 1:5 and 1:8, "kindness" is sufficient in 1:7; or in Eph 3:8 "this kindness" might be used because η χαρις αυτη points back to "undeserved kindness" in 3:7)

N.B. In some passages it might be helpful to add "the message of" in brackets prior to "undeserved kindness" if χαρις is being used as a synonymn for the entire message of how God saved us. (e.g. Eph 3:2 = "God gave me the responsibility of bringing [the message of] his undeserved kindness to you.")

N.B. In passages in which χαρις is used with θεω, it has the meaning of thanks (e.g. Ro 6:17 = "I give thanks to God").

Though it is not totally wrong to translate "Sabbath" as "day of worship" (Lev. 23:3 says it was a day of worship) yet to omit the idea of "rest" totally is more than a minor point for two very important reasons.

1. The basic meaning of the word "sabbath" is "rest." The OT sabbath day was designated as a day of rest (Ex 35:2) and this was the name (sabbath) given to it. "Rest" is a key idea of the word that is basic to its usage in many OT and NT passages. Take for example just one passage in the NT, Mt 12:1-14, in which the word "sabbath" is used four times. The Pharisees were not objecting to Jesus doing things on this day primarily because it was a day of worship. They were objecting to Jesus disciples and Jesus himself doing things on this day because it was a day of rest. The reader is misled as to the reason for the Pharisees being so upset if he doesn't know that this was to be a day of rest on which no work was to be done. Without this the main point of the passage is lost.

2. As such, that is, as a day of rest, it served as a type of the spiritual rest that the promised Messiah would bring. This idea is stated in many OT passages as well as many NT passages, e.g. Col 2:17 ("a picture of things to come"), Heb 4:9-11. Without the idea of "rest" in the translation, the Messianic message in "sabbath" is lost. This means that a whole set of passages of God's Word which contain the gospel message are muted.

Suggestion: translate with *"day of rest"* as the basic translation and translate with *"day of rest and worship"* if the context gives as much prominence to the idea of worship as to the idea of rest.

Should or Ought to or Let us?

In the exhortations which we use in our preaching or teaching, we are often prone to use such expressions as "we should . . ." or "we must…" or "we ought to …." Take out an old sermon and look for these words. Listen to a fellow pastor or a teacher as he addresses his congregation or class. Look at the papers which your confirmation class or high school religion class has turned in to you as an assignment or a test. Listen to the people in your Bible class as they discuss a point. *Should's* and *must's* and *ought to's* usually abound.

Is it wrong to use these expressions? No, not if they are understood correctly. But

there's the rub! Are they understood correctly by our people and our children when we use them?

We all would agree that communication is not what one person *intends* to say to another, but rather what the second person *actually* hears and understands when spoken to. We could cite many examples of humorous or tragic situations in which what one person intended to say was not what the other person actually understood. For example, if a child doesn't understand a word or concept which we use, the child may not ask us what we meant. Instead the child might just substitute a word or concept which he or she knows, but which may give a sense totally foreign to what we intended to convey.

What do we intend to say when we use *should* or *must* or *ought to*? Usually we use these terms in a sermon or a confirmation class in exhorting people to an action which is Gospel motivated. When we are making an application to the lives of our people or children, we say, "Since it is God's will that we live a holy life, we *should* want to do only what pleases him." Or, "Since Jesus died to save us, we *ought to* be ready to serve him with our whole life." Or, "Since God commands us to share the gospel with all people, we *must* be ready to sacrifice our time and treasure to carry out this task." What we intend to say is that our love and thanks to God for his grace and mercy compel us to a life of service.

But is this what our people or children understand? Not always. Not even usually. Usually by *should* they understand either "We should be doing this, but because we are sinners we don't do it," or "God is demanding that we do something, and we'd better do it or we are going to be in trouble." With *must* they usually understand the latter (i.e. God's demanding and we'd better do it or else). With *ought to* they understand the former (i.e. We ought to do it, but we usually don't). If you don't believe that this is what our people or children usually understand by these words, just ask them on occasion in confirmation or Bible

also abound with these expressions, and spot checks have shown a very obvious confusion in understanding.

Sometimes when we use these terms in our preaching or teaching we might really intend to emphasize the failure to do what we should do or ought to do, or that we must do this or that or we can expect God's judgment. However, if we intend to use them as an expression of gospel motivation, and they are understood in this totally foreign sense, only confusion can be the result.

What expressions can we use that will avoid confusion and also communicate clearly what we intend to say? The New Testament writers give us the answer. *Should's* and *must's* and *ought to's* are scarce. Where the NIV or KJV translate with these expressions, often the Greek word is either δεῖ or οφείλω. The first really means "it is necessary." In the pagan mouth this was the equivalent of "the fates have decreed"; in the mouth of the inspired writers of the New Testament it is the equivalent of "it is God's will" or "God wants." The word οφείλω stresses the idea that there is an obligation which is owed. Both say more than the simple English should, ought or must.

Most often the writers such as Paul, Peter, James and John use either the imperative, the hortatory subjunctive, or verbs such as ἐρώτωμεν ("we ask") or παρακαλοῦμεν ("we urge"). Look at I Thessalonians 5:12-27 which is a rapid series of exhortations which Paul directs to the Thessalonians and all Christians. Twenty times Paul urges the different aspects of a sanctified life. But there are no *should's*, or *must's*, or *ought to's*. In verse 15 when the NIV translates "try to be kind," this is a questionable translation of what more accurately says, "keep on pursuing what is helpful (useful)." In verse 16 Paul does not say "We *ought to* be joyful always," but simply, "Be joyful always!" In verse 17 he does not say, "we *should* pray continually," but more directly, "Pray continually." In verse 18 he does not say, "We *must* give thanks in all circumstances," but he exhorts, "Give thanks in all circumstances." In regard to all these he then adds, "For this is God's will for you in Christ Jesus."

Or look at Hebrews 10:19-25. After summarizing the results of Christ's redeeming work the writer urges, "*Let us* draw near (hortatory subjunctive, v22), not "we *should* draw near." "Let us hold unswervingly," he says in verse 23, not "we *ought to* hold unswervingly." "Let us consider," he adds in verse 24, not "we *must* consider." The NIV takes the two participles in verse 25 and also makes them hortatory subjunctives. This paraphrases the thought well if one makes a separate sentence of this verse.

If a person scans the epistles in only a very cursory way, this pattern of using either the imperative or the hortatory

subjunctive quickly impresses itself on the reader. And this impression readily suggests to us that there is a better way to speak than with *should's*, *must's* and *ought to's*. While the latter do not usually convey what we intend to say, the imperative and the hortatory subjunctive speak directly and clearly to the heart of the Christian.

Sometimes the suggestion is made that we might use the expression, "A Christian *will* do this or that." But this way of speaking also has a serious flaw. It implies that if one is a Christian, he *will* live in a certain way. The obvious conclusion which some might draw is that since they have not lived this way, therefore they are not Christians. Again, that hopefully is not what the speaker intended to say, but it is what some can easily understand. Because of the confusion it can cause, the expression "a Christian will," like should, must, or ought to, is best avoided unless carefully circumscribed.

The expression *try to* is often tacked on to *should* or *ought to*. One hears or reads, that *we should try to* or we *ought to try to*. These expressions confuse at best and may even completely mislead a person who takes them literally. If one is told that he or she should *try to* keep God's will, he or she might very well be led to self-righteousness. If all that the person hears is that he or she is *to try to* keep God's law, that person might think, "Well, I tried, so God will be happy with the best that I can do." Or, if we tell a congregation of believers that they ought to try to preach the gospel to every creature, let's not be surprised if what they hear is that a good try is all that God wants.

Sometimes the objection is raised that Luther used *should* in his explanations of the Ten Commandments. But the German *sollen* has a fuller idea of obligation than the English *should* and none of the implication that we *should have* even though we didn't. Even more telling is the point that Luther combined the word *should* with *fear and love*. "We should fear and love God," he wrote, not just, "We should."

The point is that we would do well to step back on occasion and take a good hard look at the expressions we are using to exhort the people committed to our care. It is so easy to slip into *should's* and *must's* and *ought to's* which do not convey what we intended to convey. This writer confesses to this fault very often also. Students in his class are conditioned by the red underlining of their *should's, must's,* and *ought to's* to be on the watch for a better and clearer way to say what is really intended. Their smile at times in class reminds the red underliner that he too does not always avoid what he counsels them to avoid.

OVER

If we want to stress something as God's will, let's just say that. "It is God's will that we ..." or "God wants us to ..." says clearly what "we should ..." or "we must" or "we ought to ..." may or may not convey clearly. The imperative is a direct and clear call to the Christian to drown his Old Adam and to let his New Man come forth and arise. On the other hand, "we should" or "we ought to" may well convey the negative idea that what is being urged is well nigh impossible instead of being a stirring call to action. The hortatory "let us ..." or "may we ..." is an urgent exhortation which the gospel motivated Christian surely understands without the confusion which *must* or *ought to* might well convey.

Let the final words of this article demonstrate the point by way of an exhortation to you. Which of the following speaks more clearly and encouragingly to you, A or B?

A) We *should* remember that in communication it is not what we intend to say but what people actually understand us to say that counts. We *ought to* learn from the writers of the New Testament epistles how to exhort Christians directly and clearly. We *must* follow their example and use the imperative and the hortatory subjunctive rather than *should, must,* and *ought to.*

B) Remember that in communication it is not what we intend to say but what people actually understand us to say that counts! Learn from the writers of the New Testament epistles how to exhort Christians directly and clearly! Let us follow their example and use the imperative and the hortatory subjunctive rather than *should, must* and *ought to.*

GW translates "repentance" with the words "change the way you think and act" or "turn to God and change the way you think and act."

As the attached printed sheet shows (copy of sections from J.T. Mueller's Dogmatics, Koehler's Summary of Christian Doctrine, and the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary dogmatics notes), Lutheran theology has classified repentance with conversion, even calling it a synonym of conversion.

Two things (not three as Roman Catholicism and Reformed theology teach) are essential in the meaning of repentance in the light of the context of all of scripture: 1) sorrow over sin; and 2) faith in God's forgiveness. Passages such as the following say that the sinner is saved by repentance: Ez 18:32, Lk 13:3 & 5, Ac 2:38, Ac 11:18, 2 Co 7:10, 2 Pe 3:9. The sanctified life which *follows* conversion/repentance is what scripture refers to as the "fruit of repentance." Roman Catholic and Reformed theology basically tend to include the sanctified life in repentance.

The translation "change the way you think and act" will tend in most people's minds to put the spotlight on sanctification rather than conversion. Many Reformed will probably be happy with this translation because they tend to blur the clear line between faith/conversion/repentance and sanctification. Though in some statements they may clearly separate the two, yet practically they confuse the issue by making the commitment of one's life to Christ part of faith. Take as an example J.W. Boice's first volume on the book of Romans, chapter 46. In his treatment of faith in this chapter, he says that the third element of faith is commitment. Then he explains this commitment with the example of a husband or wife promising to live with and share all life's pleasures and sorrows with one's spouse.

Lutherans will rightly be concerned, therefore, about the translation "change the way you think and act." It may mislead some people to think primarily of sanctification in the verses which speak about repentance. Also, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to make the true essence of repentance (i.e. contritition and faith) clear doctrinally if a Bible translates every passage which deals with repentance as "change the way you think and act."

Adding the words "turn to God" in front of "change the way you think and act" helps a little because "turn to God" can be understood as a call to believe God's promise of forgiveness. But in the context of the words that follow ("change the way you think and act") it can also be understood to say "the way you turn to God is by changing the way you think and act." Wouldn't the Christian who is weak in understanding, or wouldn't the person who is a novice Christian, tend to understand it in the latter way rather than the former way?

How might "repentance" be translated to avoid the aforementioned inadequacies? Since repentance occurs alone and in a number of different combinations with other words, there would have to be a number of similar yet slightly different translations.

A. Probably the best place to start are the passages where the idea of repentance occurs alone, that is, apart from any combination. A translation that suggests itself as a basic one, on which all the combinations might be built, is this: *turn away from sin to God (with "repent" or "repentance" as a footnote).* Some reasons for this suggestion are:
    1. This translation keeps the words "turn to God" (which was an improvement as an addition to "change the way you think and act.") Keeping these words will help cushion a change in translation of these verses from the first to the second edition of GW.
    2. Putting the thought "to God" at the end of the phrase in climactic position will help the reader think of faith more easily when he compares these verses (where this phrase "turn away from sin to God" occurs) with other passages which deal with conversion and faith.
    3. "Away from sin" hints at the idea of contrition even though it does not speak of sorrow directly. Again, when the Bible reader compares the passages with this phrase with other passages which deal with conversion, this meaning will more easily suggest itself to him.
    4. "Turn . . . from . . . to" gets at the basic idea contained in the Greek and Hebrew words which imply a change that takes place when the sinner repents.
    5. I don't think the Reformed will have any problem with this translation. If they still want to say that sanctification is one element of conversion/repentance/faith, they will still do so. But the point is that the passages with this translation will not lean heavily in that direction. At the same time, we as Lutherans will not have to deal with a translation in these passages that seems to lean in the direction of sanctification.
    6. We as Lutherans will have to prove from the rest of Scripture (as we did with "repentance") what the translation

Letter: 3/7/95

Enclosed find some suggestions in regard to "repentance." I suppose that it might sound like I am a Reformed basher, but the occasions when I raise the Reformed issue in translation is not due to seeing a Reformed error under every leaf. I have respect for some Reformed theologians. I have attended lectures conducted by Reformed men and learned from them. I review books on the NT by Reformed authors and I learn from them. But that doesn't mean that some of the doctrine taught by the Reformed isn't wrong. Our Lutheran confessions four centuries ago said that there are some serious flaws in Reformed theology, and it is still true today. My concern each time I raise the Reformed issue is that a given translation is making it less possible for a Lutheran pastor to warn his people against Reformed errors which either mute the clear gospel message or make the gospel a conditional gospel by mixing sanctification with conversion or justification.

A quick comment on one other matter. I received our copies of *God's Word* today and read Dr. Steinmann's comments on the survey regarding some technical theological terms. Most of what was said was good, but he is not correct when he says: "*Charis* does not mean gift." Louw-Nida give "(showing) kindness and giving a gift" as basic meanings of χαρις, and they comment that it is often an action that demonstrates a gracious attitude. They also give "goodwill" as a meaning, but it is significant that they cite this meaning when it is used with the verbs of having or finding. BAGD lists the meaning "favor" and "goodwill" (attitude) together with "gracious care or help" (action) together under point number 2 and imply that the context will have to determine whether the attitude or action is in the foreground in a given passage. BAGD also lists the Pauline usage in the formulas at the beginning and end of his letters as a separate item. (N.B. Luther's comments on this usage in his commentary on Galatians indicates clearly that he saw χαρις in this usage referring to God's saving action, cf. the attached copy). Then under point 3, BAGD gives the meaning of the "practical application of goodwill = a gracious deed or gift." To say that "*Charis* does not mean gift" doesn't square with BAGD either. I sent the notes on χαρις in the letter of 2/28, but after reading Dr. Steinmann's comments on it I felt I should add this comment to what I sent you earlier.

(Part of the presentation of conversion)

Koehler's

B. Conversion.

The transition of a man from the state of sin into the state of faith is variously designated in Scripture as:
Repentance - Regeneration - Illumination.
The term most commonly used is: Conversion. - Repentance describes the change properly, the other expressions are metaphorical.

I. Repentance is a change of heart - in which the person regrets his former sinfulness and through faith embraces the grace of God.

1. Repentance has a double aspect.

a) It involves
-1) A regret over former sin.
   of Job 42,6; Mt.11,21; Mo.1,15(?); Acts 8,22; 2 Cor.12,21;
   Heb.6,1; Rev.2,21.
-2) Faith as its principal element.
   of Friedlieb, al.{H.III,310,15-). April,255,*
   -a) On the fact
      of Lo.15,7.10; 24,47; Acts 2,38 coll 16,31; 5,31;Rev.16,9.
      of Gerh.,Quenst.,Chemn.,al (H.III,302,10; 300,15-;319,10-).
   -b) This faith follows contrition.
      of Colloquy, Torgau,1527. Agricola:A fide minarum incho-
      andam esse contritionem. - Melanchthon:Quid aliud est
      fides minarum quam pavor? - Luther:Sibi placere, ut
      fidei nomen tribuatur justificanti fidei ac consolanti
      nos in his terroribus.

b) No other element ever being mentioned,
-1) These two emotions may be said to constitute repentance.
   cf A.C. XII;2-5 (p 48).
   of Hafenreffer, al (H.III,301,11)
-2) A new obedience in good works is the fruit of repentance.
   cf Mt.3,8; Lo.3,8. 10-14; Acts 26,20; Rev.2,5.

124

A SUMMARY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

spdr is made bright and cheerful by faith and hope. The terms "regeneration," "new birth," 1 Pet. 1, 23; John 3, 5; Tit. 3, 5, indicate that a new, a spiritual life began the moment faith was worked in the heart; "quickening," "resurrection," Eph. 2, 5, 6; Rev. 20, 5, tell us that by faith we have been raised from spiritual death to spiritual life. All these terms are figurative, and they describe exactly the same thing, namely, that by the operation of the Holy Ghost faith is worked in the heart.

Repentance.— This term, which is the translation of a Greek word that means "change of mind," is used in a narrower and in a wider sense. Whenever it is used together with "faith," Acts 20, 21, and "believe," Mark 1, 15, it denotes sorrow and contrition over sin. When it is used alone, Luke 15, 7. 10; Mark 2, 17, it usually includes both, sorrow over sin and faith. The response and reaction of the heart to the Law; faith, the response and reaction of the heart to the voice of the Gospel. The Augsburg Confession, Art. XII, describes repentance thus: "Now, repentance consists properly of these two parts: One is contrition, that is, terrors smiting the conscience through the knowledge of sin; the other is faith, which is born of the Gospel, or absolution, and believes that for Christ's sake, sins are forgiven, comforts the conscience, and delivers from its terrors. The good works are bound to follow, which are the fruit of repentance."

Galatia, knowing that where men profess the name of Christ they may feel secure.

It is the lot of God's ministers not only to suffer opposition at the hand of a wicked world, but also to see the patient indoctrination of many years quickly undone by such religious fanatics. This hurts more than the persecution of tyrants. We are treated shabbily on the outside by tyrants, on the inside by those whom we have restored to the liberty of the Gospel, and also by false brethren. But this is our comfort and our glory, that being called of God we have the promise of everlasting life. We look for that reward which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man."

Jerome raises the question why Paul called them churches that were no churches, inasmuch as the Galatians had forsaken the grace of Christ for the law of Moses. The proper answer is: Although the Galatians had fallen away from the doctrine of Paul, baptism, the Gospel, and the name of Christ continued among them. Not all the Galatians had become perverted. There were some who clung to the right view of the Word and the Sacraments. These means cannot be contaminated. They remain divine regardless of men's opinion. Wherever the means of grace are found, there is the Holy Church, even though Antichrist reigns there. So much for the title of the epistle. Now follows the greeting of the apostle.

VERSE 3. *Grace be to you, and peace, from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ.*

The terms of grace and peace are common terms with Paul and are now pretty well understood. But since we are explaining this epistle, you will not mind if we repeat what we have so often explained elsewhere. The article of justification must be sounded in our ears incessantly because the frailty of our flesh will not permit us to take hold of it perfectly and to believe it with all our heart. Grace remits sin, and peace quiets the conscience. Sin and conscience

torment us, but Christ has overcome these fiends now and forever. Only Christians possess this victorious knowledge given from above. These two terms, grace and peace, constitute Christianity. Grace involves the remission of sins, peace, and a happy conscience. Sin is not canceled by lawful living, for no person is able to live up to the Law. The Law reveals guilt, fills the conscience with terror, and drives men to despair. Much less is sin taken away by man-invented endeavors. The fact is, the more a person seeks credit for himself by his own efforts, the deeper he goes into debt. Nothing can take away sin except the grace of God. In actual living, however, it is not so easy to persuade oneself that by grace alone, in opposition to every other means, we obtain the forgiveness of our sins and peace with God.

The world brands this a pernicious doctrine. The world advances free will, the rational and natural approach of good works, as the means of obtaining the forgiveness of sin. But it is impossible to gain peace of conscience by the methods and means of the world. Experience proves this. Various holy orders have been launched for the purpose of securing peace of conscience through religious exercises, but they proved failures because such devices only increase doubt and despair. We find no rest for our weary bones unless we cling to the word of grace.

The Apostle does not wish the Galatians grace and peace from the emperor, or from kings, or from governors, but from God our Father. He wishes them heavenly peace, the kind of which Jesus spoke when He said, "Peace I leave unto you: my peace I give unto you." Worldly peace provides quiet enjoyment of life and possessions. But in affliction, particularly in the hour of death, the grace and peace of the world will not deliver us. However, the grace and peace of God will. They make a person strong and courageous to bear and to overcome all difficulties, even death itself, because we have the victory of Christ's death and the assurance of the forgiveness of our sins.

"turn away from sin to God" means. So while it is a translation that probably communicates something in a simpler form than the technical term repentance did, still, like the translation "repentance," it does not define exactly what is meant without comparing these passages with the context of all of Scripture.

The passages where this basic translation might be used are: 1 Ki 8:47, 2 Chr 6:37, Job 34:33, Job 42:6, Jer 5:3, Jer 15:19, Jer 31:19, Jer 34:15, Is 30:15, Ex 14:6, Ez 18:30 & 32, Hos 11:5 ,Zec 1:6, Mt 3:2, Mt 4:17, Mt 11:20 & 21, Mt 12:41, Mk 6:12, Lk 5:32, Lk 10:13, Lk 11:32, Lk 13:3 & 5, Lk 15:7 & 10, Lk 16:30, Lk 17:3, Lk 24:27, Ac 2:38, Ac 5:31, Ac 11:18, Ac 13:24, Ac 17:30, Ac 26:20, Ro 2:4, 2 Co 7:9 & 10, 2 Ti 2:5, He 6:6, 2 Pe 3:9, Re 2:5, Re 2:16, Re 2:22, Re 3:3, Re 3:19, Re 9:20, Re 16:9,

---

B. In passages where " repentance" appears in combination with "produce fruits worthy of repentance", maybe something like this could be used:

> *Produce fruit that corresponds to your turning away from sin to God [with "repentance" as a footnote]*   or
> *Produce fruit that is a natural result of your turning away from God [with "repentance" as a footnote]*

Some reasons for this suggestion are:

There are several problems with the present GW translation of the passages in which repentance occurs in this combination (Mt 3:8, Lk 3:8). The present GW translation is, "Do those things that prove you have turned to God and have changed the way you think and act." The problems are:

a. Translating repentance as "change the way you think and act" (cf. the basic translation suggested above and the reasons for it under point A).

b. Translating $\alpha\xi\iota o\varsigma$ as "prove" and not translating $\kappa\alpha\rho\pi o\varsigma$ at all. The basic meaning of $\alpha\xi\iota o\varsigma$ really isn't proving something. Even though that happens to make good sense in this verse, it really isn't in the semantic range of the word. Louw and Nida point out the basic meaning is "corresponding to what is expected." This really points to something being the result rather than proof of the foregoing. The word $\kappa\alpha\rho\pi o\varsigma$ also emphasizes that the key idea here is result. At first blush it may not seem to be all that important a point. But consider that the end result of the GW translation points to sanctification as the proof of faith/repentance instead of the result of repentance. Along with this, also consider that the Reformed at times overemphasize sanctification as the proof of faith/repentance leading those weak in faith to look to their own life as assurance instead of looking only to what Christ has done. In the light of this, wouldn't it be best to translate in a way that does not give aid and comfort to this possible misuse of this passage, especially when $\alpha\xi\iota o\varsigma$ and $\kappa\alpha\rho\pi o\varsigma$ in this verse show that the stress is on result instead of on proof.

c. It would be better to translate $\pi o\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\rho\pi o\nu$ exactly as it is translated in God's Word in the verse that follows (verse10 in Matthew and verse 9 in Luke), namely, "produce fruit." Otherwise, how will the reader see the direct relationship between the command given in the earlier verse and the the warning what will happen if this command is not obeyed in the later verse. In seeking to make the meaning of the earlier verse simpler, don't we have to be careful that we don't destroy the connection which the Holy Spirit established between these verses by the words he led Matthew and Luke to use?

C. In passages where "repentance" appears in combination with "baptism" the translation (or footnote) "change the way you think and act" is particularly inadequate. Mt 3:11 is translated, "I baptize you with water so that you will change the way you think and act." Mk 1:4 and Lk 3:3 are translated "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" and Ac 19:4 with "baptism of repentance" (the last three with the footnote "Repentance is turning to God with a complete change in the way a person thinks and acts.")

Again refer to the printed quotes from Mueller, Koehler and the WLS notes which state that repentance is sorrow for sin and faith in God's forgiveness (contrition). So when repentance is combined with baptism it is speaking of baptism as a means of grace by which God saves a person. Combining baptism with the idea of changing the way one thinks and acts emphasizes more that God works a sanctified life in baptism rather than stressing conversion.

Thus the suggestion that:

> - Mt 3:11 be translated: *I baptize you with water to turn you away from sin to God* . [with the footnote "to bring about repentance"]
> - Mk 1:4, Lk 3:3, and Ac 19:4 be translated as they are now: *"baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins"*   with a change in the footnote to read *"Repentance is turning away from sin to God."*

D. In passages where "repent" is followed by "of evil" (Job 36:10, Jer 18:8), "of their sins" (Is 59:20), "of wickedness" (Jer 8:6, Ac 8:22), "of the impurity" (2 Co 12:21), "from acts that lead to death" (He 6:1), "of immorality" (Re 2:22), "of what they had done" - in all of these cases where repent is followed by some form of sin, the simple translation of *"turn away from . . ."* would be sufficient since the emphasis is solely on turning away from sin.

E. In passages where "repentance" is followed by "believe" or "turn to God" (Mt 21:32, Mk 1:15, Ac 3:19, Ac 20:21), the simple translation *"turn away from sin"* would suffice since the second key element of the word "repentance" (i.e. of turning to God in faith) is supplied by the words that follow.

J. T. Mueller's "Dogmatics"

→ Section Heading = "Synonyms of Conversion"

CONVERSION, OR THE BESTOWAL OF FAITH.   365

the gracious promises of the Gospel, Rom. 1, 5. 6; 8, 30; 1 Cor. 1, 2. 26; 2 Tim. 1, 9, etc.

e. *Repentance (poenitentia)*. The term *repentance (μετάνοια)* is used in both a narrower and a wider sense. The *Formula of Concord* thus writes (Thor. Decl., V, 7. 8) : "The term *repentance* is not employed in the Holy Scriptures in one and the same sense. For in some passages of Holy Scripture it is employed and taken for the entire conversion of man, as Luke 13, 5; 15, 7. But in this passage, Mark 1, 15, as also elsewhere, where repentance and faith in Christ, Acts 20, 21, or repentance and remission of sins, Luke 24, 46. 47, are mentioned as distinct, to repent means nothing else than truly to acknowledge sins, to be heartily sorry for them, and to desist from them" (*i. e.*, from outward motives of fear and punishment; cp. Judas).

Thus the term denotes: a) contrition, or the knowledge of sin wrought by the Law *(terrores conscientiae)*; this is the meaning of the word in all those passages in which repentance is distinguished from remission of sins, Luke 24, 47; b) contrition and faith, or the entire conversion of man, Luke 13, 5. In the latter sense the term *repentance* is a synonym of conversion.

Baier writes of this distinction (III, 310) : "Although repentance is sometimes used in a stricter sense for that part of conversion which is called contrition, yet often it is employed for the entire conversion." So also the *Augsburg Confession* describes repentance when it says (Art. XII) : "Repentance properly consists of these two parts: One is contrition, that is, terrors smiting the conscience through the knowledge of sin; the other is faith, which is born of the Gospel, or of absolution, and believes that for Christ's sake sins are forgiven, comforts the conscience, and delivers it from terrors."

The *Augsburg Confession* rightly adds that the good works which are bound to follow repentance are the *fruits of repentance. Deinde sequi debent bona opera, quae sunt fructus poenitentiae.*

Three passages in Matthew need improvement.

Matthew 5:28

GW translates "whoever looks at a woman <u>and desires her</u> has already committed adultery in his heart."
This translation is inadequate for two reasons:

1) It can easily lead a reader to think that any desire a man has for a woman is sinful. Perhaps it might be argued that the meaning of "sinful desire" is obvious. But if it is obvious, why leave the verse somewhat ambiguous. A tender conscience may be unnecessarily wounded. Is a man not to look at a woman and is he to have absolutely no desire for her prior to the time he marries her?

2) The Greek does not have "and" ("and desires her"). It has the preposition προς with the infinitive which expresses what the look is all about.

3) Elsewhere GW translates this word with a number of other translations besides the simple translation "desire." In Ro 1:24, 2 Ti 2:22, and Tit 3:3 "lust" is used. In Ro 7:7, 1 Pe 4:3, and 2 Pe 1:4 "sinful desire" is used. In 1 Jn 2:17 "evil desire" is used.

Brug, Jahn: "The suggested revision is certainly needed."

Suggestion: *"whoever looks at a woman <u>with a sinful desire</u> has already committed adultery in his heart"*

Matthew 21:32

GW translates "John . . . showed you the way that God wants you to live . . ."
This translation is wrong because it makes all of John's teaching deal with sanctification ("the way God wants you to live"). The Greek says "the way of righteousness," or as GW usually translates "the way to have God's approval." Translating this word the way GW usually does would leave the interpretation open. "The way to have God's approval" could be understood either as justification or sanctification or both.
[Jahn, Brug: "definite improvement."]

Suggestion: *John . . . showed you the way to have God's approval . . ."*

Matthew 28:19

GW translates "So wherever you go, make disciples of all nations."
This translation is misleading for several reasons.

1) It changes the almost universal understanding of the participle πορευθεντες as an imperative "Go!" Almost all the translations and commentaries take it this way. The use of a circumstantial participle as an imperative when it modifies an imperative is well documented in NT grammar (cf. Robertson, p946). GW translates the other two circumstantial participles in this verse which modify "make disciples" as imperatives: "Baptize . . . teach . . ." Elsewhere the GW regularly translates a circumstantial participle with an imperative this way (e.g. Mt 2:8 "Go and search", Mt 2:13, Mt 11:4 "Go back and tell John", Mt 17:27 - just to mention a few examples in Matthew). Why change the circumstantial participle to a subordinate clause in this one case?

2) The addition of "wherever" is unwarranted on the basis of the Greek. There is no idea in the Greek of this being a generalized expression. Even if the participle is taken as a circumstantial preliminary participle (as the aorist tense almost always indicates in a circumstantial temporal participle) instead of as an imperative, it would be translated "After you have gone out, make disciples etc." This is not a generalized idea.

3) A generalized statement can either be all inclusive or it can be indefinite. "Wherever you go" can be all inclusive and so have the sense of "everywhere you go" or it can be indefinite and have the sense "when and if you happen to go someplace." In either case it has a conditional idea, that is, the main verb (make disciples) is conditioned by wherever we go or when and if we go someplace. Neither is really what the Greek says, and so either understanding puts a condition on Jesus' Great Commission that is misleading. From the beginning of

the NT church, this verse has been a clear trumpet call to Christians to do world mission work. Many a pastor and many a Lutheran teacher has used this passage to remind Christians that we have a God-given obligation to carry the gospel to the ends of the earth. This idea is lost and replaced by the indefinite idea of "wherever." "Wherever you go" is not a command to go. It says that everywhere you happen to go or when and if you go someplace, then in that place you should make disciples. Yes, the command is still there to make disciples of all nations, but the urgency of "Go!" is watered down. If the Greek were not emphatic, this somewhat weaker expression is what we would preach and teach. But the Greek is imperatival. It commands us to go, not just to make disciples wherever we happen to go somewhere in the world. Thus the generalized translation gives the trumpet an uncertain sound, and as Paul says in 1 Co 14:8: Who will get ready for battle if the trumpet gives an uncertain call?

4) Mk 16:15 has the exact same construction and is translated in GW "Go . . . and tell."

Jahn, Brug: "Although GW isn't false doctrine, it certainly shifts the meaning and sense. Since this is such a key verse in the NT, we should be sure to get it right."

Suggestion: "*So go out and make disciples of all nations!*"

Subject: GW, Suggestions for Mark
From: D. Kuske, 3/22/95   Status: submitted to GW

Mark 2:17

GW presently reads: " . . . not people who think they don't have any flaws." Several problems with this are:

1. Put "think" in brackets because this is an interpretive addition.
2. Why change the usual translation of δικαιος which is "approved by God"? This verse gives another view of this word which is helpful in the overall study of what it means to be approved by God. However, it isn't obvious that this is parallel passage if the word is given a totally different translation here.
3. Avoid the double negative ("not . . . don't")

Jahn, Brug: "definite improvement"

Suggestion: "*not people who [think] they have God's approval.*"

The same translation occurs in Lk 5:32 = "*I've come to call sinners to turn away from sin to the Lord, not to call people who [think] they are approved by God.*"

Mark 7:19

GW presently translates: "(By saying this, Jesus declared all foods acceptable.)" This translation creates a contradiction in Scripture:

1. Scripture elsewhere says that Jesus did away with the Mosaic law by his death on the cross (e.g. Eph 2:14-16 says he brought an end to the commandments found in Moses' Teachings by his cross. Confer also Hebrews chapters 7-10 which say over and over again that it was Christ's death which brought an end to all of the commandments in Moses' Teachings.) If Christ did away with the dietary laws here in Mark 7 prior to this death, then people can rightly say that there is a contradiction in Scripture (not just a difference, but an actual contradiction). I suppose some might say it is a minor thing, but any contradiction in scripture would be a major thing.

2. The Greek construction can just as easily be describing the whole previous thought instead of modifying Jesus. The NT has a number of examples of this which are sometimes called "hanging participial nominatives." In this syntactical analysis Jesus would be saying that the process he just described (food goes into the

stomach and then into the toilet) is what makes all food clean. This is the interpretation which fits best both with what precedes (v18 = it's not the food that goes into a person that makes him unclean) and what follows (v20 = it's the sins that come out of his heart that make the person unclean).

3. The words "saying" and "declared" are not in the Greek and have to be added to come up with this interpretation. Then the parentheses are necessary because this interpretation does not fit in the flow of the thought.

Brug: "important in the overall harmony of Scripture"
Jahn: "I think the paraphrase will be clearer to the average Bible reader."

Suggestion: *"This is how all foods are made acceptable."* or in a paraphrase of the thought *"This is why the food that goes into a person doesn't make him unclean."*

N.B. If this suggestion, or something like it, is not put into the text, at least put it in a footnote. Then the person who sees that the present interpretation raises a contradiction in scripture will also see that this verse does not have to be understood that way.

Subject: GW, suggestions for Luke
From: D. Kuske, 3/22/9595

Luke 2:21

Presently GW translates "before his mother became pregnant." The Greek actually says "before he was conceived in the womb." So the Greek puts the focus on Jesus and his conception, while the present GW loses this completely and simply speaks of Mary becoming pregnant. This is one of the few passages in Scripture that speaks of Jesus' conception, and this important expression should not be lost.

Brug, Jahn: "The last point (i.e. "one of the few passages") makes the suggested revision necessary."

Suggestion: *"before he was conceived in his mother's womb"*

Luke 4:4

The footnote in GW says that a "few" manuscripts and translations add some words in this verse. This is not accurate since even if one takes only the early witnesses up to 600 A. D., there are actually as many manuscripts and more translations that add the words than leave them out. The usual footnote in GW says "some manuscripts etc." and for the sake of accuracy this usual footnote is also the one that should be used here. [Jahn, Brug: "a matter of consistency"]

Suggestion: *"Some manuscripts and translations add . . ."*

Luke 8:12

GW presently translates "so that they don't believe and become saved." To say "become saved" after "believe" is a Reformed expression that is often used by those who don't accept universal redemption and justification. They say a person is not really redeemed and justified until he believes. It is at that point the person "becomes saved." The Greek doesn't have any word that expresses "become." It simply says "so that they don't believe and are saved." A smoother way of expressing negative purpose in English might be to say something like "to keep them from believing and being saved." [Brug, Jahn: "the words "become saved" also makes it easier to read into this verse that salvation is an internal, sanitive process."

Suggestion: *"to keep them from believing and being saved"*

Luke 16:16

In Luke 16:16 the words "[in force]" are added. This might imply to many readers that since the time of Christ the OT is no longer "in force." As the context that follows makes clear, it is not the OT being in force that is talked about. Rather, the subject is what John preached or taught. John the Baptist did not teach the OT but the Good News about the Messiah. [Brug, Jahn: "GW is misleading as it now reads"]

Suggestion: "*[taught]*"

Luke 19:9

In this verse the words "You've shown that" can easily suggest to the reader that Zacchaeus was saved because of what he did rather than what he believed. When Jesus indicates that he knows Zacchaeus was "one of Abraham's descendants" he is referring to the faith Zacchaeus had in his heart like Abraham's faith. Compare Galatians 3:7: "You must understand that people who have faith are Abraham's descendants," and Romans 4:16 "those who are descendants by believing as Abraham did." Jesus is not saying Zacchaeus deeds which showed he was a believer are what saved him, but he is simply saying he is saved by faith just as Abraham was. [Jahn, Brug: "important point involving a key truth of the Bible."]

Suggestion: Drop "You've shown that" and just translate "*You, too, are one of Abraham's descendants.*"

Luke 27:47

In this verse the words "must" are added. The Greek is simply stating (as verse 46 does) what the Scripture says would happen, not what must happen. Keep the word "would" used in 46 also in verse 47 so that the reader knows that this is a continuation of v46 in which Jesus is merely reminding his disciples what the Scripture said would happen. In the second half of v47 (told to people of all nations) Jesus is also reminding his disciples what Scripture said would happen.

Also, changing from "Messiah" in v46 to "Jesus" in v47 is jarring and really isn't necessary.

Jahn, Brug: "a matter of consistency and the big flaw is the way GW translates repentance."

Suggestion: "*Scripture also says that by his authority people would be told to turn away from sin to God so that there sins are forgiven. And Scripture says that this message would be told to people from all nations, beginning in the city of Jerusalem.*"

Subject: Gw translation of John's Gospel
From: D. Kuske,
Status: sent to GWN   4/2/95

John 1:16
    GW translation = "because of all that the Word is"

    Problems with this translation:
    1. The word "because" does not go with the words εκ του πληρωματος αυτου ("out of this fulness of his"). It goes with the verb "received." GW has decided not to translate the conjunction οτι, but it cannot then be transferred to the prepositional phrase and used to replace the preposition εκ ("from"). That changes the meaning completely. The preposition εκ tells us what kind of storehouse this supply of gifts is coming from. If the words "all that the Word is" are retained, then the translation should read "from all that the Word is." (i.e. "Each of us has received one gift after another from all that the Word is.")

    2. However, the words "all that the Word is" don't really mean anything in this context, do they? Is John saying that we receive gifts from the storehouse of the whole essence of Christ?

    3. Furthermore, the words "all that the Word is" don't really reflect the meaning of the words του πληρωματος αυτου in this context. Literally, εκ του πληρωματος αυτου means "from this fullness of his." It refers back to the idea of "full" in verse14 (after the aside in v15). This needs to be reflected in the translation so that the reader sees the relationship of v16 to v14. To do this the translation would read something like: "from this full storehouse of his."" Or, to help the reader see the reference back to v14 more easily: "from the full storehouse [of his unde-served kindness]."

    Suggestion: *"from the full storehouse [of his undeserved kindness]."*
        [Jahn: "a definite improvement"]

    ....

John 1:51
    GW translation = "to the Son of Man"

    Problem with this translation: Although the preposition επι can mean "to," that is not its normal meaning. I'ts nor-man meaning is "upon, on."

    By the words Jesus uses, he seems to be making a reference to the vision of Jacob on his way to Haran (when Jacob saw the angels of God going up and coming down on a ladder). Jesus can be understood to be saying here, then, that he is the ladder in the vision of Jacob, that is, it is only through Christ that a sinner like Jacob (who left home under a cloud of sin) could expect God's angels to watch over him on this journey to Haran. What Jesus is saying to Nathanael by this analogy is that the "greater things" Nathanel will see is that Jesus is the ladder in Jacob's vision - that Jesus is God's Son, the Savior, the promised Messiah.

    When the translation "to the Son of Man" is used, the meaning is that the angels are sent by God to serve Christ. What that says to Nathanael in this context is nebulous. And with this translation, any connection to Jacob's dream is dulled, if not lost completely.

    Suggestion: Either replace the reading in the text with the following, or put the following in a footnote preceded
                by "Or:" = *"on the Son of Man.""*
      [Jahn: "replacing the reading in the text would be much better than a footnote"]

    ....

John 2:4 and John 19:26
    GW translation: "Why did you come to me?"

    Problems with this translation:
    1. Elsewhere the Greek construction here (τι εμοι και σοι) is translated "Why are you bothering me now?" (e.g. Mk 5:7, Mt 8:29, Lk 8:28). To be consistent this verse should also be translated, "Why are you bothering me now?" The Greek construction (τι εμοι και σοι) in all these instances means literally "What do we have in com-mon?" It should be translated consistently so that the interpreter can cross reference these passages to bring out

the meaning better by showing how it is used in several different settings. The speaker is not just asking why a person came, but there is a bit of annoyance, and distancing, that is being expressed.

2. The word Jesus uses to address Mary, namely, "woman" is dropped in GW. This address is an important passage like the address Jesus used on the cross (John 19:26 = "Woman, here is your son."). These are two of a number of passages that can be used to show the error of Roman Mariolatry. GW drops the address in both passages for no apparent valid reason. Since this is the address which the inspired text says Jesus used, it does not seem right just to drop it completely.

Suggestion: "Why are you bothering me now, woman?" and in John 19:26 "Woman, look, here is your son."
[Jahn: "There is annoyance and/or distancing. Even though it may not have been quite as strong in the culture of Jesus' day as it is today, it is a thought that needs to be reflected in the translation."]

John 3:6
GW translation: "Flesh and blood give birth to flesh and blood, but the Spirit gives birth to things that are spiritual."

Problems with this translation:
1. In the context Jesus is explaining to Nicodemus that no one can enter God's kingdom without being born from above (v3). Nicodemus thinks immediately of the birth of a baby, but Jesus explains that the birth he is referring to is being born of water and the Spirit (vv4-5). The question of interpretation in v6a is whether Jesus' answer is just saying, "Yes, Nicodemus, there is a birth of a baby from a human being (a physical birth), but there is another birth (a spiritual birth) that takes place in baptism." Or, is Jesus saying in v6a, "Nicodemus, the reason a second birth is necessary for a person to enter into God's kingdom is because in our physical birth we receive our parents' corrupt nature which dooms us to an eternity apart from God. It is only by baptism that we are spiritually renewed and so enter God's kingdom." The first interpretation is faulty because it never does give Nicodemus a reason why a second birth is necessary. The second one fits the context better because in this rather typical cryptic statement, Jesus expresses a deep spiritual truth. He tells Nicodemus both why a second birth is necessary and how this second birth takes place. The first interpretation is the interpretation of those of the Reformed persuasion who deny original sin. The second has been the common interpretation of the Lutheran church (cf. the LC-MS catechism, question 81 on original sin, where this verse is one of the four passages used to teach the doctrine of original sin.)

2. Elsewhere in the GW when σαρξ and πνευμα are used in contrast to one another in a context (here even withing a single verse) the translation "corrupt nature" is used. Is there any valid reason for changing that pattern in this verse? Even some Reformed commentaries (e.g. Mickelsen's) grant that because of the contrast in this verse σαρξ means "sinful nature."

3. The translation "things that are spiritual" is faulty for two reasons: a) It breaks the cryptic, pithy parallelism that Jesus uses to express one of the deep truths of Scripture; and b) If the first part of this parallel statment is a general truth about physical birth, then the second part can also be understood to say that the Spirit gives birth to some rather general spiritual "things" like God-pleasing thoughts, words and deeds.

Suggestion: Either replace the text with what follows, or put what follows in a footnote beginning with "Or"
        "The corrupt nature gives birth to a corrupt nature, but the Spirit gives birth to a spiritual nature."

        [If the translation must be watered down a bit to let the interpretation of the first part of the
              parallelism be a bit more ambiguous about original sin: 'The human nature gives birth to
              a human nature, but the Spirit gives birth to a spiritual nature."   - "The corrupt nature gives
              birth to what is corrupt, but the Spirit gives birth to what is spiritual."   - "The human nature
              gives birth to what is human, but the Spirit gives birth to what is spiritual."]

    [Jahn: I strongly prefer the "suggestion" to any of the alternatives mentioned in brackets. In the editing of Genesis 6:3
              I made the same suggestion in my editorial review.]

John 6:45

GW translation: "Those who <u>do</u> what they have learned from the Father . . ."
Problem with this translation: In chapters 5 and 6 Jesus repeatedly uses the word ακουω which GW regularly translates "hear" or "listen." In this one instance the translation is changed to a whole different meaning, and sanctification becomes the main thrust of the verse. Jesus is talking about listening in faith to what God teaches, not about living. Adding the words "what they have learned" also doesn't reflect the substance of what the Greek says. Jesus has just quoted the prophets as saying that God is ready to teach everyone so that they can be brought back to life on the last day (v44-45a). Now he underscores the fact that what people must be ready to do is both listen to him and learn from him (not listen and then refuse to learn as the Jews were doing).

Suggestion: "*Those who listen to the Father and learn from him . . .*"
[Jahn: "GW gives the verse a whole different meaning that is not the point of the verse"]

John 7:19

GW translation: "his teachings"
Problem with this translation: It makes it sound like the teachings are Moses personal teachings instead of being the Teachings he received from God on Mt. Sinai (capital letter used regularly in GW when referring to the Mosaic Law). Other places the expression "the Teachings" is used (e.g. Jn 1:17).

Suggestion: "*the Teachings*"
[Jahn: "though it is a fine point it is important in view of modern higher critical denials of biblical revelation & inspiration"]

John 7:39

GW translation: "as <u>it</u> would be"
Problem with this translation: The Holy Spirit is referred to as an "it". Everywhere else (even though the Greek consistently uses the neuter to refer to the Holy Spirit) the GW translates with "he" (cf. Jn 16: 12, 14 etc.)

Suggestion: "*as he would be*"
[Jahn: "seems to be a slip here since GW usually doesn't translate this way elsewhere"]

John 8:31

GW translation: "If you <u>live</u> by <u>what I say</u> . . ."
Problems with this translation:
1. An oft quoted, fundamental statement of Jesus is given an entirely new meaning which is highly questionable in the light of the previous context. In verse 24 Jesus says that if the Jews <u>don't believe</u> that he is the Messiah, they can't be saved. After recording the exchange that followed, John focuses in verses 30 and 31a on the people who <u>did believe</u> in Jesus. He is not talking about the sanctified life they are living. To introduce the the idea of living in Jesus statement in v31b brings in something totally foreign to what is being emphasized in the previous context. If an idea is to be added in v31 it should be believing.
2. That believing, not living, is in focus is also evident from the context that follows. We do not become Jesus disciples, learn the truth, and become free by the life we live according to Jesus words. This comes only by believing Jesus words. <u>Introducing the idea of living in this context not only ignores the context, but it also introduces a faulty statement about how we are saved</u>.
3. If the verb μενω is to be paraphrased, it's meaning ought not be totally lost. It puts a lot of stress on doing something continuously. This idea should be retained in this fundamental statement of Jesus in regard to those who are his disciples.
4. The translation "what I say" tends to remove somewhat the parallel with Jn 17:17. There the translation "<u>Your words</u> are truth" is used. In both passages λογος and αληθεια are being paired. The closer the translation between these two verses, the more likely the reader is to catch the parallel.

Suggestion: "*If you continue [to believe] my words . . .*"
[Jahn: "change suggested here is a must - a passage such as this with an important gospel exhortation should not be turned into law"]

John 10:35
GW translation: "Scriptures cannot be discredited."

Problems with this translation:
1. "Dicredit" means to ruin a reputation or cause not to believe. That isn't what the Greek word λυω means.

2. The Greek word means to "destroy" and when used specifically in reference to a legal document whose wording is established, it means "annul, overturn, change." (Cf. Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, Danker)

3. This is a passage, therefore, that is properly used to refer to the inspiration of Scripture. It says no one has the right to alter or change what the Bible says. It is one of the passages used in the LC-MS catechism to teach verbal inspiration (question 3).

Suggestion: "Scriptures cannot be changed (or annuled, or overturned)."
   [Jahn: "though GW is not false doctrine, the suggestion is a point well taken"]

John 12:25
The translation "guard them for" seems quite awkward. Wouldn't we say instead "preserve them for"? This is another possible meaning given in lexicons for the Greek verb used here.
   [Jahn: "the description of 'awkward' is true - and therefore also confusing"]

John 17:19
GW translation: "so that they, too, will use the truth to be holy."

Problem with this translation: Changing the voice of the verb to say "they will use" changes the meaning of the verse to put the focus on what people do with the truth rather than what Jesus is asking God to do for people by the truth (cf. v17). Literally the Greek says "so that people may be made holy [by you, i.e. God] in [or, by] the truth." This is what Jesus asks God to do in v17, and changing the subject changes Jesus whole point.

Suggestion: "so that you can use the truth to make them holy."
   [Jahn: "changing the verb does change the meaning"]

John 19:28
GW translation: "so that Scripture could finally be concluded"

Problems with this translation:
1. The verb "conclude" in its intransitive use speaks of something coming to an end. This translation will mislead the reader who is not well acquainted with Scripture because it will seem to say that this brought either Scripture itself, or the writing of Scripture, to a conclusion.
2. The idea expressed here is very similar to that expressed in many other passages like v36 which follows. It is speaking of Scripture being fulfilled, or as GW translates, of Scripture coming true. The only thing that is different in this verse is that the Greek verb used here wants to say that Jesus acted as he did so that everything foretold in the OT would come true ("completed" in the sense of nothing left that did not come true).

Suggestion: "so that everything Scripture said would come true"
   [Jahn: "definitely misleading - and doesn't really make sense in the usual way the word 'concluded' is used"]

Subject: GW translation of Acts
From: D. Kuske
Status: sent to GWN 4/2/95

Acts 2:5

GW translation: "they heard the wind"
Problem: There was no wind, but only a "sound like a . . . wind" (cf. v2). The Greek in this verse does not say "wind" but "sound."
[Jahn: "more accurate"
Suggestion: ""they heard the sound [of a wind]." or "they heard the sound [like a wind}."

Acts 2:11

GW translation: "miracles that God has done"
Problem: The Greek word means more than just "miracles." It speaks of all the wonderful or great things God does, in this setting especially of God's saving work in Jesus.
[Jahn: "the translation 'miracles' restricts the meaning too much"

Suggestion: "great things God has done" or "the wonderful things God has done"

Acts 2:23

GW translation: "By using men who don't acknowledge Moses' Teachings . . ."
Problem:
1. The reference is to people who were not subject to the Mosaic law, namely, the Romans. As Louw-Nida and BAGD both indicate, the Greek word "lawless" is used at times simply as a synonym for εθνη (Gentiles, non-Jews) - or in a pejorative sense it can take on the sense of "godless."

2. As non-Jews they were not obligated to keep the Mosaic law. Therefore, it was not necessary that they "acknowledge" the Mosaic law. The implication of the GW translation is that these men should have acknowledged the Mosaic law. To avoid this implication, use a translation that simply indicates that they were non-Jews or godless people.
[Jahn: "an important point about the Mosaic law that has to be made clear"

Suggestion: "By using men who were not Jews . . ." or "By using godless men . . ."

Acts 2:38

GW translation: "must" twice
Problem: The Greek does not have δει which GW regularly translates with "must." Instead, the Greek has the imperative which GW regularly translates with a simple command or with "should." For consistency use a simple command or "should" here also. "Must" is particularly jarring in a context like this where Peter is not giving the people a law to obey but is exhorting them to believe and be baptized.
[Jahn: "the first suggestion is preferable"
Suggestion: "Turn away from sin to God, all of you, and be baptized in the name . . ." or
            "All of you should turn away from sin to God and be baptized in the name of . . ."

<u>Acts 2:39</u>

GW translation: "who worships the Lord our God"
Problem: When Scripture describes someone as "calling on the Lord" GW translates this as "worships the Lord."
Here, however, the person is not calling on the Lord, but the Lord is calling a person to faith. Therefore "worships" in
this instance is not what the verse is saying. The Greek word means to "call for" someone in the sense of asking that
person to come. Thus it also has the meaning "summon" or "invite" (cf. Liddell and Scott).
       [Jahn: "more accurate"]

Suggestion: *"whom the Lord our God calls"* or *"whom the Lord our God invites"*

....

<u>Acts 3:6</u>

GW translation: "Through the power of Jesus . . ."
Problem: The Greek does not say "power" but "name" of Jesus. Elsewhere (e.g. Acts 16:18 and 19:13) GW translates
"in the name of" rather than "by the power of." Also, in Acts 4:7 and 4:30 "power" and "name" are used coordinately
indicating that there is a distinction between the two and that they are not exactly the same thing.
       [Jahn: "All of the notes from here to 4:12 do not involve false doctrine. It is a matter of accuracy and
              faithfulness to the original. Making something more easily understood is not legitimate if it
              really is a change in meaning."]

Suggestion: *"In the name of Jesus . . ."*   N.B. Confer the implications this has for the next two
                                                 items also.

....

<u>Acts 3:16</u>

GW translation: "We believe in the one named Jesus. Through his power alone this man, whom you know, was
                       healed, as all of you saw."

Problems:
1. As in 3:6, "power" is substituted for "name." As was indicated in the notes on 3:6, this is not consistent with what is
done elsewhere in GW, nor can "power" be substituted for "name" since there is a distinction between the two.

2. The GW translation leaves out a couple thoughts that are expressed by the Greek. The underlined parts in the fol-
lowing literal translation indicate what has been lost: "And on the basis of faith in his name, <u>his name made this man
strong</u> whom <u>you see and</u> know. And <u>this faith that is by him</u> gave to this man complete healing in front of all of you."
These are all points of emphasis in Peter's statement that are not redundant but important to his argument.

Suggestion: *"We have faith in the one named Jesus. We used his name to strengthen the man present here whom
               you know. The faith that comes through Jesus gave him the health that all of you now see."*

....

<u>Acts 4:10</u>

GW translation: "because of the power . . ."

Problem: The same problem as in 3:6 and 3:16 (point 1) = "power" substituted for "name." In 3:7 the Jewish leaders
ask not only by whose power but also by whose name this miracle had been done. Also, the preposition εν does not
mean "because."

Suggestion: *"through the name . . ."*

Acts 4:12

GW translation: "Indeed, we can be saved only by the power of the one named Jesus and not by any other person."

Problem: The same one as in 3:6, 3:16, and 4:10 = "power" substituted for "name." Maintaining the difference in meaning between "power" and "name" is particularly important in this verse. This verse is not speaking of how we come to faith (Jesus' power) but what our faith trusts in (Jesus' name). Note that this is the thrust of the three questions in the LC-MS catechism where this passage is cited (questions 1, 115, and 186).

Suggestion: "Indeed, of all the names given to people in this world, this is the only one that can save us."

....

Acts 7:51

GW translation: "How can you be so heartless and disobedient?"
Problem: The word "heartless" means "unsympathetic, cruel." That is not the thought in this verse. The Greek says "uncircumcised in heart and ears." "Disobedient" works well for "uncircumcised in ears", but "uncircumcised in heart" means "unbelieving."
        [Jahn: "the translation 'unsympathetic' misses the meaning"]

Suggestion: "How can you be so unbelieving and disobedient?"

....

Acts 13:10

GW translation: "distort the truth about the way the Lord wants people to live"

Problems:
1. The GW limits the truths here to teachings about the law, that is, God's commands about how he wants people to live. Paul and Barnabas are clearly teaching more than law to the governor.

2. The Greek says "distort the ways of the Lord, the straight ways." "Straight" used with "ways" has the sense of a path that has been clearly designated by God and which a person has left to follow another path. Confer the very same expression used of Balaam in 2 Pe 2:15 who was clearly told by God what to do but chose to follow an entirely different path. In Acts 8:21 essentially this same sense is used of Simon whose "heart was not straight before God" and the GW tranlates "how twisted your thinking is." Use a translation that speaks of the Lord's ways as being straight in the sense that they are very clear. This will leave the interpretation open as to whether the meaning here is limited to teaching only law or whether it also includes the gospel, as the context seems to indicate.
        [Jahn: "good insight"

Suggestion: "distort the Lord's clear truths"

....

Acts 13:38

GW translation: "your sins can be forgiven"

Problem: The Greek does not indicate only the possibility that their sins can be forgiven (implying that until they believe forgiveness is only a possibility), but literally the Greek says that through Jesus the proclamation is being made that their sins are forgiven. It is another passage that teaches objective justification, and this should not be lost in the translation.
        [Jahn: "the GW is wrong because it introduces a conditional gospel"]

Suggestion: "your sins are forgiven"

Acts 13:48

GW translation: "Everyone who had been <u>prepared</u> for everlasting life believed."

Problems:
1. "Prepared" here can be understood either in an active sense (these people were ready for everlasting life to come, i.e. they were not unprepared for Jesus' second coming) or in a passive sense (God had prepared these people to be ready for Jesus' second coming.) Thus the translation is quite ambiguous. It doesn't say who did the preparing, they themselves or God.
      [Jahn: "the translation 'prepared' misses the point of the original"]
2. In either the active or passive sense, "prepared" as indicated in #1 can easily be understood to mean that a person is ready for Jesus' second coming. But that is not the sense of the Greek word. It means to "appoint, designate, establish, assign, determine." BAGD indicates that with the preposition εις and a thing (eternal life in this case), τασσω used in reference to a person means "to classify someone among those possessing something" or to "designate someone to have something." The latter seems to fit particularly well in this context.

Suggestion: *"Everyone whom God designated to have everlasting life believed."*

Acts 16:4

GW translation: "had made for the people"

Problem: Maybe it is just my reaction to this translation that leaves me with the uncomfortable feeling that some who want the clergy to make all the decisions for laypeople will misuse this verse as a result of the way it is translated. The Greek has an infinitive that modifies the action of the leaders (φυλασσειν). If one recalls the decision making process and the letter that was sent as the result of the discussion (Acts 15), the purpose of these decisions was to give the church some guidelines that would avoid conflict between Jews and Gentiles in the church. The infinitive is added to indicate that this was also the purpose of Paul's sharing these decisions with the congregations in Galatia. The failure to translate the infinitive in GW leaves this purpose out and to that degree it doesn't express the whole thought. Adding it doesn't change the concept that the leaders made the decision, but it does help recall the important reason for their action and also Paul's reason for sharing this with these Christians. Therefore, to me at least, it seems crucial to include it in the translation.
      [Jahn: "I can't see any reason for not translating the infinitive."]
Suggestion: *"had made for the people to follow."*

Acts 26:14

GW translation: "It's hard for a mortal like you to resist God."

Problem: As with 16:4, this is not a major problem. But it does two things that go beyond translation and are really interpretation. Adding the words "a mortal like" goes far afield from the metaphor used by Paul which speaks of an animal kicking back against a prod used by the person who is seeking to guide that animal in a particular direction. If the metaphor is dropped it seems the words "resist God" is enough. If something is added, it would be better to hint at the metaphor in the Greek rather than adding a totally new thought like "a mortal like." Hinting at the metaphor could be done by saying "like a stubborn ox." Or the animal metaphor could be basically retained by saying "resist the prod your master is using."
      [Jahn: "The third suggestion probably is best because most people today would probably not understand
            the metaphor."]

Suggestion: *"It's hard for you to resist God like a stubborn ox"* or *"It's going to be hard for you to resist the
                prod your master is using."* or *"It's hard for you to resist God."*

                N.B. If neither of these, nor something like any one of them commends itself, the present GW
                   could be lived with (even though it is interpretation rather than translation).

Subject: GW translation of Romans
From: D. Kuske 5/21/95
Status: Sent to GWN

Ro 1:16
GW tranlation: "because of faith"
Problems:
1) This makes faith the reason why God approves our status in his sight instead of the means by which we receive the approval he gives us a gift because of Christ's redeeming work.
2) This says that Christ's merits and the believer's faith are complementary causes of our justification (when Christ's merits according to Scripture are the only cause.)
3) This also undermines the doctrine of objective approval (justification) because it says that we were not approved (justified) until we came to faith.
4) The NT never uses an expression that expresses cause in connection with faith (e.g. δια with the accusative case). It always says "by means of, through" (e.g. δια with the genitive, εκ with the genitive). Faith is never the cause but always the means or the channel by which the approval Christ won for us becomes ours.
5) Pieper's Dogmatics: "in justification no intrinsic value dare be ascribed to faith alongside the grace of God in Christ"
            (cf. all the references in the 2nd column of the index, Vol 4, p304)
6) Walther's Law and Gospel: p268 we are not saved for the sake of our faith
                              p273-4 or on account of our faith
7) Abiding Word, Volume 252, p252: "When we say that no human merit at all enters into the transaction which we call justification, we imply that faith must not be considered a meritorious action on account of which God might justify us. The famous dogmatician Johann Gerhard correctly says that we are justified through faith, but not on account of faith (Loc. de Justif., par. 179). Faith is simply the taking of what God offers. No merit attaches to it. . . . Faith is the instrument, not the cause of our justification."

Suggestion: "by faith" or "through faith"
        [Jahn: Agree. This is a change that is needed more than anything else in GW.]

Ro 2:4,5
GW translation: "to him and change the way you think and act" and "to change the way you think and act"
Problem: This translation contradicts what Scripture means by "repentance" by bringing sanctification into repentance (conversion). Confer the lengthy comments on repentance sent in a separate mailing earlier.
Suggestion: "to turn from sin to God"
        [Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 2:12
GW translation: "And whoever has laws from God and still sins will be judged by them."
Problem: The addition of "still" is not legitimate since it is not in the Greek and so adds something to the text (not an equivalent since this is neither stated in the original nor impied by it.) It is also takes some emphasis away from the previous sentence, following as it does on the "still" in that previous sentence (where "still" is legitimate on the basis of the Greek). The previous still says that even though a person doesn't have the law, God will judge him. This "still" seems to imply that having the law ought to be enough for a person to keep the law. That isn't what Paul is saying. He is just saying that a person who has the law and sins will also face God's judgment.

Suggestion: drop the word "still"
        [Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 2:14 and 15
GW translation: "Moses Teachings" (twice)
Problem: Injecting Moses Teachings into these verses confuses the whole point. Paul is speaking only of the moral law that he wrote in the hearts of all people, not all the laws contained in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy.
1) The non-Jews did not have to keep Moses Teachings. They were only for the Jews.
2) The Gentiles would not have kept the laws regarding worship, foods, the priesthood, sacrifices etc. To imply that they would do this "by nature" is terribly confusing here.
Suggestion: "those laws" in verse 14, and" God's laws" in verse 15
        [Jahn: Agree most strongly.]

Ro 2:15

GW translation: "some requirements"

Problem: The problem really began by injecting "Moses Teachings" into this context. When that was done, the word "some" had to be added here to avoid the idea that the non-Jews would by nature have a priesthood, sacrifices, sabbath days, etc. However, adding the word "some" did not of itself remove the confusion caused by adding "Moses Teachings." "Moses Teachings" needs to be replaced by "God's laws" (cf. preceding suggestion) and "some" needs to be dropped.

Suggestion: Drop the word "some"
    [Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 2:15

GW translation: "Their consciences speak to them."

Problem: The Greek uses the verb συμμαρτυρεω which means "to bear witness together with." In other words, Paul is saying that their consciences also bear witness to God's will right along with God's laws written in their hearts. So to say only that their consciences "speak to them" is not an equivalent because an important point has been lost. This is one of the key verses in Scripture that describes what the conscience does, and so it should be translated with the full description intact.

Suggestion: *"Their consciences also speak to them about these requirements."*
    [Jahn: Agree]

Ro 2:17-27

GW translation: "the laws in Moses' Teachings" in verses 17 and 23; "Moses Teachings" in verses 18, 20, 23, 26 and 27; "Moses' laws" in verse 25

Problem: Paul cannot be speaking of the Mosaic laws in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy because:

    1) In verses 20 to 24 he is speaking about the Jews teaching "others" whom verse 24 identifies as the "nations." The Jews would not be teaching the Mosaic law to non-Jews because these laws did not apply to others. What they would be teaching is only the moral law (God's laws that apply to all people). Since GW regularly uses "God's laws" as the translation for the moral law, that should be the translation here in order to avoid the implication that Jews would be teaching the Mosaic law to non-Jews.

    2) In verses 26 and 27 Paul speaks of an uncircumcised person keeping the law. Again, this cannot be the Mosaic law because a non-Jew (uncircumcised) was not required to keep the Mosaic law of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy - nor would he do so voluntarily unless he also was circumcised.

Thus througout this section, Paul is not speaking of the Mosaic law which applied only to Jews, but of the moral law which applies to and is to be kept by all people. Since the usual translation used by GW for the moral law which applies to all people is "God's laws," that is the proper translation throughout these verses.

    N.B. If someone wants to interpret this as the Mosaic law, the translatoin "God's laws" still allows him to do this. But the translation "Moses Teachings" does not allow for the interpreter to take this as the moral law.

Suggestion: v17,20,23 (first part of the verse), v25, v26, v27 (twice) = *"God's laws"*
        v18 = *"his laws"*   and   v23 (second part of the verse) = *"those laws"*
    [Jahn: Definitely agree.]

Ro 3:19

GW translation: "in Moses' Teachings applies to everyone under their influence"

Problems:

1) Paul cannot be speaking of Moses' Teachings here because in the next sentence he says "The whole world is brought under the judgment of God." Since Moses' Teachings in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy apply only to Jews, they do not judge the world.

2) The words "under their influence" seem to imply that it is left up to people whether the laws of God apply to them (i.e if they are not "influenced" by God's laws then those laws do not apply to them.) The Greek uses the verb "speak" here and that should be reflected in the translation.

Suggestion: *"in God's laws applies to those whom God is addressing."* or *"in God's laws applies to those to whom*
    [Jahn: Again, I agree.]   *God is speaking."*

Rom 3:20
GW translation: "by following Moses' Teachings. Moses' Teachings show what sin is."
Problem:
1) Again, as in the previous suggestion, this does not square with the last part of verse 19 which speaks of the whole world being brought into judgment.
2) This verse has been used in Lutheran catechisms as a key passage regarding God's law serving as mirror to show us our sin. The Mosaic law in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy is not the law that serves as a mirror for us in NT times.

Suggestion: *"by obeying God's laws. God's laws show what sin is."* or *"by obeying God's laws because they show what sin is."*
          N.B. The second one seems preferable for use in the catechism for catechism instruction.
          [Jahn: Agree.]
          ....

Rom 3:21
GW translation: "other than Moses' Teachings".
Problems:
1. As in v20 "Moses' Teachings" is not the meaning here because the Romans who are mostly Gentiles never were obligated to keep Moses' Teachings. Paul is also talking to the Romans about receiving God's approval. Thus he speaking to them in a time after Christ's death when Moses' Teachings (the laws given in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deutronomy) were "brought to an end" (Eph 2:15).
2. The translation "other than" is not a very close equivalent to the Greek word χωρις which means "completely apart from." Something like "that has nothing to do with" would be a closer English equivalent.

Suggestion: *"that has nothing to do with God's laws."*
          [Jahn: Agree, as throughout this section.]
          ....

Rom 3:26
GW translation: "a God of justice, a God who approves"
Problem: The Greek does not make "a God who approves" an appositive to "a God of justice" as GW translates. The way GW translates there is one thought (i.e. that God is a God of justice) with the second "a God who approves" explaining the first "a God of justice." According to the previous context, God's justice is not evident in the fact that he approves the believer but that he demands payment for sin. The Greek has a και indicating a second point added to the first. This is also evident from the the two words joined by the και. One is the adjective "just" which states an attribute God has, <u>what God is</u> (that is that he is just, or as GW translates "a God of justice" = one who demands pay-ment for sin) and a second which describes an action of God, <u>what God does</u> (i.e. that God approves people who believe in Jesus.) This is a key verse of Scripture which describes two things about God: 1) He is just and so demands that sins be paid for; and 2) He is a God who approves the person who by faith looks to Jesus as the one who made the payment for sin. This double truth about God should be evident in the translation.

Suggestion: *"a God of justice and a God who approves"*
          [Jahn: Agree - an important point.]
          ....

Rom 3:28
GW translation: "because of his faith, not because of his own efforts"
Problem:
1) On the problems with the translation "because of faith" - confer the notes of Romans 1:16 above.
2) The translation "his own efforts" does not translate the Greek word "law" (a key point which has to be noted).
3) The second "because" does not reflect the Greek at all. The Greek word used is χωρις (the same as in the second note under 3:21 above) and means "completely apart from." It should be translated the same way as it is in 3:21 so that the parallel between the thoughts in these two verses can be pointed out to the reader. Perhaps this could be done in this verse by making a separate sentence which says: "God's approval has nothing to do with what a person does to obey God's laws."

Suggestion: *"by faith. It has nothing to do with what a person does to obey God's laws."*
          [Jahn: The suggested suggestion is a definite improvement.]

Rom 3:30
GW translation: "because of faith"
Problem: cf. the notes under Ro 1:16 above

Suggestion: *"through faith"* (to parallel the use of "through" later in this same verse)
      [Jahn: Yes.]

Rom 3:31
GW translation: "Moses' Teachings" (twice)
Problem: cf. the notes under a number of verses above dealing with this same item

Suggestion: *"God's laws"* (twice)
      [Jahn: Yes.]

Heading prior to chapter 4
GW heading: "Because of Faith"
Problem: cf. notes under Ro 1:16 above

Suggestion: *"By Faith"*
      [Jahn: Yes.]

Ro 4:3
GW translation: "that faith was regarded by God to be his approval of Abraham."
Problems: (same notes as at Gal 3:6)
1) I'm not sure what meaning the words "regarded . . . to be approval" convey, and I think that most Christian laypeople would have trouble explaining what they mean. Or if they did explain them, they would not come close to the real meaning of the verse (i.e. that God is dealing with Abraham's legal status in his sight). This, in turn, suggests that a person who has little or no Bible knowledge would get even less out of these words. Since this is one of the key passages in Scripture (cf. its prominence in both of Paul's epistles dealing with justification, Romans and Galatians), it shouldt be translated in a way that makes the meaning clear.
2) Although some argue that the Hebrew is not as clear cut as the Greek, the Greek used here leaves little doubt what is meant. The Greek speaks of an accounting procedure. On the basis of other uses of this idiom in Greek literature, Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker, Kittel, and Louw-Nida all recognize this. The word λογιζομαι used with the dative means to place something on a person's account. When εις and the accusative are added, this prepositional phrase indicates what is put on the person's account (i.e. the legal status ascribed to the person, or the commercial credit or debt put on the person's financial account). This is a key point in teaching the doctrine of justification. Justification is not a change in the person but is simply a change in the person's legal status before God. This could be made most evident to the reader by translating "and this is how God's approval was put on Abraham's account." Or if the word "regarded" is considered better as a translation for both the Hebrew and Greek, the idea of a legal status could at least be hinted at this way: "He believed God, and this is what God considered in regarding Abraham as approved." The important point conveyed by by both the Greek and Hebrew (and what should be clear to the reader) is that these words are speaking about Abraham's status in God's sight.

Suggestion: *" it was on the basis of this faith that God regarded Abraham as approved."*
      [Jahn: I, too, don't know what GW means here. The suggested revision definitely is clearer.]

Ro 4:5
GW translation: "their faith is regarded as God's approval"
Problems: cf notes on 4:3 above

Suggestion: *"it was on the basis of this faith that God regarded them as approved"*
      [Jahn: Ditto.]

Ro 4:9
GW translation: "Abraham's faith was regarded as God's approval of him"
Problem: cf. the notes under 4:3 above
Suggestion: "It was on the basis of Abraham's faith that God regarded him as approved."
 [Jahn: Ditto.]

Ro 4:10
GW translation: "How was his faith regarded as God's approval?"
Problem: cf. the notes under 4:3 above
Suggestion: "How was his faith the basis on which God regarded him as approved?"
 [Jahn: Ditto.]

Ro 4:11
GW translation: "Abraham's faith was regarded as God's approval while he was still uncircumcised."
Problem: The GW translates this as though the Greek were the same as verse 3,5,9, and 10. But it is quite different. Elsewhere GW reflects the Greek word used here with the translation "seal" (e.g. Eph 1:13, 1 Co 9:2). There doesn't seem to be any reason why it shouldn't also be translated that way here so that the closest English equivalent of the Greek is reflected in the translation.

Suggestion: "Abraham received the seal of God's approval by faith while he was still uncircumcised."
 [Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 4:11
GW translation: "their faith, too, is regarded as God's approval of them"
Problem: cf. the notes under 4:3 above
Suggestion: "it was on the basis of their faith that God also regards them as approved."
 [Jahn: Ditto above.]

Ro 4:13-15
GW translation: "Moses' Teachings" (twice, v13 and v14) and "the laws in Moses' Teachings" (v15)
Problem: As in a number of instances ealier in Romans, "Moses Teachings" can't be the meaning here.
1) Moses' Teachings were not in existence at the time of Abraham, so in v13 as earlier in v2 Paul has to be speaking of Abraham's efforts to do what God's will is for all people, the moral law - not the laws God set down in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy.
2) In verses 14 and 15 Paul is speaking about Christians at the time he is writing to the Romans - after Christ's death when Moses' Teachings were "brought to an end" (Eph 2:15).

Suggestion: "God's laws"
 [Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 4:13
GW translation: "through God's approval of his faith"
Problem: The Greek does not speak of God approving Abraham's faith but of God's approval that comes by faith (cf. the last half of Philippians 3:9).
Suggestion: "through the approval that comes by faith"
 [Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 4:17
GW translation: "nations"
Problem: The Greek doesn't indicate that "nations" is meant. This translation limits the interpretation so that it cannot be understood to refer to God's work of creation at the beginning of time. This means that it does not refer to anything God ever did that is recorded in Scripture (When did God ever use a miracle to call a number of nations that did not exist into existence?). At the same time it eliminates from consideration the event that demonstrates God's power more than any other.

Suggestion: "things"
 [Jahn: "Nations" is interpreting (perhaps it could even be called speculating) rather than translating.]

Ro 4:20
GW translation: "Instead, giving honor to God [for the promise], he became strong because of his faith, and was
absolutely confident that God would do what he promised."
Problems:
1) The first part of the verse is difficult to understand (one has to read it several times to get the meaning) and the
addition ("for the promise") isn't needed if the verse is translated more simply. The whole thought could be expressed
more simply and in a closer natural equivalent something like this: "Instead, his faith made him strong. He gave honor
to God by being absolutely confident . . ."
2) The translation "God would do" is not what the Greek says. It says "God could do" (δυνατος).

Suggestion: *"Instead, his faith made him strong. He gave honor to God by being absolutely confident that God could
do what he promised."*
   [Jahn: The GW sentence structure is overly complicated which makes it difficult to understand. The suggestion is a
   big improvement.]
   ....

Ro 4:22
GW translation: "his faith was regarded as God's approval of him"
Problem: cf. notes under 4:3 above
Suggestion: *"his faith was the basis on which God regarded him as approved"*
   [Jahn: Ditto above.]
   ....

Ro 4:23
GW translation: "his faith was regarded as God's approval of him"
Problem: cf. notes under 4:3 above
Suggestion: *"It was on the basis of this faith that God regarded Abraham as approved"*
   [Jahn: Ditto.]
   ....

Ro 4:24
GW translation: "Our faith will be regarded as God's approval of us . . ."
Problem: cf. notes under 4:3 above
Suggestion: *"It is on the basis of our faith that God also regards us as approved . . ."*
   [Jahn: Ditto.]

   ....

Ro 4:25
GW translation: "so that we could receive God's approval"
Problem:
1) This is one of the passages of Scripture that teaches objective justification. The translation "so that we could
receive God's approval" introduces the Reformed error that Christ only made our justification possible (i.e. when we
come to faith). The word "could" (i.e something is possible) is neither stated nor implied in the Greek.
2) The translation "so that" makes this a purpose clause. The Greek cannot by any stretching of the syntax be under-
stood to be a purpose clause. Though it might be argued that purpose makes good sense in this verse, the Greek (δια
with the accusative) expresses cause, not purpose. Confer any Greek lexicon or grammar regarding this construction.
That is the way it is translated earlier in the verse ("because of our failures") and that is the only way it can be translat-
ed in the last part of the verse = "because of our justification." God brought Jesus back to like because he had estab-
lished God's approval of us (i.e. Before we ever came to faith, we had God's approval. Jesus' coming back to life
proved that fact.)

Suggestion: *"because we have God's approval"*
   [Jahn: Agree.]

   ....

Ro 5:1
GW translation: "because of faith"
Problem: cf. notes under Ro 1:16 above

Suggestion: *"by faith"*
   [Jahn: Ditto above 1:16.]

<u>Ro 5:2</u>
GW translation: "Through Christ we can approach God and stand in his favor."
Problems:
1) I'm not sure what the words "we <u>can</u> . . . stand in his favor" mean. According to the Greek of this verse, we not only have the possibility of standing in God's grace ("can stand") but we possess a constant status of being in God"s grace.
2) The word "favor" does not express the meaning of the Greek word χαρις which expresses the status of having God view us with kindness even though it is totally undeserved.
3) The Greek does not make standing in God's grace a second item but says that what we approach (or better, have access to) is not God but God's grace. Thus the present GW translation is not really a close equivalent to what the Greek says. The idea of standing in God's grace could be expressed better in English with the idea that "we have the assurance" of being treated by God with undeserved kindness.

Suggestion: *"Through Christ we have the assurance of constant access to God's undeserved kindness."*
    [Jahn: I like the suggested revision.]

<u>Ro 5:4</u>
GW translation: "and character creates confidence"
Problem: Why substitute "confidence" for what the Greek word means, namely, "hope"? The two are not exactly the same - "confidence" does not immediately lead the reader to think of the future, especially our future in heaven, like "hope" does. Yes, people today often think of "hope" as some vague dream about the future, but so did many people in Paul's day. A non-Christian will never use the word hope in the same sense that a Chistian does, but Paul did not let that fact lead him to use another word and neither should we. Look at how often this beautiful word is used in our hymns (e.g. "My hope is built on nothing less . . ."). There is also an inconsistency in GW because sometimes confidence is used and other times hope is used. The best solution to reflect what the inspired writers meant is to stay with hope and not use a word that does not say exactly what they meant.

Suggestion: *"and character creates hope."*
    [Jahn: Agree.]

<u>Ro 5:5</u>
GW translation: "We're not ashamed to have this confidence"
Problem: This is not an equivalent to what Paul is saying. Paul does not say that he does not need to be ashamed of his hope, but that this hope will not put him to shame. Hope is the subject, not the object of the verbal idea of shaming. The verbal idea of shaming is not a present tense but a future tense. So Paul is not saying that while he lives on this earth he is not ashamed to be known as a person who believes in life after death in heaven. He is referring instead to the time of the last day, and he is affirming that he is sure that what he is hoping for then (life with God in heaven) will take place and the hope he had will not leave him shamefaced as one who had a foolish dream. This future reference needs to be reflected in the translation.
Suggestion: *"What we are hoping for will not put us to shame"* or *"What we are hoping for is not something we will*
                                                          have to be ashamed of someday"
    [Jahn: Perhaps the second suggestion is a little clearer than the first one. Either one is better than GW.]

<u>Ro 5:7</u>
GW translation: "Finding someone who would die for a godly person is rare. Maybe someone would have the courage
                   to die for a good person."
Problems:
1. "Finding someone who would die" implies that someone is seeking such a person. The Greek does not say this or impy this so this is not an equivalent of the original.
2. Doesn't the progression from "a godly person" (greater) to "a good person" (lesser) say the opposite of moving from a kind of dying that is rare (less likely) to the kind of dying maybe someone would do (more likely)?
3. The word δικαιος can be translated "live a good life" and αγαθος can refer to a person who is "helpful" to others.
Suggestion: *"It would be a rare thing if someone died for a person who lived a good life. Maybe someone would have the courage to die for a person who helped others."*
    [Jahn: Agree, especially with point #1.]

<u>Ro 5:10</u>
GW translation: "If the death of his Son restored our relationship with God . . . the life his Son lived will save us."
Problems: The last part of the verse refers to a time after Christ died (i.e. Paul's argument is: If Christ's death restored our relationship, now that he is alive again we are even more certain he will save us from God's anger (v9) in the final judgment.) Thus Christ's "life" here is not his active obedience (that is the perfect life he lived while he was on earth), but it refers to his being alive again after his death which establishes our being in heaven (cf. "the glory we will receive from God" in v3, "what we're hoping for will not put us to shame" in v5, "save us from God's anger" in v9).

Suggestion: "*If the death of his Son restored our relationship with God . . . Christ's being alive [again] will save us.*"
[Jahn: I agree. GW misses tha point in the second half of the verse.]

<u>Ro 5:12</u>
GW translation: has "so" at the beginning of verse 12
Problem: Verse 12 is not a consequence of verse 11. Instead the second half of verse 12 is a consequence of the first half of the verse. That is what the Greek construction Δια τουτο ωσπερ. . . και ουτως indicates. Thus the "so" should be at the beginning of the second sentence in verse 12 rather than at the beginning of the verse.

Suggestion: "*Sin came into the world . . . So death spread . . .*"
[Jahn: Yes.]

<u>Ro 5:20</u>
GW translation: "Rules were added . . ."
Problem: In verse Paul said "Sin was in the world before there were any laws." Now Paul is picking that thought up again and speaks about the time when laws were introduced into the world. Changing from "laws" to "rules" makes it far less likely that the reader will see this line of thought. Also the word "rules" (What kind of "rules" are these? Whose "rules" are these?) makes it far less likely that the reader will understand these as the laws God introduced at the time of Moses (cf vv13,14).

Suggestion: "*Laws were added . . .*"
[Jahn: Agree. "Rules" is unclear and leaves too much room for possible misunderstanding.]

<u>Ro 5:21</u>
GW translation: "As sin ruled by bringing death, God's kindness would rule by bringing us his approval."
Problem: This verse expresses the reason why (ινα = purpose) God did what is stated in verse 20. This is such an important point it needs to be expressed somehow, perhaps by beginning verse 21 with the words "God did this so that . . ."
Suggestion: "*God did this so that as sin ruled by bringing death, God's kindness would rule by bringing us his approval.*"
[Jahn: Good suggestion.]

<u>Ro 5:21</u>
GW translation: "because of Jesus Christ our Lord."
Problem: The Greek is not δια with the accusative case which means "because of." It is δια with the genitive which means "through." This might seem like a minor point in English, but the Greek expresses agency rather than cause, and even more importantly "through Jesus Christ" is a phrase that Paul repeats over and over again in all his letters.

Suggestion: "*through Jesus Christ our Lord.*"
[Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 6:4

GW translation: "As Christ was brought back from death to life . . . so we, too, should live a new kind of life."

Problem: This verse is expressing the reason why (ινα = purpose) we were baptized into Jesus' death (v4). It is not a command from God telling us what to do ("we should"). This relationship between the two verses is so important that it needs to be expressed somehow, perhaps by beginning this verse with "This happened so that" and replacing "should" with "would."

Suggestion: *"This happened so that as Christ was brought back from death to life . . . so we, too, would live a new kind of life."*

[Jahn: Good suggestion. It does help connect the line of thought.]

Ro 6:5

GW translation: "united with him when we come back to life."

Problem: The GW translation gives the meaning that we won't be united with Christ until the last day when he brings us back to life again. What Paul is talking about in this section is the Christian's new sanctified life as a believer. Throughout verses 3-11 Paul speaks of the Christian's new way of life as a dying and rising with Christ. Paul has said that as we died with Christ to sin (v3) so we also entered a new kind of life just as Christ rose from the dead (v4). In this verse (v5) he is just repeating these two thoughts to emphasize them. Our new life is both a uniting with Christ in a death like his (v5a) and "in a resurrection like his" (v5b). The latter is the way this last half of verse 5 should be rendered rather than jumping to the resurrection at the end of the world.

Suggestion: *"united with him in a resurrection like his."*

[Jahn: GW misses the point. The suggestion is better.]

Ro 6:6

GW translation: "the person we used to be"

Problem: This translation implies that we don't have an old person any more ("used to be"). That is not what the Greek says, and what is worse, it denies what Scripture says about the old person. Paul refers to this person who still clings us as "old" because this person was not converted when we came to faith and so does not have the new attitude that is ours by faith.

Suggestion: *"our old person"*

[Jahn: Strongly agree.]

Ro 6:6

GW translation: "Because of this we are no longer slaves of sin."

Problem: Though this translation at first glance seems to make good sense, is it not what the Greek says. The Greek does not say that what precedes is the cause of our no longer being the slaves of sin. Rather, the construction is an explanatory infinitive. This simply says that what precedes (our old peson being crucified) is the same as saying that we are no longer slaves to sin. Is there a difference in meaning? Yes. Making this sentence causal implies that the crucifixion of our old person means that he was totally done away with (which we know from experience isn't really true because we still sin) and that is why we are no longer slaves of sin. Making this sentence explanatory says that what is meant by the crucifixion of our old person is simply this that we are no longer slaves to sin.

Suggestion: *"Another way of saying this is that we are no longer slaves of sin."*

[Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 6:10 and 11

GW translation: "died once and for all to sin's power" (v10) and "So consider yourselves dead to sin's power . . ." (v11)

Problem: The Greek in both instances does not talk about dying to sin's power but just dying to sin. This same expression (dying to sin) was translated well in v2 as "as far as sin is concerned." That meaning is also the one that fits far better here than "power" because Paul is really going back to the thought he started with. He is saying that the Christian in his sanctified life has died as far as sin is concerned.

Suggestion: *"died once and for all as far as sin is concerned"* (v10) and *"So consider yourselves dead as far as sin is concerned."* (v11)

[Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 6:11
GW translation: " but living for God in the power Christ Jesus gives you."
Problem: To translate the simple phrase εν Χριστω Ιησου with "in the power Christ Jesus given you" says a lot more than this little phrase really means in and of itself. If the context suggested this, it might be possible to defend this expansion of meaning. However, in the preceding Paul has said again and again from v3 on that our sanctified life is like dying, being buried, and rising with Christ. This is the better translation, therefore, both on the basis of what the Greek means ("in connection with Jesus Christ") and especially on the basis of the context.
Suggestion: *"and living for God together with Christ Jesus."*
　　　　[Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 6:12
GW translation: "Therefore, never let sin rule your physical body so that you obey its desires."
Problem: The Greek word translated "physical" is θνητω which really means "dead." Since Paul has spoken several times in the previous verses about the Christian's death together with Christ in sanctification (v2, v3, v5, v6, v7, v8, v11), the idea of being dead fits well and should be retained so the reader sees that this verse is picking up the thought emphasized over and over again in the preceding verses.

Suggestion: *"Therefore, never let sin rule your body so that you obey its desires. Your body is dead [as far as sin is concerned.]"*
　　　　[Jahn: The suggestion in a good improvement.]

Ro 6:13
GW translation: "Never offer any part of your body to sin's power."
Problem: Maybe it is just my problem, but it seems strange to speak of offering something to sin's power. Isn't the idea basically to serve sin (as Paul later shows he means by offering oneself to another, cf v16 which follows.)

Suggestion: " *Never offer any part of your body to [serve] sin.*"
　　　　[Jahn: I agree.]

Ro 6:15
GW translation: "we are not controlled by laws but are controlled by God's favor?"
Problem: Doesn't if flow better if the second "are controlled" is dropped?

Suggestion: *"we are not controlled by laws but by God undeserved kindness?"*
　　　　[Jahn: Yes.]

Ro 6:23
GW translation: "The reward for sin"
Problem: The Greek does not speak of a reward (which can also be an undeserved gift), but of wages which are earned.

Suggestion: *"The wages [God pays] for sin . . ."*
　　　　[Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 7:1, 4, 5, 7 (twice), 12
GW translation: "Moses Teachings" (vv1, 7, 12), "the laws in Moses' Teachings" (v4), "Moses' laws" (vv 5, 7)
Problem: As Gentiles, not many people in the congregation at Rome would have been familiar with the Mosaic law as recorded in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. Also, at the time Paul is writing, Moses Teachings had been "brought to an end" as Paul writes in Eph 2:15. Throughout chapter 7, therefore, Paul is not talking about Christians and their relationship to the Mosaic law simply because Moses Teachings never did apply to non-Jews and no longer apply to either Jew or non-Jew. Instead, he is speaking:
1) of Christians being freed from the necessity of keeping God's laws in order to be saved (v4); and
2) of the rebellious reaction of the Christian's Old Adam ["corrupt nature" (v5, 14, 18, 25) or "sin" i.e. the sinful attitude living in the Christian (v8, 11, 17, 20, 25)] to God's laws.
Suggestion: *"laws"* (vv 1, 4, 5) and *"God's laws"* (vv7 twice, 12)
　　　　[Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 7:4
GW translation: "You have died to laws . . . You belong to . . . the one who was brought back to life. As a result, we can do what God wants."
Problem:
1) This is not a result clause. It is a ινα purpose clause and so expresses God's reason for bringing about the change in us of dying to laws (as a means of salvation) and now belonging to the one who was brought back to life.
2) Adding the word "can" adds a whole new thought (the idea of strength or ability) to the purpose clause. This changes the substance of the meaning considerably and so is not the "closest natural equivalent."

Suggestion: *"You have died to laws . . . You belong to . . . the one who was brought back to life. This change was made so that you would do what God wants."*
    [Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 7:5
GW translation: "Stirred up by Moses' laws, they did things that result in death."
Problem: The antecedent of "they" is not clear. There are two plural nouns (laws, bodies) between "they" and its antecedent "passions."

Suggestion: *"These passions were stirred up by laws, and they did things that result in death."*
    [Jahn: Good point.]

Heading before Ro 7:7
GW heading: Moses' Laws Show What Sin Is
Problem: cf comments under 7:1 above
Suggestion: *God's Laws Show What Sin Is*
    [Jahn: Agree.]

Heading before Ro 7:14
GW heading: God's Standards Are at War With Sin's Standards
Problem:
1) Cf. the comments in the following two items about the use of the word "standards."
2) Paul does not speak of God's laws as warring against the corrupt nature in us. Instead, he speaks of the the sinful attitude in us because of our corrupt nature that rebels against and so wars against God's laws.
Suggestion: *Sin's Rule Is At War With God's Laws*
    [Jahn: Or the heading could be "SINS RULE IS AT WAR WITH GOD'S LAWS.]

Ro 7: 14, 16, 21, 22, 25 and 8:3
GW translation: "God's standards"
1) God's laws are the focus of attention in vv7-13, and they continue to be the focus in vv14-25. So the translation of the Greek word which is used throughout these verses should be the same. Otherwise, the reader will be led to think that vv14ff are speaking of something different from the preceding verses. For example, Paul poses the basic question in verse 7 ("Are God's laws sinful") and then answers that question in v12 by saying that God's laws are holy, in verse 14 that they are spiritual, and in v16 that they are good.
2) The word "standards" is used only a couple times for νομος in GW. It would be better to stay with one translation throughout GW rather than only occasionally introducing "standards" (especially since "standards" does not make the meaning of any passage clearer than the use of "laws" does.)

Suggestion: *"God's laws"*
    [Jahn: Yes.]

Ro 7: 23

GW translation: "However, I see a different standard [at work] throughout by body. It is at was with the standards my mind sets and tries to take me captive to sin's standards which still exist throughout my body."
Problem:
1) As in the immediately preceding item, the word "standard" doesn't communicate the thought well here either.
2) Paul uses νομος in a slightly different sense in this verse than plain "law." I don't remember which commentary suggests the use of the translation "rule" for νομος in this verse, but it seems to be the only English word that clearly brings out the slightly different sense of νομος in this verse. "Rule" works because it is an English word that is both a noun (corresponding to the meaning of the word "law" = a rule to obey) and also a verb (which expresses what laws do to us = they rule us.)
3) Paul continues to use νομος in this same sense in 8:2 where again the word "standards" leaves the meaning unclear but the meaning "rule" communicates the thought simply and clearly (cf. notes on 8:2)
Suggestion: *"However, I see a different rule [at work] throughout my body. It is at war with the way my mind rules me and tries to take me captive to sin's rule which still exists throughout my body."*
        [Jahn: The suggested revision certainly is clearer.]

Ro 7: 25

GW translation: "but I am obedient to sin's standards with my corrupt nature."
Problem: cf. the notes on 7:23
Suggestion: *"but I am obedient to sin's rule with my corrupt nature"""*
        [Jahn: Yes.]

Ro 8:2

GW translation: "The standards of the Spirit . . . have set you free from the standards of sin and death."
Problems:
1) I'm not sure what the expressions the "standards of the Spirit" or the "standards of . . . death" mean.
2) The word νομος here is used in the sense of "rule" as it is in 7:23 and 7:25 (cf. notes on those verses). That the idea of "rule" is meant here is also evident from the verses that follow (e.g. cf. notes below on 8:5).

Suggestion: *"The rule of the Spirit . . . has set you free from the rule of sin and death."*
        [Jahn: The suggestion is clearer.]

Ro 8:4

GW translation: "Therefore, we who do not live . . . are able to meet God's standards."
Problems:
1) The same problems as in 7:4. It is a pupose clause (God's reason for doing what he did) and adding the idea of our ability ("are able") is not the closest natural equivalent because this idea is not in the Greek.
2) Change "God's standards" to "God's laws" for the same reasons as those cited in the note on 7:14 et. al.

Suggestion: *"God did this so that we who do not live . . . would meet the demands of God's laws."*
        [Jahn: Yes.]

Ro 8:5

GW translation: "Those who live by the corrupt nature . . . But those who live by the spiritual nature . . ."
Problem: In verse 4 Paul does say "live by" these two natures. He uses the verb περιπατεω. In verse 12 Paul again uses the idea of living by these two natures. There he uses the verb ζαω. Here, however, Paul is saying something different, something even more emphatic. He uses the verb ειμι, "to be, to be characterized as." Perhaps the idea of "to follow" brings this change from "live" to a somewhat more emphatic expression.
Suggestion: *"Those who follow the corrupt nature . . . But those who follow the spiritual nature . . ."*
        [Jahn: Good point.]

Ro 8:7

GW translation: "God's standards"   Problem: Same as in 7:14 et. al.   Suggestion: *"God's laws"*
        [Jahn: Yes.]

Ro 8:20
GW translation: "subjected it to frustration did so in the hope"
Problem: The meaning of "did so in the hope" is not real clear. It seems to say that what follows is God's hope (i.e. In spite of the fact that God had subjected creation to frustration, he hoped that somehow it would also be set free.) But the hope is the hope that God provided to those who were subjected to frustration. The Greek says that God's subjecting creation to frustration was not done without also providing a basis of hope to go along with it.

Suggestion: "subjected it to frustration did not do so without also providing the hope" or "subjected it to frustration while also providing the hope"
[Jahn: Either suggestion is clear. Since the second is one word versus five, I lean toward favoring the second.]

Ro 8:33
GW translation: "God has approved of them."
Problems: Seems to be a somewhat awkward statement in English (approve of people ?). It would seem that having God's approval would be less awkward and also would come closer to expressing the idea of justification, that is, a cleared legal status in God's presence.

Suggestion: "They have God's approval."
[Jahn: Agree.]

Ro 10:4
GW translation: "Moses' Teachings"
Problem: As the last part of the verse shows (everyone who has faith), Paul is speaking of Jews and non-Jews in the NT time. Therefore, "Moses' Teachings" can't be meant here: a) because they never did apply to non-Jews; and b) they no longer apply to either Jews of non-Jews in NT times because with Christ's coming they were "brought to an end" (Eph 2:15).
Suggestion: "God's laws"
[Jahn: Yes.]

Ro 10:12,13, 14
GW translation: "prays to" (v12), "prays in" (v13), and "pray" (v14)
Problem: Verse 13 is a quote of Joel 2:13 which is also quoted in Acts 2:21. In both of those instances GW translates "call" on the name of the Lord. For consistency shouldn't verse 13 be translated the same way? And then shouldn't verses 12 and 14 which express the same thought be translated the same as v13?

Suggestion: "calls on" (v12), "calls on" (v13), "call on" (v14)
[Jahn: Definitely.]

Ro 12:12
GW translation: "confidence"
Problem: cf. notes on 5:4, cf. the use of "hope" in 8:20-25
Suggestion: "hope"
[Jahn: Yes.]

Ro 13: 8,10
GW translation: "Moses Teachings"
Problem: cf. notes on 10:4
Suggestion: "God's laws"
[Jahn: Yes.]

Ro 14:1
Problem: This is a minor point, but the translation "but don't get into an argument" seems to be far more negative in tone than the accompanying circustantial idea Paul expresses. Wouldn't we simply say "without getting into an argument."
[Jahn: Good point.]

Ro 14:4

GW translation: "The Lord will determine whether his servant has been <u>successful</u>. The servant will be successful because the Lord makes him <u>successful</u>."

Problem:

1) I'm not sure what "successful" means in this verse. I've read the verse over a number of times and just don't see how the thought of being successful fits the context. The Greek says "stand or fall." The end of verse 3 speaks of people being acceptable to God and the beginning of verse 4 speaks of condemning another person's servant. In verses 10 and 12 (where Paul sums up the point of verses 3-12) he speaks of people <u>standing</u> in front of God (the same word as is used in verse 4 = stand or fall) to be judged whether they are acceptable or not. Thus the context seems to suggest that "stand or fall" in this verse means whether someone is acceptable or not.

2) The last sentence in the Greek speaks of the Lord as being able to do something ("The Lord is able . . ." or "The Lord can . . .")

Suggestion: *"The Lord will determine whether his servant is acceptable or not. His servant will be acceptable because the Lord can make him acceptable."*

[Jahn: Agree.]

Subject: GW translation of 1 and 2 Corinthians
From: D. Kuske 4/5/95
Status: sent to GWN

1 Co 1:30

"Righteousness" should be changed to "approval" for consistency in translating δικαιουσυνη. This is also an important passage to use in connection with the others where δικαιουσυνη is translated "approval" to show that our approval really has nothing to do with us but everything to do with Christ as our substitute.

       Pastor Jahn: Yes.

----

1 Co 4:15

GW translation: "I became your father in the Christian life by telling you the Good News about Jesus Christ."

Problems:

1. This adds too much. None of the words that are translated "my Christian way of life" in v17 are found here in v15.

2. "Christian life" here is probably going to be understood in the sense of sanctification, but that is not what Paul means because he says he became their father (was the agent by whom God brought them to faith) by telling them the Good News about Christ Jesus.

2. To say that Paul is anticipating v17 isn't the case because:

      - vv16-17 are a conclusion based on v15 and so is not saying the same thing;

      - he is still continuing with the thought begun in the first part of verse 15 = they don't have many [spiritual]
          fathers but only one [spiritual] father.

Suggestion: *I became your [spiritual] father by telling you the Good News about Jesus Christ.*

       Pastor Jahn: Yes.

----

1 Co 5:8

GW translation: "must" (twice)

Problem: In neither case is δει used which is the word GW translates "must." Instead the construction here is the one that GW regularly translates with "should." (cf. 5:11 and many times in chapter 7 = vv2, 3, 5, 9, 10 etc.)

Suggestion: *should* (twice)

       Pastor Jahn: Yes.

----

1 Co 10:11

GW translation: "the closing days of history"

Problem: This is not exactly what the Greek says ("the last of the ages"), and it can give a wrong idea here. Paul is not saying that there are only a few days of history left before Christ comes again. Instead, he is simply saying that he and the Corinthians are living in the last period of history (without saying that there are only a few days left.)

Suggestion: *"the last period of history"*

       Pastor Jahn: GW certainly is likely to be misunderstood. The suggested change is clearly needed.

----

1 Co 11:3

GW translation: "a husband has authority over his wife"

Problems:

1. This ignores the whole rest of the chapter where these two words are translated man and woman. One of the basic rules of proper interpretation is that a word which can have two different meanings takes its meaning from the immediate context. Some argue that this is a parallel passage to Eph 5:23 which says "The husband is the head of his wife as Christ is the head of the church." That argument also ignores this basic rule of interpretation. In all the other verses that follow in Eph 5 the meaning is husband and wife - so the meaning in v23 of Ephesians 5 is husband and wife. In all the other verses that follow here in 1 Co 11 the meaning is man and woman - so the meaning in v3 of 1 Co 11 is man and woman. The meaning of the Greek words are governed in each case by the context, not by the passage in Paul's other letter. So 1 Co 11:3 and Eph 5:23 are not exact parallel passages. Rather, in Ephesians Paul makes an application to marriage of the general principle that he states regarding all men and women in 1 Co 11:3-16.

2. It is also contrary to a basic rule of interpretation to change the meaning of a word in the same verse unless the context of the verse shows very clearly that the writer is changing its meaning the second time he uses it in the verse. There is nothing in this verse that suggests a change in meaning from the first clause ("every man") to the second clause. In fact the whole following context shows that throughout this section Paul is using man and woman with no change in meaning. The argument that the article used with "man" in the second clause indicates a change of meaning cannot stand in the light of the clause before and the clause after this clause. "Man" in this second clause is used as the subject of the clause. That is what the article indicates. In Greek, the article is used with the subject of a sen-

tence or clause to distinguish it from the predicate nominative in the clause. Note how the article is used with χριστος and with θεος in the first and third clauses to indicate both of those words as the subject in those clauses. As proper nouns, neither χριστος nor θεος needs the article, but Paul uses it with both to indicate that he wants the sentence to read "Christ is the head of every man, man is the head of woman, and God is the head of Christ." By using the article with "Christ", "man" and "God" to indicate they are the subjects, he can move the word "head" (the predicate nominative) ahead of the subject in each clause to give it special emphasis.

3. In this verse (v3) the principle is stated. In verses 4-16 this principle is explained further and also applied to the public custom of all men and women in Corinth. Here the principle that governs God's good and gracious will in regard to the role of man and woman in this earthly life is stated more clearly and more succinctly than any other place in Scripture. That is why numerous articles in theological journals in discussing the roles of men and women highlight this passage. That is also why the Wisconsin Synod statement on the roles of men and women uses this passage as a primary proof passage in its doctrinal statement on this subject. So it is not a minor matter. Rather, here is a key passage on this subject. If the Greek can be translated either way in this passage (i.e. either as "man and woman" or "husband and wife", then people are using it wrongly to state a principle. But based on the syntax (point #2 above) and the context (point #1) above, what the Greek says is man and woman, not husband and wife.

4. The translation "authority over" loses an important point that Paul is making in stating the principle of the basic earthly relationship of man and woman. Paul describes the relationship of man to woman as similar to that of a head to its body. He does this to suggest that man's authority in this relationship is not an autocratic authority, but an authority filled with loving care and concern like that of a head for its body. This is a vital point that a reader may not pick up on right away. But it is a vital point in explaining what God wants the relationship of man in regard to woman to be and, therefore, striving here for a simpler translation has to give way to expressing a substantive point which is a key in establishing exactlly what God's will is.

5. Translating "a husband" and "his wife" is highly questionable in this case because ανηρ has an article and γυνη doesn't. To translate the way GW does, the use of the article would normally be the reverse, or both nouns would have an article.

Suggestion: starting at thebeginning of verse three *"However, I want you to realize that Christ is the head of every man, man is the head of woman, and God is the head of Christ."*

      Pastor Jahn: I can only agree - most strongly.

-----

1 Co 11:10
GW translation: "to show she is under [someone's] authority,"
Problem: The translation "someone's" implies that the context does not clearly indicate whose authority she is under. The context (esp. vv6,7) indicates that the public custom of covering the head in Corinth indicated that the woman was under man's authority. Either the addition should be dropped so the reader is not given the impression that Paul is saying something different than in the previous verses, or the word "[man's]" should be used instead.

Suggestion: *"to show she is under authority,"* or *"to show she is under [man's] authority,"*
      Pastor Jahn: Yes.

-----

1 Co 14:26 and 34 and 37
Problem: Once in verse 26, twice in verse 34, and once again in v34 "must" is used when δει is not the word used in Greek. Also the same construction is translated in the surrounding verses (v27, 28, 29, 30, 35, 38) with "should."
Suggestion: For consistency use *"should"* instead of "must"
      Pastor Jahn: Yes.

-----

1 Co 14:34
Problem: The translation "Moses Teachings" can't be right here for two reasons: 1) because Paul said that Moses Teachings were brought to an end with Christ's death (Eph 2:15) so they are no longer in effect when Paul speaks these words to the Corinthians; and 2) the Corinthians are mostly Gentiles who never were subject to what Moses Teachings said so Paul cannot use Moses Teachings to tell the Corinthians what God's will is for them.

Suggestion: either *"the laws"* (leaving the meaning purposely vague since the interpretation of this clause is debated) or *"God's laws"* since Paul is obviously speaking of God's will that the Corinthians are to follow (cf. verse 37).
      Pastor Jahn: Or why not the singular, "God's law" or just "law"?

1 Co 15:18
GW translation: "have died"
Problem: The translation "died" loses the great comfort of the truth that the word "sleep" gives in a passage like this. Let's not change this thought in those passages on which so many of our Easter and funeral hymns are based. The context here clearly indicates the "sleep" means "death" so the reader doesn't need any help to understand what is being said.
Suggestion: "went to sleep"
> Pastor Jahn: Yes.

---

1 Co 15:20
GW translation: "He is the very first person of those who have died . . ."
Problem: The Greek word "firstfruits" has as its main point that many others will follow Christ in coming back from life. The verse does not say this plainly. It only says he was the first one to die who also came back to life. That really isn't quite true either, because others were raised by Jesus earlier.

Suggestion: "He is only the first one to do this. Many others who have died will also come back to life like he did."
> Pastor Jahn: Yes.

---

1 Co 15:56
Problem: The translation "standards" is neither as clear as "laws" nor is it consistent with the way GW normally translates this word.
Suggestion: "laws"
> Pastor Jahn: Or the singular "law."

---

1 Co 16:2
Problem: The translation "money" is really inadequate to reflect the meaning of the Greek words οτι εαν ευοδωται. Though the word "income" does not capture the thought fully either, it does come a lot closer than money does since the Greek refers to how a person prospers from Sunday to Sunday. It does not refer to the money one owns as much as to the money one gains each week, one's income.
Suggestion: "income" (instead of "money")
> Pastor Jahn: Yes.

---

2 Co 5:1
GW translation: "We know that if the life we live here on earth"
Problem: The words "the life we live" don't mislead the reader entirely, but neither do they reflect what Paul means by the word οικια ("house") here. Note in verses 8 and 9 when he picks this thought up again and develops it further he talks about living in the body or away from the body.

Suggestion: either stay with the Greek and translate with "house" in the beginning of this verse as is done in the last part of the verse = "We know that if the house we live in here on earth"

or, what would be better, substitute the word "body" so the reader catches the connection with vv8,9 = "We know that if the body we live in here on earth"
> Pastor Jahn: The second suggestion is my preference. It is clearer for the lay reader.

---

2 Co 5:17
GW translation: "The old way of living has disappeared. A new way of living has come into existence."
Problems: The words "way of living" is an interpretive addition and should be put into brackets. However, it doesn't seem to be the proper addition. Paul is not speaking of sanctification (way of living) but of an old and new relationship with God. Note that in verse 18 which refers back to 17, Paul says that "God has done all this." Then he does not go on to speak of a new way of living but of a new relationship with God. This is also evident in the clauses that precede v17b. In the last part of verse 16 Paul speaks of a different way of thinking about Christ, and in the first part of verse 17 he speaks of being a new creation in Christ. All this verse 18 says God did by restoring our relationship with him. If an interpretive addition is made, then, "relationship" is what Paul is speaking about rather than "way of living."

Suggestion: "The old [relationship] has diappeared. A new [relationship] has come into existence."
> Pastor Jahn: Yes.

<u>2 Co 5:18 and 19</u>
GW translation: "this ministry of restoring relationships" and "this message of restored relationships"
Problem: Using the plural "relationships" is quite confusing because it makes one wonder what other relationships are meant other than the one spoken about earlier in both verses, namely, the relationship between God and us and God and humanity. To make this clear, use the singular together with the word "this" to make it clear in each case that Paul is speaking of the one relationship described in the beginning of each verse.

Suggestion: "*the* ministry of restoring *this* relationship" and "*the* message of *this* restored relationship"
      Pastor Jahn: I certainly agree. The plural is unclear.

<u>2 Co 9:9</u>
GW translation: "<u>The righteous person</u> gives freely to the poor."
Is this perhaps a slip-up here? The Psalm quoted here is translated in the OT "He gives freely to the poor." That is also what the Greek says here rather than "The righteous person gives freely to the poor." Since the Greek says what the Hebrew does, shouldn't this verse be translated the same as the Psalm verse so the reader sees this quote as being an exact quote?

Suggestion: "*He gives freely to the poor.*"
      Pastor Jahn: Yes.

<u>2 Co 12:7</u>
GW translation: "I am <u>forced to deal</u> with a recurring problem."
Problem:
1. Doesn't "forced to deal with" give the impression of a person grudgingly doing something he resents. Instead of complaining, Paul speaks of this being a blessing in disguise for him. So perhaps a more neutral translation would be better.
2. The idea that this problem was <u>given to Paul by God</u> is lost if the verb "give" is dropped. This, too, is a key point that Paul wants to emphasize in speaking about this problem.

Suggestion: "*I was given a recurring problem to deal with.*"
      Pastor Jahn: I agree that it gives the impression of grudgingly doing something. The suggestion is much better.

<u>1 Co 7:39</u>
GW translation: "but only if the man is a Christian"

This is an additional suggestion for 1 Corinthians made by Pastor Jahn. I agree that the present GW translation injects an interpretation into Scripture which is not readily defensible on the basis of the Greek. Since this translation is an interpretation that can clearly be misused by anyone with a legalistic bent, it is best that it be dropped. Otherwise consciences may be bound by a translation that it is not based on a clear statement in the original.

The Greek (εν κυριω) does not say that the man a Christian woman marries must be "in the Lord", that is, be a believer. It is not the object of her remarriage (the man she marries) that must be "in the Lord." Rather it is her action of remarriage that must be "in the Lord." This simply means that she will make sure that she is doing nothing contrary to the Lord's will as she considers another marriage.

Suggestion: Use the footnote in the text so that it reads "*. . . she is free to marry anyone she wishes, but only as*
                                       the Lord guides her."

Gal 2:16
GW translation: "because of their own efforts to live according to a set of standards"
Problems:
1. To maintain a contrast to the phrase "by believing" the preposition "by" should be used instead of "because" The Greek preposition εκ does not have cause asone of its primary meanings. Cause is usually expressed with δια and the accusative. Using "because" with "faith" or "believing" leads to a false understanding of the role of faith in receiving God's approval. (cf. the notes on Ro 1:17 in the booklet of verses on "faith)
2. The expression "their own efforts to live according to" is rather wordy. This could be said very simply with "obeying."
3. The expression "a set of standards" is both wordy and is too general. What set of standards is meant?The context indicates that what Paul is speaking about is God's law since it is God's approval that is involved. The words "a set of standards" vaguely implies there is a set of standards somewhere that must be met without indicating exactly what that set of standards is. This is an extremely important point, but only a reader who has a good knowledge of God's word would know what is meant.
4. The expression εξ εργων νομου should always be translated the same way in Paul's epistles, and it should always be translated in a way that shows that Paul uses it as the exact opposite of "by believing in Christ." [cf. the notes made on this verse in the booklet of verses on "faith"]

Suggestion: *"by obeying God's laws"* [or *"by doing what God commands"*]
            (cf. comments on this verse in the booklet of verses on "faith")
        Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Gal 2:16
GW translation: "because of faith"
Problems: cf. the notes on Rom 1:17 in the booklet of verses on "faith"
Suggestion: *"by faith"*
        Pastor Jahn: This has to be changed every time it occurs or the translation will be unfit for use. "Because of faith"
                here is false doctrine.

Gal 2:16
GW translation: "not because of our own efforts"
Problems: ditto the first item of 2:16 above

Suggestion: *"not by obeying God's laws"*
        Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Gal 2:16
GW translation: "because of their own efforts to live according to a set of standards"
Problems: ditto the first item of 2:16 above

Suggestion: *"by obeying God's laws"*
        Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Gal 2:19
GW translation: "the law's standards"
Problems:
1. Since Paul's relationship with God is the point in this context, God's law is what is meant.
2. Introducing "standards" is wordy and it raises more questions than it answers for the reader. What "standards" are meant? How high or low are those "standards"? What does obeying "standards" mean?
Suggestion: *"God's laws"*
        Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Gal 2:21
GW translation: "obeying laws"
Problem: The context makes it clear that God's law is meant, not some general set of "laws" that are not identified.
Suggestion: *"obeying his laws"*
        Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Gal 3:1, 3
GW translation: "You stupid people" and "Are you that stupid?"
Problem: The Greek word does not mean "lacking brains" or "lacking intelligence." It means not using one's brains or not doing any thinking when a person reasonably should be expected to do so. Note the next question about being under a spell. Calling the Galatians "stupid" (which is a derogatory label to put on anyone) is not what an evangelical apostle would do in speaking to people whose souls are in danger and whom he is attempting to call back from the brink of disaster.

Suggestion: In 3:1 *"Have you Galatians stopped thinking?"* and in 3:3 *"Are you really unable to do any thinking?"*
      Pastor Jahn: I agree. Much better than "studpid."

Gal 3:5
GW translation: "through your own efforts or through believing"
Problem:
1. The words "your own efforts" fails to mention God's law which is a key point throughout this whole part of Galatians.
2. This again is the expression εξ εργων νομου which should be translated the same way throughout Paul's epistles because it is a key point in Paul's argument whenever he deals with justification.
3. "Through believing" is used here and "by believing" is used in 2:16. Either is OK but wouldn't it be best to be consistent and translate this key expression of Paul the same way every time it occurs. Only then will the reader have the importance of this expression impressed on his mind as Paul tries to do by repeating it again and again.

Suggestion: *"by obeying God's laws or by believing"*
      Pastor Jahn: I agree that it would be best to be consistent and translate this key expression the same way each time
            it occurs.

Gal 3:6
GW translation: "He believed God, and that faith was regarded by God to be his approval of Abraham."
Problem:
1. I'm not sure what meaning the words "regarded . . . to be approval" convey, and I think that most Christian laypeople would have trouble explaining what they mean. Or if they did explain them, they would not come close to the real meaning of the verse (i.e. that God is dealing with Abraham's legal status in his sight). This, in turn, suggests that a person who has little or no Bible knowledge would get even less out of these words. Since this is one of the key passages in Scripture (cf. its prominence in both of Paul's epistles dealing with justification, Romans and Galatians), it shouldt be translated in a way that makes the meaning clear.
2. Although some argue that the Hebrew is not as clear cut as the Greek, the Greek used here leaves little doubt what is meant. The Greek speaks of an accounting procedure. On the basis of other uses of this idiom in Greek literature, Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker, Kittel, and Louw-Nida all recognize this. The word λογιζομαι used with the dative means to place something on a person's account. When εις and the accusative are added, this prepositional phrase indicates what is put on the person's account (i.e. the legal status ascribed to the person, or the commercial credit or debt put on the person's financial account). This is a key point in teaching the doctrine of justification. Justification is not a change in the person but is simply a change in the person's legal status before God. This could be made most evident to the reader by translating "and this is how God's approval was put on Abraham's account." Or if the word "regarded" is considered better as a translation for both the Hebrew and Greek, the idea of a legal status could at least be hinted at this way: "He believed God, and this is what God considered in regarding Abraham as approved." The important point conveyed by by both the Greek and Hebrew (and what should be clear to the reader) is that these words are speaking about Abraham's status in God's sight.

Suggestion: *"He believed God, and it was on the basis of this faith that God regarded Abraham as approved."*
      Pastor Jahn: I also an not sure what meaning the present GW translation conveys. The suggestion is clear.

Gal 3:8
GW translation: "to non-Jewish people who have faith"
Problems:
1. The word εθνη here does not mean "non-Jewish people" but "the people of the world" as it is translated in the last half of the verse and in 3:14. Paul is saying that Scripture saw ahead of time that God would approve all people through faith not just "non-Jewish people" (which could imply that the Jews would be saved some other way.) He is merely paraphrasing what the Genesis quote says. He does not limit what God said to Abraham to only non-Jews.

Note how Paul continues in verse 9 and applies what he said in verse 8 to all who believe, not only to non-Jewish believers.

2. The words "who have faith" changes the emphasis of what Paul is saying. Paul uses here the same phrase that he repeats throughout this context, namely, εκ πιστεως, "through faith." This is a key phrase that should be translated the same way each time it appears so that the reader catches this point which Paul wants to impress on the mind by constant repetition. Paul is not stressing who would be approved but how they are approved. It might be argued that the relative clause does say how they are saved. However, it does not do so as clearly as the original does, and to that degree Paul's main point in this verse is muted by failing to follow carefully what the Greek says.

Suggestion: *"to the people of the world through faith"* or *"to the people of the world by faith."*
      Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Gal 3:10
GW translation: "their own efforts to live according to a set of standards"
Problem: Same as the first item under 2:16
Suggestion: *"obeying God's laws"*
      Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Gal 3:10
GW translation: "Whoever doesn't obey everything"
Problem: A key point is missing from the Greek. The Greek has the verb εμμενει which stresses a continual obedience. The fact that this verb is in the present tense underscores the idea of a continual action even more. This is a key point because God does not just require obedience, but a continual obedience throughout every day of a person's life. Again one might argue that this idea is implied by the verb "obey", but the original does more than just imply the idea of continual obedience. By a verb which states it and by a tense that underscores it the point is made that one aspect of the perfection God requires in his law is a continual lifelong perfection. To omit this point that is stressed so strongly in the original is to mute the preaching of the law in this verse.

Suggestion: *"Whoever doesn't continually obey everything"* or *"Whoever doesn't continue to obey everything"*
      Pastor Jahn: I prefer the first suggestion. It sounds a little more idiomatic to me.

Gal 3:11
GW translation: "the law's standards"
Problem: Same as in 2:19
Suggestion: *"God's laws"*
      Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Gal 3: 11
GW translation: "because of faith"
Problem: Same as the second item under 2:16
Suggestion: *"by faith"*
      Pastor Jahn: Absolutely.

Gal 3:12
GW translation: "Whoever obeys laws"
Problem: This is an OT quote, and the laws referred to are the decrees and laws of God mentioned in the previous verse in the OT context. The Greek says "these laws" and this should not be dropped. Otherwise the verse is given a different meaning from what it means in its OT setting.

Suggestion: *"Whoever obeys these laws"*
      Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Gal 3:18

GW translation: "If we have to gain the inheritance by following those laws, then it no longer comes to us because of the promise."

Problems:

1. Paul does not say "we" but he makes a general sweeping statement. A literal translation = "If the inheritance is by law, then it is no longer by promise." Using "we" changes the statement somewhat.

2. Paul does not refer to "those laws", that is to the laws of Moses mentioned in verse 17. As the literal translation shows, he is referring to the idea of law in general. This is clear from the fact that there is no article with νομος in this sentence. The same is true of the translation "the promise." Paul is not referring to the promise mentioned in the previous verse, but to the the idea of promise in general (επαγγελιας without an article). In other words he is saying that if something has the essence of law, then it no longer has the essence of promise. Later in the verse this idea is correctly reflected by the translation "through a promise" (not "through the promise"), and that is the way it should also be translated at this point earlier in the verse.

3. "Because of" is out of place in this verse as in the other verses in Galatians where GW translated εκ with "because."
   (cf. the comments on Ro 1:17 in the booklet of verses on "faith")

4. Use the word "comes" (cf. the second half of this sentence) also in the first part of the sentence to show the direct contrast Paul is making between law and promise.

5. The words εκ νομου is the expession Paul uses again and again in Galatians. It should be translated the same way each time ("by obeying laws") so that the point Paul is hammering away at is evident to the reader.

Suggestion: *"If the inheritance comes by obeying laws, then it no longer comes through a promise."*

      Pastor Jahn: Yes. The first two points are especially important.

Gal 3:19

GW translation: "the descendant to whom the promise was given" with a footnote "the descendant referred to in the promise"

Problem: In this whole context Paul has emphasized the promise was given to Abraham (not to Christ who is the descendant). Confer v8 "announced the Good News to Abraham", v14 "the blessing promised to Abraham", v17 "the promise to Abraham", v18 "gave the inheritance to Abraham."

Suggestion: Drop what is in the text and replace it with the footnote.

      Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Gal 3:21

GW translation: "because we obeyed them"
Problem: cf. points 1 and 4 under 2:16
Suggestion: *"by obeying them"*

      Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Gal 3:22

GW translation: "But Scripture states that the whole world is controlled by the power of sin. Therefore, a promise based on faith could be given to those who believe."

Problems:

1. A key word in the Greek ("imprisoned") is not translated. A literal translation: "The Scriptures imprisoned the whole world under the control of sin so that what was promised through faith in Jesus Christ could be given to whose who believe." The same problem occurs in the next verse. Looking at the two verses together, a key idea has been dropped in GW. The idea of imprisonment is not superfluous because it is Paul's word picture that makes his whole point here quite vivid.

2. The translation "Therefore, a promise based on . . . could be given" seems to suggest that what is meant here is merely the giving of a promise to Abraham that was based on faith. The Greek does not say "based on" but "through." The Greek does not speak of the promise being given to Abraham, but to all those who believe. So "promise" here has to mean "what was promised", namely:
   - the blessing of God's approval which God promised Abraham and which all who believe share with Abraham (vv 8-9, v14); or
   - the inheritance God gave to Abraham and all who believe through a promise (v18)

3. The translation "Therefore, . . . could be given" gives a slightly skewed understanding. It implies that the only reason God's promised blessing <u>could</u> be given was because Scripture made the whole world the prisoner of sin.

Suggestion: *"But Scripture says that sin controls the whole world as its prisoner so that the [blessing] God promised through faith in Jesus Christ would be given to those who believe."*

    Pastor Jahn: The present GW translation also has an unnecessary passive construction. The "prison" picture in the original certainly can be understood by the modern reader and should be retained. Good suggestion.

Gal 3:23
GW translation: "We were kept under control by Moses' laws until this faith came."
Problems:
1. The implication could be given that the Mosaic laws were successful in keeping the believers under control ("We were kept under control), i.e. that they did not sin much. The point being expressed (as verses 19 and 22 indicate) is just the opposite. Their sins were made all the more evident by Moses' laws.
2. Since GW usually translates the preposition υπο and the accusative case with "under the control of," this means that both the verb and the participle in the Greek (both expressing the idea of being imprisoned) are not translated. A point that is given double emphasis in the original is not expressed at all in GW.
3. cf. also point 1 under Gal 3:22

Suggestion: "Moses' laws controlled us as prisoners until this faith came."
        Pastor Jahn: Yes. The GW has another unnecessary passive construction.
....

Gal 3:24
GW translation: "because of faith"
Problem: cf. Gal 2:16 and the notes on Ro 1:17 in the booklet of verse on "faith"
Suggestion: "by faith" or "through faith"
        Pastor Jahn: Definitely.
....

Gal 5:5
GW translation: "to wait eagerly for the confidence that comes with God's approval."
Problem: We are not waiting for confidence itself. Rather, we are looking forward to what we are confident we will have someday. As with the word "promise" in 3:22 (which did not mean the promise itself but what was promised, i.e. the promised blessing), so here the word "hope" (confidence) does not mean hope itself but what we hope for, name-ly, life eternal in heaven. In Titus 2:13 the same thought is translated "what we hope for." This would work well here also.

Suggestion: "to look forward to what we hope for since we have God's approval."
        Pastor Jahn: Yes.
....

Gal 5:14
GW translation: "Moses Teachings"
Problems:
1. Moses' Teachings (i.e. the whole Mosaic covenant as spelled out in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy) is not summarized with "Love your neighbor . . ."
2. Paul is talking to the Galatians after Chist's death when the Mosaic Teachings were brought to an end (Eph 2:15). The Galatians are also mostly Gentiles and thus people to whom Moses Teachings never did apply.

Suggestion: "God's laws"
        Pastor Jahn: Definitely.
....

Gal 5:18
GW translation: "you are not subject to Moses' laws"
Problems:
1. The Galatians (most of whom are Gentiles, cf. 4:8) were never subject to Moses' laws at any time.
2. Paul is speaking of what motivates them to be guided by their spiritual nature in living their lives. Earlier in 4:6 he had stated the only proper motive is faith-born love, a motivation of thanks to God for saving them from sin and death. In this general statement he is saying that their spiritual nature is not motivated by laws of any kind (cf. νομος without an article) , i.e. laws didn't control them.
3. GW usually translates υπο with the accusative as "under the control of" or "controlled by."

Suggestion: "you aren't controlled by laws."
        Pastor Jahn: Definitely.

<u>Gal 6:4</u>
GW translation: "you must examine your own actions"
Problem: The word δει is not used here (which the GW translates with "must"). It is a simple imperative which the GW translates with "should" (cf. v6, "should").

Suggestion: *"Each of you should examine your own actions"* (or *"God wants each of you to examine your own*
   Pastor Jahn: Yes. I don't have a strong preference between the two alternatives.   *actions"*)

Gal 6:10
GW translation: "we have to do what is good"
Problem: Ditto what was just said in 6:4. The imperative should be translated consistently the same way (not with "must" or "have to").

Suggestion: *"we should do what is good"* (or *"God wants us to do what is good"*)
   Pastor Jahn: Yes. No strong preference between the two alternatives.

Gal 6:13
GW translation: "It's clear that not even those who had themselves circumcised did this to follow Jewish laws."
Problems:
1. Paul is not speaking of "Jewish laws" (which the GW uses consistently to refer to the laws the Pharisees added to the Mosaic law code.) The Pharisees laws never were the issue in Galatia. The issue centered only in the Mosaic laws.
2. Does the expression "not even those . . . did this to follow" express the thought clearly? I read it over several times before I was sure what was meant. Wouldn't "even those . . . aren't following" be clearer?

Suggestion: *"It's clear that even those who had themselver circumcised aren't following Moses' laws."*
   Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Ephesians 4:12

GW translates "Their purpose is to prepare God's people, to serve, and to build up the body of Christ." This makes the words "to serve, and to build up the body of Christ" refer to what pastors and teachers do ("Their purpose" refers back to pastors and teachers in 4:11).

Some in LC-MS and WELS want this verse to refer (as the KJV did) to fuctions that pastors serve. But this meaning is faulty for several reasons:

   1) Then the verse never says what pastors "prepare God's people" for. That thought just hangs there at the beginning of the verse without ever being completed.

   2) The Greek construction does not make this a series of coordinated ideas. As in English, there would have to be an "and" in front of the third item for it to be a series of coordinated ideas.

   3) The Greek construction makes this verse either a series in which the second and third parts (to serve, to build up) are appositional or a series of purposes each building on the previous member (cf. the attached exegesis of verse 12). In either of these cases the idea could be paraphrased this way: The purpose of pastors and teachers is to prepare God's people, i.e. they prepare people to serve, i.e. they prepare people to serve in order to build up the body of Christ.

It is not un-Lutheran to have this verse speak of the people being prepared to serve in order to build up the body of Christ.

   1) This is what the Greek says (cf. point 3 above).
   2) Verse 16b repeats this thought by saying that every member of the body has a part in building up the body of Christ. So verse 12 and verse 16 are a beautiful expression of the universal priesthood of all believers.
   3) This is the way Luther translates this verse (cf. the attached exegesis of verse 12).

Suggestion 1: Translate verse 12 "*Their purpose is to prepare God's people to serve in building up the body of Christ*"

Suggestion 2: If there is pressure from some Lutherans to make the passage more neutral, this would be a more neutral translation: "*Their purpose is to prepare God's people so that they serve in buildling up the body of Christ.*" In this translation "so that they serve" can refer either to the pastors referred to in the words "Their purpose." Or it can refer to "God's people." By leaving the antecedent of "they serve" open in this way, the interpretation is left up to the reader instead of being decided by the translation itself.

Pastor Jahn: I agree. Nothing I can add.

(N.B. The next sheet is an exegesis of Ephesians 4:12 indicating from Greek usage how the prepositional phrases in this verse are to be understood.)

Verse 12 states the purpose why Christ gave each of the four types of spiritual leaders to his church. The prepositions πρὸς ανδ εἰς denote purpose when they are used with a noun expressing a verbal idea. The question is: are the three prepositional phrases in this verse used in apposition to one another (describing a single purpose of a spiritual leader viewed from three different angles)? Or does the first prepositional phrase express a purpose of a spiritual leader, the second phrase a purpose which follows out of the first, and the third phrase a purpose that follows out of the second?

Either explanation is in perfect accord with usage in the Greek language. In the first case, the three prepositional phrases would be in apposition to one another. One needs only to look ahead to the next verse to see the same kind of construction. In verse 13, three εἰς prepositional phrases are used consecutively without any conjunction. Each consecutive phrase stands in apposition to the preceding one. Each phrase expands on the preceding in describing how long the activity described in verse 12 is to continue. That activity is to continue until all Christians are united in the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God thus becoming mature adults (as opposed to being an "infant", cf. the next verse) who measure up to the full height of Christ's perfect knowledge.

Note that in this syntactical construction each consecutive phrase is in apposition to the preceding one. They don't form a series expressing three different types of work done by a spiritual leader. The latter would more likely be expressed with the conjunction καὶ or δὲ coordinating the three phrases as independent members of a series as was done in verse 11. Koine Greek regularly expresses coordination by using conjunctions, and if Paul would have meant these phrases to be coordinate, he could easily have made that clear by the use of several conjunctions. Without any conjunction, the three consecutive phrases in verse 12 (if they are to be understood as telling us why Christ gave spiritual leaders to his church) express one purpose with each consecutive phrase expanding on the preceding in describing that one purpose.

The first prepositional phrase, then, would express the purpose for which Christ gave spiritual leaders to the church, namely, to equip the saints. The second phrase would explain that this equipping is doing work (ἔργον without an article) which is ministry or service for others (διακονίας without an article and serving as a descriptive genitive). The third phrase would explain that the service performed is the building up of the body of Christ. To paraphrase this analysis, Paul would be saying that Christ gave various kinds of spiritual leaders to the church so that they could equip the saints, thus performing a service that builds up the body of Christ spiritually.

The second syntactical possibility (the first phrase expressing Christ's purpose in giving spiritual leaders to his church, the second expressing a purpose following out of the first, and the third expressing a purpose following out of the second) would be similar to the use of consecutive prepositional phrases beginning with πρὸς and εἰς in Romans 3:26. There following the statement that God presented his Son as the ultimate sacrifice of atonement, Paul goes on to state the purpose for which God did this with a πρὸς prepositional phrase. His purpose was to show that in spite of the fact that he had let the sins of the OT believers go unpunished in the past, he now had punished Christ for them. So he was a just God who punished sin as he said he would. But there was also a second purpose which followed out of this first purpose. This Paul expresses with an εἰς phrase. The ultimate purpose of God was to show that he is a just God who in Christ both punished sin and at the same time justified the believer.

When we interpret verse 12 according to this syntactical possibility, each consecutive phrase would give the purpose for what precedes. Christ gave spiritual leaders to his church so that they would equip the saints. Christ wanted the saints to be equipped so that they would be at work performing service for others. Christ wanted the saints to be at work performing service for others so that his body might be built up spiritually. This is the way Luther translated this verse: "Dasz die Heiligen zugerichtet werden zum Werk des Amts dadurch der Leib Christ erbauet werde." ("so that the saints might be prepared to do the work of the ministry in order that the body of Christ might be built up.")

Which syntactical possibility gives the meaning that best fits the context? In both of these possibilities the basic point is that Christ gave spiritual leaders to the church to equip the saints. In the first one this activity of the leaders is a work of service which builds up Christ's body spiritually. The second says that this activity of the leaders enables the saints to be active in building up the body of Christ spiritually. Thus there is no essential difference in meaning between the two; there is only a slight shift of emphasis. The first emphasizes the important activity of the leaders in building up the church in faith by equipping saints for their personal ministry as individual believers. The second emphasizes that the leaders are to equip the saints so that they can be active in building up the church in faith as they carry out their personal ministry as believers.

When one considers the context of this verse, both what precedes and follows, the emphasis is on the activity of the individual believer. This would seem to argue for the second possibility as the one that best fits the context. Remember that the setting for this verse is the exhortation in verses 1-6 to the Ephesians to be actively working to preserve the precious unity of faith God gave them. Remember also that in verse 7 Paul emphasized that each Christian has a gift given him by God to be used for this purpose. Look ahead to verse 16 and note that in his summary of this section (verses 1-16), Paul again stresses that the spiritual growth of the body will be in direct proportion to how active each member of the body is. As in the similar passage in 1 Corinthians 12 noted above, the introduction of the spiritual leaders simply shows that one reason God gives them to the church is to equip the saints to actively use the gracious gift Christ gives each of them. Thus while the first possibility would not conflict with the context, the second fits the flow of thought from verse 1 to 16 better.

The KJV translation ("for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ") is faulty in two ways. It might suggest to the reader that the three phrases are coordinate (three distinct functions of the public ministry) instead of each successive phrase being in apposition to or expanding on the previous one. Also, the addition of the article "the" to "ministry" in English has often led people to think that there is only one ministry in the church, "the ministry" of the public ministers such as apostles, prophets, evangelists and pastor-teachers. However, there is no article with diakoniva" in the Greek, and serving as it does (as part of a phrase that explains or expands on the previous prepositional phrase and in turn is explained or expanded on by another appositional phrase), it is doubtful whether the technical meaning of the term fits here. If the prepositional phrase eij" e[rgon diakoniva" were the first one and the other two phrases were explaining or expanding on what it means, the technical meaning might be given some consideration. As it is, the general meaning "service performed for others" is the meaning that fits this context.

Ephesians 4:22-24

GW translates these verses this way: "You were taught to change the way you were living. The person you used to be will ruin you through desires that deceive you. However, you were taught to have a new attitude. You were also taught to become a new person created to be like God, truly righteous and holy."

These verses, as the context shows, are speaking of the Old Adam and the New Man. What these verses teach about this subject is completely confused by the present GW translation.

1) Translating τον παλαιον ανθρωπον as the "person you used to be" misleads because it leaves the reader with the impression that as a Christan he no longer has an "old person." Translating ενδυσασθαι τον καινον ανθρω- πον in verse 24 as "become a new person" adds to this wrong impression. If you "used to be" something and then you "become" (v24) something else, then you no longer are that old thing any more. That is not what the verse is saying. It says you still have an old person, and that old person needs to be taken off just like you would take off an old, out-of-date (παλαιον) garment. It also says that a second thing needs to be done, namely, to put on the new person like one would put on new, good quality (καινον) piece of clothing.

2) Paul is using a simple, straightforward metaphor (just as Jesus often used metaphors, similes, and parables) to make a doctrinal point clearer to his readers. This clear picture is "taking off" the old person and "putting on" the new person like a garment. The word αποθεσθαι ("take off") in v22 is not translated, and the word ενδυσασθαι ("put on") in verse 24 is given a meaning it does not have ("become). Thus the explanatory metaphor Paul uses is lost completely.

3) In v22 the words "the way you were living" is taken as the object of the verb instead of what it is in Greek, namely, an expression modifying "old person." It is a prepositional phrase in Greek, not a direct object of the verb. To translate is as the object changes its meaning significantly. This is not good translation.

4) It is very difficult in English to reflect how the third verbal idea in these verses fits in with the other two. The other two, "take off" and "put on", are both aorist infinitives. The third verbal idea, ανανεουσθαι, is a present infini- tive that is sandwiched right between the two aorist infinitives. Since it is a present infinitive it indicates the idea of continual action. The translation "you were taught to have a new attitude" does not reflect this important truth of continued action. Sandwiched as it is between the other two infinitives, both of which speak of taking off and putting on a garment, this infinitive indicates that those two actions are the way the continual activity of renewing one's attitude is done. In English this idea of reflecting on the other two infinitives cannot be accomplished by sandwiching it between the other two ideas. To accomplish this in English, it needs to be put up front ahead of the other two ideas. This explains why this idea is up front in the suggestion below.

N. B. In the LC-MS catechism, this verse is quoted under the question (#81) on original sin. In its present form the GW Eph 4:22 could no longer be used as a passage dealing with original sin (cf. especially the words "the person you used to be")

Suggestion: Translate vv22-24 something like this to accomplish 1-4 above:
"You were taught to continue to think in a new way. You were taught to take off your old person like an out-of-date garment. Your old person follows the way you used ot live and ruins you through desires that deceive you. You were also taught to put on your new person like a new piece of clothing. Your new person is created to be like God, truly approved by God and holy."

Pastor Jahn: The GW translation is totally inadequate for this key doctrinal verse. It has to be revised. The suggestion is good.

1 Tm 1:4
GW translation: "promoting God's plan"

Problem: Perhaps it's just a personal reaction, but "promoting" God's plan doesn't seem like a good way to describe what is to be done instead of raising a lot of questions. Several other translations use the word "promote," but they use this word in reference to myths and genealogies rather than in speaking about God's plan.

Suggestion: Would something like "*furthering*" express the thought better here than "promoting"?
> Pastor Jahn: I could live with "promoting", but "furthering" may be better.

----

1 Tm 1:8, 11
GW translation: "Moses Teachings"

Problem: While Moses Teachings fits in verse 7, most interpreters suggest that in v8ff Paul is turning to a more general discussion of God's laws for all people and not just the Mosaic law which applied only to Jews only in the OT times. This is supported by the fact that in v8 and v11 Paul speaks about how God's laws are to be used at the time he writes this letter. Using "God's laws" in v8 and v11 instead of "Moses' Teachings" would leave the interpretation open. If someone believed that Paul is still speaking of the Mosaic law in vv8-11, he could still interpret these verses this way if the translation said "God's laws" were used. But using "Moses' Teachings" makes it impossible to interpret these verses as speaking of NT times and of all people in general rather than just referring to Jews only.

Suggestion: "*God's laws*"
> Pastor Jahn: Yes.

----

1 Tm 2:14
GW translation: "and brought sin into the world"

Problem: The introduction of "world" into this verse is unwarranted on the basis of the Greek. The Greek continues with "the woman" as the subject and simply says literally "and she became in sin" [or in paraphrase "she became a person who was in a state of sin."] While it is true that it was Eve's sin which introduced sin into the world, that is not what the text is saying here. This verse speaks only of Eve and not of the world.

Suggestion: "*and became a sinner*" or "*and so became sinful*" or "*brought sin on herself*"
> Pastor Jahn: Yes. I lean toward the either of the first two suggestions more than the third, but all will do.

----

1 Tm 5:4 and 6:1
GW translation: "must" is used in both verses

Problem: The Greek does not have δει in either verse (which is what GW translates with "must" e.g. 1 Tm 3: 2ff.). To be consistent with what GW does in the surrounding verses the translation should be "should." Confer the use of "should" in 5:9, 10 and 6:2.

Suggestion: "*should*"
> Pastor Jahn: Yes.

----

2 Tm 2:15
GW translation: " who isn't ashamed to teach the word of truth correctly."

Problem: Is Paul saying that Timothy should never let unbelievers make him ashamed to teach God's word correctly, or is Paul saying that Timothy should be a teacher of God's word who never has to be ashamed before God because he always teaches God's word correctly? The Greek is not clear because it simply puts the second thought (teaching God's word correctly) in apposition to the first (not being ashamed). Rather than limit the interpretation, the translation should leave the interpretation open by reflecting the appositional construction of the Greek.
Suggestion: "*who isn't ashamed and who teaches the word of truth correctly.*"
> Pastor Jahn: Yes.

Philippians 3:5,6

GW translation: "When it comes to living up to <u>standards,</u> I was a Pharisee" and "When it comes to winning God's approval by keeping <u>Jewish laws,</u> I was perfect."

Problems with this translation:
1. Paul uses νομος in both instances underlined above. In the second instance he could not have been speaking about the extra laws that the Pharisees added to the Mosaic law because he knows these had nothing to do with winning God's approval. Since he uses the same word in both instances, the meaning in both cases has to be the Mosaic law.
2. Paul regularly uses νομος to refer to the Mosaic law code. There is nothing in the context that indicates that he means anything other than that here also. In fact, it would undermine his whole argument (that if anybody had a reason to boast before God he did) to speak to the Philippians about man-made laws rather than God's own law.
3. Adding two additional translations (standards, Jewish laws) to refer to the Mosaic law will not help the reader who is unacquainted with Scripture to understand what is being said. It would be better to use Moses Teachings regularly so he or she catches the meaning of every verse referring to the Mosaic law more readily.
4. The Pharisees were the ones who were the strictest group in insisting on obedience to the Mosaic law. That's the only reason Paul refers to himself as a Pharisee in the verse 5.
5. The present tense (When it comes) doesn't express the thought best that Paul is referring to what lay in the past.

Suggestion: *"I was a Pharisee in regard to my attitude toward Moses' Teachings."*
                "When it came to winning God's approval by keeping Moses' Teachings, I was perfect."
          Pastor Jahn: A definite improvement.

Colossians 3:9,10

GW translation: "You've gotten rid of the person you used to be and the life you used to live and you've become a new person."

Problems with this translation: Confer the notes on Ephesians 4:22-24. It is a parallel passage and the problems are mostly the same. One additional problem is that the words "the life you used to live" is a good translation of the words προτεραν αναστοφην in Ephesians, but here in Colossians Paul uses the words συν ταις πραξεσιν which is not really the same thing except in an extremely broad sense. The other difference is that here Paul uses απεκδυω which is a synonym to αποτιθημι in Ephesians. What this synonym empasizes even more is the fact that Paul is using the metaphor of taking off a piece of clothing to make his point here. So here even more so than in Ephesians the translation "gotten rid of" is inadequate.

Suggestion: *'You've taken off your old person and what he does like a worn-out piece of clothing and you've put on your new person like a new piece of clothing."*

          Pastor Jahn: The suggestion is certainly needed, as it is for the Ephesians 4 passage.

Subject: GW translation of 1 and 2 Thessalonians
From: D. Kuske 4/23/95
Status: Sent to GWN

<u>1 Th 4:13, 14, 16</u>

GW translation: "those who have died"

Problem with this translation:

1. The Greek word used does not mean "to die" but "to sleep." While it is true that "sleep" is used here as a metaphor for "die," the two are not the same. When Scripture uses the metaphor "sleep" in referring to Christians who have died, it does so to emphasize that for the believer death is like a sleep from which he will come back to life on the last day. Rather than just referring to a person's demise, this metaphor is a message of comfort. So to remove the metaphor is to remove one of the points of comfort God wishes to convey in this passage.

2. Jesus uses this same metaphor when referring to Lazarus (Jn 11:11) and the daughter of Jairus (Jn 8:52). GW keeps it in those passages but eliminates it in the epistles. It might be argued that in those passages, the meaning is clear from the context. But isn't the meaning also clear here in 1 Th 4? Paul uses "those who are still alive" twice, and twice also speaks of people "coming back to life." Surrounded by these expressions, the meaning of "sleep" in this passage is clear without changing the translation to "die."

3. In Christian hymnals there are several funeral hymns which center in "sleep" as a metaphor for death (e.g. "Asleep in Jesus, Blessed Sleep"). In at least half of the funeral hymns there is at least one verse which does the same. If the references to "sleep" as a metaphor for "death" are consistently removed from the epistles, this has negative ramifications for using these passages and the hymns based on them in our funeral services.

Suggestion: *"those who are sleeping"*

>   Pastor Jahn: This verse, and others like it, should be revised as suggested for the reasons stated.

<u>1 Thess 5:6-8</u>

GW translation: "must" 4 times

The Greek does not have δει or οφειλω (which GW regularly translates "must") but it has the 1st person subjunctive which GW regularly translates "should" elsewhere.

Suggestion: for consistency use '*should*" four times

>   Pastor Jahn: Yes.

He1:2
GW translation: "God made his Son responsible for everything."
Problem: This translation implies that this action is already completed. But the Greek says that God made his Son an heir. Being an heir means that there is something that one will receive in the future, not something that a person already has. In verse 13 God promises to bring all the Son's enemies under his control. 1 Co 15:25 indicates that Christ will continue to rule until this happens, and 1 Co 15:24 and 26 indicate that then the end will come. So isn't the writer to the Hebrews saying that just as the Son was there at the creation of the world (the next words in this verse), so all of history revolves around him until he becomes the heir and history comes to its end? Christ is the beginning (the maker of the universe) and the end (the heir of all things).

Suggestion: *"God designated his Son as the one who will inherit everything."*
> [Jahn: Agree.}

He 2:8
GW translation: "his Son's control"
Problem: As the footnote to "Son of man" in verse 6 indicates, this can refer either to Jesus or to humans. Either the word "Son" should be dropped in verse 8 to leave the interpretation open, or a similar footnote to that in v6 should be added to show that here in v8 humans can also be meant.

Suggestion: *"his control"* or add a footnote *"Some believe, as in verse 6, that this refers to humans in general."*
> [Jahn: I would leave GW as it is.]

He 4:6
GW translation: "However, some people enter that place of rest."
Problem: The Greek word απολειπεται is not translated. It is a word that is essential to the substance of what is being said by the writer to the Hebrews. It says that though God said that when Israel rebelled they would not enter, "the fact remains" or "it is still true" that there well be some people who are entering.

Suggestion: *"It is still true, however, that some people do enter that place of rest."*
> [Jahn: Yes.]

He 4:11
GW translation: " must"
Problem: The Greek does not have δει or οφειλω which GW translates "must." It has a first person subjunctive which GW translates either with "should" or "need to" (as in v14 which follows).

Translation: *"should"* or *"need to"*
> [Jahn: Yes.]

He 7:20
GW translation: "may have become priests"
Problem: The translation "may have" implies either that we don't know whether they became priests without an oath or not, or that the usual way they became priests was with an oath but there may have been some who did not follow this pattern. Either understanding is not what the Greek says. It simply contrasts the OT priests to Christ: they became priests without an oath but Christ became a priest with an oath.

Suggestion: "became priests"
> [Jahn: Yes.]

He 8:6, 7, 8, 9, 13 and 9:1, 4, 15, 18 and 10: 15 and 12:24 and 13:20
GW translation: "promise" or "promise to"
Problem: The word "promise" works in this section when it refers to the NT, but it a misleading word to use to refer to the Sinaitic covenant. It would be much better to replace "promise" with the word "arrangement" that is used in Gal 4:24. Paul clearly distinguishes between the Abrahamitic arrangement as the arrangement that is a promise and the Sinaitic arrangement as the arrangement that is Law (cf. Gal 3:17, 3:19, 4:24 and 28). So it is very misleading to refer to the Sinaitic arrangement as a "promise."

Suggestion: "arrangement" or "arrangement with"
    [Jahn: "arrangement" is better.]
....

He 10:22, 23, 24, 25
GW translation: "must"
Problem: The Greek does not have δει or οφειλω which GW translates "must." It has a first person subjunctive which GW translates with "should" as is done at the beginning of v25.

Suggestion: "should"
    [Jahn: Yes.]
....

He 10:38
GW translation: "because of faith"
Problem: This isn't what the Greek says (εκ with the genitive) and can mislead doctrinally. Cf. the comments made about Ro 1:7 in the booklet on all the passages dealing with "faith."

Suggestion: "by faith" or "through faith"
    [Jahn: Definitely.]
....

He 11:2
GW translation: "God accepted our ancestors because of their faith."
Problem: The Greek here is the same as in 11:39 and should be translated the same way (esp. to avoid "because of . . . faith.")
Suggestion: "Our ancestors were known for having this kind of faith."
    [Jahn: Agree.]
....

He 11:5
GW translation: "Faith enabled Enoch to be taken . . ."
Problem: This breaks the pattern which the writer repeats over and over again. "Enabled" used with a passive verse is an awkward and confusing expression. It says faith was the power that enabled Enoch to do something, and then the sentence takes a 90 degree turn and speaks of something being done to Enoch.
Suggestion: "Faith led to Enoch's being taken by God . . ."
    [Jahn: Agree.]
....

He 11:11
GW translation: "Faith enabled Abraham to become a father,"
Problem: Avod "enabled" and the implication it gives that Abraham's faith was the power that worked a miracle. Keep the pattern in all the other verses that the writer to the Hebrews repeats again and again.

Suggestion: "Faith led to Abraham's becoming a father,"
    [Jahn: Agree.]
....

He 11:29, 30
GW translation: "Faith caused the people . . ." and "Faith caused the walls of Jericho to fall"
Problem: The Greek does not say faith was the cause. God was the one who caused these things. Keep the pattern.
Suggestion: "Faith led the people" and "Faith led to the fall of Jericho's walls"
    [Jahn: Agree.]

He 12: 1 (twice), 2, 28 (twice)
GW translation: "must"
Problem: The Greek does not have δει or οφειλω° which GW translates "must." It has a first person subjunctive which GW translates with "should" as is done in 13:4, 13:15, et. al.

Suggestion: *"should"*
    [Jahn: Yes.]

....

He 13:11
GW translation: "The chief priest brings . . . But the bodies . . . were burned"
Problem: It's a minor point, but the change in tenses is not good English (present and past referring to the same event). The Greek has the present in both instances.

Suggestion: *"The chief priest brings . . . But the bodies . . . are burned"*
    [Jahn: Good point.]

Subject: GW translation of James
From: D. Kuske 5/24/95
Status: Sent to GWN

Ja 1:5
GW translation: "you should ask God"
Problem: Drop "you should." The Greek is a simple imperative.
Suggestion: "ask God"
        [Jahn: Yes.]

....

Ja 1:9
GW translation: "because being humble make them important . . . because being rich should make them humble."
Problem: The Greek does not have the verb "make them" and "should make them" in the last part of the verse is
even more of a stretch. The Greek simply says "in their high rank" and "in their humble rank." This can be stated quite
simply and more clearly by saying "because they are important" and "because they aren't important."

Suggestion: "because they are important" and "because they aren't important."
        [Jahn: Yes.]

....

Ja 2:8
GW translation: "You are doing right"
Problem: Translating κατα την γραφην simply as "right" isn't a very close natural equivalent.

Suggestion: "You are doing what Scripture says"
        [Jahn: Agree.]

....

Ja 2:21
GW translation: "approval as a result of what he did"
Problem: Scripture teaches that God's approval is never a result of what a person does. As the next words show,
what Abrhaham did "worked together with" his faith, that is, "his faith was shown to be genuine by what he did." Thus
the translation "by" (which is the meaning of the Greek preposition εκ) is the translation that corresponds to what the
context says and helps the reader see the proper correspondence of 2:21 and 2:22.

Suggestion: "approval by what he did"
        [Jahn: Agree.]

....

Ja 2:23
GW translation: "that faith was regarded by God to be his approval of Abraham."
Problem: Cf. the notes on the passages in Romans 4 that correspond.
Suggestion: "it was on the basis of this faith that God regarded Abraham as approved."
        [Jahn: Yes.]

....

Ja 2:24, 25
GW translation: "because of what"
Problems:
1) The Greek has εκ which is basically "by."
2) The possible doctrinal misunderstanding to which saying "because" in the context of faith can lead.
3) Cf.. the notes on verse 21 above. These verses should be translated the same way as v21 so that v21 becomes the
key verse by which these verses are also interpreted (i.e. what a person does works together with faith in the sense
that it shows that faith is genuine.)

Suggestion: "by what"
        [Jahn: Again, yes.]

Ja 5:8

GW translation: "You, too, must"

Problem: The Greek does not have δει or οφειλω° which GW translates "must." It is a simple imperative. Perhaps the translation "need to" that GW uses elsewhere is best here.

Suggestion: *"You, too, need to"*
     [Jahn: Yes.]

....

Ja 5:19

GW translation: "if one of you wanders from the truth, someone <u>can</u> bring that person back."

Problem: The addition of the word "can" (which is not in the Greek) changes the meaning of the sentence. The last part of this verse is still part of the condition.

Suggestion: *"let's say that one of you wanders from the truth and someone brings that person back."*
     [Jahn: Yes.]

1 Pe 1:3, 13, 21 and 3:5, 15
GW translation: "confidence"
Problem: As elsewhere in GW "confidence" is not the closest natural equivalent of the Greek work ελπις. The Greek word means to look to our future home in heaven, while confidence suggests to the reader a feeling of certainty that a person is capable of doing something. GW does use the word "hope" in a number of NT passages (Eph 1:12, Col 1:5, Tit 2:13, Ro 8:20 etc.) and it would be far better to use it here also.

Suggestion: "hope"
    [Jahn: Yes.]

---

1 Pe 1:13
GW translation: "should"
Problem: The Greek does not have δει or οφειλω which GW translates "must." It is a simple imperative. Perhaps the translation "need to" that GW uses elsewhere is best here.

Suggestion: "need to"
    [Jahn: Yes.]

---

1 Pe 1:15
GW translation: "you must be holy"
Problem: The Greek does not have δει or οφειλω which GW translates "must." It is a simple imperative. Drop "you must" and translate with a simple imperative as is done in the very next sentence ("live your time").
Suggestion: "be holy"
    [Jahn: Yes.]

---

1 Pe 2:19
GW translation: "God is pleased if a person is aware of him while enduring the pains of unjust sufering."
Problem: The Greek has δια συνειδησιν ("because of his awareness") which makes this the cause of the action not just an accompanying circustance ("while enduring").

Suggestion: "God is pleased if a person endures the pains of unjust suffering because he is aware of God."
    [Jahn: Good point.]

---

1 Pe 2:21, 24
GW translation: "you could"
Problem: Translating with "could" implies that God gave us the ability, but the Greek is a purpose clause which says that this was God's goal.

Suggestion: "you would"
    [Jahn: Definitely.]

---

1 Pe 3:3, 8, 10, 11 (twice), 4:10, 4:11 (twice), 4:19, 5:5
Problem: The Greek does not have δει or οφειλω which GW translates "must." It is a simple imperatival sense which GW ordinarily translates "should" in other NT books.

Suggestion: "should"
    [Jahn: Yes.]

2 Pe 1:21
GW translation: "Instead, it was given by the Holy Spirit as humans spoke under God's direction."
Problem: The Greek says literally: "But humans spoke [words] from God as they were directed by the Holy Spirit."
The present GW translation is not saying something wrong, but it is not really saying what the original says either. The GW translation adds the words "it was given" which are not in the Greek. This shifts the emphasis in the verse from the people who are speaking (the process) to what was spoken (the product). While this is seemingly a minor point, there are those who try to undermine the doctrine of verbal inspiration by saying that the words may have been inspired, but the people were not. Therefore, there can be some human elements mixed with the divine in the words of Scripture. Secondly, the GW translation shifts the idea of direction from the Holy Spirit to direction from God (i.e. "under God's direction" instead of "as directed by the Holy Spirit") and thereby omits the thought that what they said came directly from God (the Greek says απο του θεου and clearly indicates that what the men said came from God as its source). Again, people will be perfectly willing to say that what the writers of Scripture wrote was done under some kind of direction from God, but what they said did not come from God (e.g. they take the words "under God's direction" to mean only that they got the idea to write from God, but that the words they wrote were not from God.) In short, the present GW translation presents verbal inspiration, but since it does not say everything exactly as the original does, it does not address some of the present attacks on verbal inspiration as adequately as the original does.

Suggestion: *"Instead, humans spoke [words] from God as they were directed by the Holy Spirit."*
      [Jahn: Weighty reasons for following the Greek more closely.]

----

2 Pe 2:2, 7, 18
GW translation: "sexual freedom"
Problem: Would it be better to put these words in quotations to indicate that this is a perversion of what is truly God-pleasing freedom in regard to sexual matters? Each time I came across this term, I stopped and reread the sentence to make sure I understood the sentence correctly.

Suggestion: *"sexual freedom"* enclosed in quotation marks
      [Jahn: I agree. The meaning of the Greek word is sexual libertinism. It always has only a negative meaning.
          Since libertinism is too big a word to use, putting "sexual freedom" in quotes is the next best t hing.
          What about people who hear it read but don't have the printed text in front of them?]

----

2 Pe 3:3
GW translation: "must"
Problem: The Greek does not have δει or οφειλω which GW translates "must." It is a simple participle used in an imperatival sense which GW ordinarily translates "should" in other NT books.
Suggestion: *"should"*
      [Jahn: Yes.]

1 Jn 2:28 and 3:3

GW translation: "confidence"

Problem: As elsewhere in GW "confidence" is not the closest natural equivalent of the Greek work ελπις. The Greek word means to look to our future home in heaven, while confidence suggests to the reader a feeling of certainty that a person is capable of doing something. GW does use the word "hope" in a number of NT passages (Eph 1:12, Col 1:5, Tit 2:13, Ro 8:20 etc.) and it would be far better to use it here also.

Suggestion: *"hope"*
> [Jahn: Yes.]

----

1 Jn 4:1

GW translation: "Dear friends, <u>don't believe all people who say</u> that they have the Spirit. Instead test them. See whether the spirit they have is from God."

Problem: This is strictly a style matter, but the expression "don't believe all people who say" seems awkward com- pared to saying "don't believe every person who claims." Maybe it's just my problem. I realize that "all people" was probablly used to correspond with the plurals in the next two clauses. But wouldn't the following suggestion also avoid any singular/plural change from clause to clause?

Suggestion: *"Dear friends, don't believe every person who claims to have the Spirit. Instead test such people. See whether the spirit they hav e from God."*
> [Jahn: The suggestion reads much smoother.]

----

1 Jn 4:7, 21

GW translation: "must"

Problem: The Greek does not have δει or οφειλω (as it does in verse 11) which GW translates "must." In verse 7 a first person imperative is used and in verse 21 a clause is used which has an imperatival sense. Such constructions GW ordinarily translates "should" in other NT books.

Suggestion: *"should"*
> [Jahn: Yes.]

Re 9:20

GW translation: "did not turn to me and change the way they were thinking and acting"

Problem: This is not a major point, but the Greek verb μετανοεω is used here with "from the deeds of their hands." Thus it simply means to turn away from these things. That is the way it is translated in v21 = "they did not turn away from committing murder, etc." It would be better to translate the same way in this verse.

Suggestion: *"did not turn away from the things they were doing."*
> [Jahn: Agree.]

Re 20:5, 6

GW translation: "people came back to life"

Problem: The usual translation of GW for αναστασις (come back to life) works in most places in the NT because throughout much of the NT it refers to the resurrection on the last day when people who were once alive and who died are being brought back to life again by God. In these two verses, however, the reference is to coming to faith. In this instance, therefore, people who never were alive spiritually were made alive for the first time. The basic meaning of the Greek word is simply to raise a person up (i.e. from the dead). It does not inherenlty mean they were once alive and then are brought back to life, and that is not it's meaning here. To translate "came back to life" can mislead the reader to think that there are two resurrections at the end of the world (the milennial error).

Suggestion: *"dead people are made alive."*
> [Jahn: I agree.]