

2. Starkova G. V. Mif u kiberprostori: Internet jak prostir utilennja neomifologem. – <http://www.ic.kharkov.ua/RIO/kultura34/22.pdf>

3. Sm.: Shherbina M. M. Mif i Internet: mifologicheskij i jekrannyj kul'turnyj kod // Gileja: naukovij visnik. – 2014. – Vip.91. – S.272–275.

4. Sokolov B. G. Raj giperprostranstva // Obraz raja: ot mifa k utopii. Serija «Symposium», vypusk 31. – SPb.: Sankt–Peterburgskoe filosofskoe obshhestvo, 2003. – S.149–151.

5. Tihonova S. V. Tipologija sovremennogo internet–mifotvorcestva // Tezisy IX Vserossijskoj ob#edinennoj konferencii «Internet i sovremennoe obshhestvo». – SPb., 2006. – S.122–124.

6. Jepshtejn M. Tvorcheskoe ischeznovenie cheloveka. Vvedenie v gumanologiju // Filosofskie nauki. – 2009. – №2. – S.91–105.

7. Fedorova M. V. Religioznaja kommunikacija: sushhnost' i specifika sovremennogo sostojanija // ScienceTime. – №4 (4) / 2014.

8. Diskussija «Transgumanizm protiv Boga?». – <http://kriorus.ru/news/Diskussiya–Transgumanizm–protiv–Boga>

Dobrodum O. V., D.Sc. Associate Professor of Philosophy Department of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts (Ukraine, Kyiv), dobrodum.olga@gmail.com

The mythological character of virtual reality (some methodological aspects)

At present, mythology and theology of Internet are being formed in online space, the concepts of mediaphilosophy, the religion of transhumanity, the esoterics of immortality, the worldview of the Aquarius Age, the technocratic vector of NewAge etc. are accepted into the general discourse. Developing interdisciplinary scientific direction of GameStudies as a phenomenon of science and technology is actualized, also as a manifestation of virtual reality. In recent decades, the latest information technology has penetrated into all spheres of society, deeply embedded in the very nature of everyday life, while the context of being continues to contain a fairly large variety of mythological components. The task of this article is the conceptualization of the mythological character of virtual reality, among research methods: expert analysis and historical-comparative. WWW appears as one of the myths of the present, to which positive and negative soteriological properties are attributed.

Keywords: Internet, mythology, cyberspace, theo-logos, high-tech, religion.

Добродум О. В., доктор філософських наук, доцент, професор кафедри філософії, Київський національний університет культури і мистецтва (Україна, Київ), dobrodum.olga@gmail.com

Міфологічний характер віртуальної реальності (деякі методологічні аспекти)

В даний час в онлайн-просторі формується міфологія і теологія Інтернету, в загальноприйнятій дискусії входять поняття медіафілософії, філософії транслюдів, езотерика іморталізму, світогляд епохи Водолія, технократичний вектор NewAge тощо. Міждисциплінарний науковий напрям GameStudies як феномен науки і техніки розвивається та актуалізується, в тому числі, як маніфестація віртуальної реальності. В останні десятиліття новітні інформаційні технології проникли в усі сфери життя суспільства, глибоко ввелися в саму тканину повсякденності, в той же час контекст буття продовжує містити досить велику частку міфологічних компонентів. Завдання цієї статті – концептуалізація міфологічного характеру віртуальної реальності, серед методів дослідження: експертного аналізу та історико-компаративістський. WWW постає як один з міфів сучасності, якому приписуються позитивні і негативні сoteriological властивості.

Ключові слова: Інтернет, міфологія, кіберпростір, theo-логос, high-tech, релігія.

* * *

УДК 261.7

Dyatlik T. N.,

competitor of the Department of Cultural Studies of the National Pedagogical University named after M. P. Dragomanov, a chairman of a non-governmental organization «Euro-Asian Theological Association» (Ukraine, Rivne), tdyatlik@gmail.com

THE VALUE OF BIBLICAL GREEK IN THEOLOGY AND EXEGESIS OF MARTIN LUTHER

This study of the value of Greek in Luther's theology and exegesis will take the following three steps. First, I will try to define the possible Greek tools which Luther might have used. Second, I will look at Luther's use of Greek in his exegesis.

Finally, I will examine the influence of Greek on Luther's theology. In his early career Luther was quite comfortable with the Vulgate. Studying his theory of the Bible translation, Krause concludes that Luther «was suspicious of returning to the original languages of Scripture, preferring the traditional interpretations based on the Vulgate». Luther used Greek the first time in order to better understand the Epistle to Romans when lecturing on it in 1515–16. Even after years of working with Greek, however, he never attained as high a level of the language as some of his philologically trained contemporaries primarily because of his schooling in the Scholastic rather than humanist tradition.

Keywords: Martin Luther, Reformation, Vulgate, Greek New Testament, Reformed Theology, Salvation, Justification

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

At the time of the Reformation Greek scholarship was still crude, and Luther had access to the pioneering editions of the Greek tools. From the end of the fifteenth and during the sixteenth century about forty Greek grammars were produced [35, p. 24]. At least three of these were available to Luther and may have been used by him: 1) a manual written by Lascaris, and published by Aldus Manutius in 1495. In its preface an important note occurs: «there is a multitude of those who yearn to be well-instructed in Greek» [16, p. 42], which gives witness to the rising interest in the Greek New Testament studies in the medieval ages; 2) the grammar of Theodor of Gaza that was translated and published by Erasmus in 1516; and 3) the elementary grammar written by Melanchthon in 1518.

Publishing new grammars entailed the production of Greek dictionaries. However, there were no dictionaries in a literal sense save those so-called *glosses* (for example, compiled by Jerome) which Luther might have used in his rendering of the New Testament. During revisions of the New Testament after 1522 he might also have utilized a Greek-Latin glossary that was included in the Complutensian Polyglot published in 1522 [15, p. 525]. The absence of good dictionaries made the labour of a medieval exegete, and Luther in particular, yet more difficult because it «made men work to find for themselves, through wide reading and meditation of the use of words, how to compare passage with passage and analyze the shade of meaning a word had in a given context» [16, p. 43].

The first dictionary, called *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum*, was printed at Paris in 1530. It consisted of «additions and interpretations from all the Greek lexicons of previous decades and from the writings of Bude, Erasmus, Valla and others less well known», and contained Melanchthon's brief account «of the Greek names of the months and the calendar» [16, p. 43]. Luther might have used this *Lexicon* in his later Greek studies, and while revising the New Testament after 1530.

It is generally considered that the first Old Testament in Greek was published by Aldus at Venice in 1518–1519 (although the Complutensian Polyglot was printed in 1514, but stored until 1521/22). This edition of the Septuagint consisted purely of the Greek text of the Old Testament and the first edition of the Greek New Testament of Erasmus, but with no Latin translation. In 1526, with a few changes, the Aldine text was reprinted at Strassburg in two volumes.

During Luther's time, the Septuagint did not have the same popularity or wide usage as it would by later theologians, because, as Hall asserts, «the sixteenth century scholar tended to view the Septuagint as a version of the Hebrew text which was at many points deliberately corrupted by the Jewish translators, or at least ill translated, and therefore of secondary importance when compared

with the Hebrew or Vulgate texts» [16, p. 56]. Considering that many textual problems with the Septuagint still are not resolved, we should not judge the medieval scholars for their attitude towards it.

In the sixteenth century, the most significant text of the Greek New Testament was that of Erasmus. It had first been printed by Froben in March 1516, and included a new Latin translation with commentaries which were prepared by Erasmus as well. In 1519, at Basel in Switzerland, the second edition of the Greek text by Erasmus was published. This text was much improved by the removal of the majority of misprints and the introduction of readings from some better manuscripts. At that time, it was the most modern exegetical tool that Luther used in rendering the New Testament. Luther may also have used the reprinted version of the Greek text by Gerbel published in 1521 without Latin translation and notations. However, some scholars doubt it, indicating that «in several passages he failed to avail himself of hints that were helpful for a proper understanding of the text». Other scholars argue that many other translated passages proved that Luther indeed used Erasmus's edition of the Greek text [9, p. 212].

Thus, it is obvious that only just before and at the time of the Reformation, God provided published Greek tools such as grammars, dictionaries, and the original text of the Bible to medieval biblical scholars such as Luther for use in understanding, interpreting and preaching the Scriptures. The modern theologian, with access to vast resources of lexical aids, studying the exegetical works of the medieval biblical scholars must always endeavor to understand the difficult labour of the exegetes who worked with few lexical aids.

On one hand, every translation is interpretation and at the same time exegesis. On the other hand, interpretation follows exegesis of the text. Therefore, the translator has two common tasks. The first, and the most important one, is to search out the original meaning of the text, i.e. to exegete it. The second is to find the best way to render the original meaning, i.e. to interpret the text. «To do so he will have to be a philologist, an historian and a theologian» [3, p. 11].

As a Bible translator Luther had unique gifts from God, especially his knowledge of the original languages. Even though his knowledge was only moderate, he was able to make independent conclusions about the meaning of the original text. Luther was very scrupulous in his process of rendering the New Testament. He says that «it has happened that I have sometimes searched and inquired about a single word for three or four weeks» [38]. Luther not only translated the Bible himself, but he also encouraged others to do so: «I might have died in the mistaken notion that I was a learned fellow. All those who think that they are learned ought to do some such work» [24, p. 105].

Being encouraged by Melanchthon, Luther started rendering the New Testament in November–December of 1521, and finished it about March 1522 before he left Wartburg. The first addition of the *Das Neue Testament Deutzch* appeared shortly before 25 September 1522. The December edition (1522) had hundreds of corrections, which indicate that Luther continued to work with the Greek text, comparing and improving the translation. In 1529–30, Luther with the help of Melanchthon, whose knowledge of Greek surpassed Luther's, completed a thorough revision of the New Testament.

The following three examples indicate how Luther endeavored to comprehend exegetically the original meaning of the Greek text and to communicate it in intelligible German.

Since Jerome Emser demanded a literal translation (not one that follows the sense of the text) and tried to conform it to the Vulgate instead of the Greek text, he highly criticized Luther's few errors in rendering the New Testament. Thus, he criticized Luther's rendering of Gabriel's greeting to Mary in Luke 1:28 arguing that *κεχαριτωμενη* had to be translated according to the Vulgate, *gratia plena* (full of grace), because he saw in this a key to the medieval doctrines of Mariology. Since *gratia plena* pointed at Mary having found favor with God, Emser translated this Greek participle as *voll genaden* (full of grace). Luther himself considered that «Mary is praiseworthy and can never be lauded and extolled enough» [24, p. 1256], however he objected that translating *κεχαριτωμενη* as *voll genaden* is not good German. So, Luther translated it as «du, Holdselige» (you gracious one), saying that «this way a German can at last think about what the angel meant by his greeting» [38]. Then he indicates that he would even prefer to translate this salutation as *Gott grusse dich, du liebe Maria* (May God greet you, dear Mary): «Anyone who knows German also knows what an expressive word «dear» (liebe) is: dear Mary, dear God... I do not know if one can say this word «liebe» in Latin or in other languages with so much depth of emotion that it pierces the heart and echoes throughout as it does in our tongue» [ibid.].

However, in spite of this explanation it has to be noted that Luther's translation points that Mary has favor with humans rather than with God. But «it could be more properly identified as Luther's correction of a mistranslation in the Vulgate that conveniently served a purpose in Luther's doctrinal dispute with Rome» [33, p. 67]. Thus, in his rendering this phrase we see that Luther endeavored to comprehend the Greek text and render not the literal meaning but the sense of the text.

If one translates the magi's question in Matt. 2:2 from the original word-for-word this would yield a rough translation such as Emser's: «Wo is der, der da geboren ist, ein König der Juden? (Where is the one, the one who is born, a king of the Jews?)» However, Luther managed it with «Wo is der neugeborne König der Juden? (Where is the newborn king of the Jews?)» Krause made two observations about the latter translation of this phrase. First, he says that Luther «eliminated the choppiness of the articular participle by rendering it as a simple adjective» [33, p. 69]. It is closer to the original text, because the participle *ο τεχθεις* describes the noun *βασιλευς*. Second, Luther translated *ο τεχθεις* as «newborn», so, adding «an interpretative twist by his choice of adjective», and «thus tying the magi story to the stable and shepherd of Luke's nativity. Luther's first change was a stroke of linguistic genius; his second either a delightful addition or tendentious eisegesis, depending on one's point of view» [ibid.].

Although Luther's translation is more beautiful than Emser's one, and is in accordance with the original, «it is also risky reading, applying the analogy of faith where it may not be necessary» [33, p. 70].

In «An Open Letter on Translating» there is nothing to indicate that Luther was criticized for his renderings of Matt. 12:34 and Luke 6:45. However, he used these verses

as an example of his translation principles: «What is this «abundance of the heart»? No German can say that; unless, of course, he was trying to say that someone was altogether too magnanimous, or too courageous, though even that would not yet be correct, as «abundance of the heart» is not German... But the mother in the home and the common man say this: «What fills the heart overflows the mouth». That is speaking with the proper German tongue of the kind I have tried for, although unfortunately not always successfully. The literal Latin is a great barrier to speaking proper German» [38].

Krause makes here an interesting and important conclusion about Luther's translation principles, which demand further research: «In this rendering one finds the modern spirit of dynamic equivalency, for Luther has left the Greek idiom to offer a clear phrase with similar impact» [33, p. 68].

From these examples it is obvious that in his exegetical exposition of the New Testament, Luther first of all was connected to the plain sense of the text: he analyzed the sentences, phrases, and words, and used other parts of the Bible in order to clarify grammatical, semantical, and theological issues. Luther wanted to transpose the Greek text from its context into the reader's one, and his principle of generalization is an important achievement in the history of exegesis, translation and interpretation.

Luther discovered that the Latin text in Matt. 4:17, used by Catholic theologians to support the doctrine of the sacrament of penance, was a mistranslation. In the Vulgate Luther read *paenitentiam agite*, but checking the Greek text of Erasmus he saw μετανοεῖτε. The Latin word *poena* means not only «punishment», but also «a satisfaction, compensation», and «penalty». Luther was surprised to learn that the original speaks not about «making penitence», but invokes «to be penitent, to repent, to change your mind».

In 1518, in the letter to John Staupitz, his spiritual tutor, Luther writes: «I remember, dear Father, that once, among those pleasant and wholesome talks of thine, with which the Lord Jesus oft times gives me wondrous consolation, the word *poenitential* was mentioned» [39]. Then he explains that the word *paenitentiam* struck in him «like a sharp arrow of the mighty», and from that time forth he «began to compare it with the texts of Scripture which teach penitence» [ibid.]. Luther describes his discovery in so delightful way that it is worthy to cite his own words: «After this it came about that, by the grace of the learned men who dutifully teach us Greek and Hebrew, I learned that this word is in Greek *metanoia* and is derived from *meta* and noun, i.e., *post* and *mentem*, so that *poenitentia* or *metanoia* is a «coming to one's senses», and is a knowledge of one's own evil, gained after punishment has been accepted and error acknowledged; and this cannot possibly happen without a change in our heart and our love... Then I went on and saw that *metanoia* can be derived, though not without violence, not only from *post* and *mentem*, but also from *trans* and *mentem*, so that *metanoia* signifies a changing of the mind and heart, because it seemed to indicate not only a change of the heart, but also a manner of changing it, i.e., the grace of God» [ibid.].

Further in the letter he blames «those men false teachers», which «ascribed so much to works of penitence that they left us scarcely anything of penitence itself except trivial satisfactions and laborious confession, because, forsooth, they had derived their idea from the Latin words *poenitentiam agere*, which indicate an action, rather than

a change of heart, and are in no way an equivalent for the Greek *metanoia*» [ibid.].

It was, probably, Luther's first astonishing theological experience of the value of the Greek language. From that time forward, he always tried to keep his theology in accordance with the Greek text of the New Testament.

Time and time again Luther thought he was working on his final revision of the 1522 translation, but in effect his work of revising and editing the Bible never ended as his theological understanding of the Scriptures developed more and more. Some Catholic theologians accused Luther of adapting the translation to his theology. Although they had some foundation for their accusations, at the same time they may be confronted with the same objections. Luther emphasized that no one can translate in opposition to grammar, yet he always tried to give a theological strength to the words of the text, relating them usually either to the gospel or to the law. He was devoted to such an extent that while revising the translation of the New Testament he changed some of the terminology in order to be correct theologically. Despite the fact that there are many other examples where Luther's theology influenced his translation, the following two are given with regard to the Greek word δικαιοῦν in Romans since the doctrine of justification by faith is central in Luther's theology.

The Greek word δικαιοῦν may be used for «righteousness» in the juridical as well as in the religious sphere. So, in human law and in theology it has utterly different meanings. In 1522, rendering the New Testament, Luther translated the Greek word δικαιοῦν with German *rechtfertigen* (in Latin it is translated as *iustificare*).

However, in 1530, while revising the translation «he changed *rechtfertigen* to *gerecht machen*» in all cases where the context had theological implication, «but he retained *rechtfertigen* in cases of human litigation». Schwarz provides the list of the changes (verbs, as well as nouns and adjectives) in the revision of 1530 (here are listed only those of Romans): Rom 2:13; 3:4, 10, 20, 24, 26, 28, 30; 4:2, 5; 5:1, 9, 16, 18; 8:30 (twice). He also denotes that he found some «possible exceptions where a change is expected, but, for reasons unknown, not made» (in Rom 6:7). [36, p. 199–200].

Since Luther believed that δικαιοῦν in different contexts has different meaning, he made these changes in order to clarify his theological view on it. Schwartz denotes that «from the philological point of view his change could not be attacked, even by those who compared his translation with the Vulgate», because «the Latin dictionaries explain *iustificare* as *iustum facere*, though also as *rechten*, *rechtfertigen*». He continues: «For this reason G. Witzel, who attacked Luther's rendering in 1533, had to admit that the Latin word *iustificare* has a wider meaning than the Hebrew and Greek equivalents in the Bible. He therefore explained the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek words and tried to prove that this is different from Luther's translation *gerecht machen*; the real significance of the Hebrew and Greek words is *gerecht achten* or *gerecht sprechen*. This rendering, Witzel asserts, does not imply the transformation of man as Luther's version expresses it. Witzel fully understood that the basis of Luther's change was his theological belief» [36, p. 199–201].

Thus, Luther's understanding of δικαιοῦν demanded the two different words in order to render the two different ideas of «justification».

In Luther's translation of the New Testament, the most important theological and anti-Catholic influence is the famous interpolation of the word «alone» in Rom. 3:28. Luther tried to emphasize the doctrine of justification by faith, saying that German requires its insertion. In the Greek New Testament of Erasmus the text of Rom. 3:28 goes this way: λογίζομεθα ουν πιστει δικαιοσθαι ανθρωπον χωρις εργαων νομον. Luther translated the Greek phrase πιστει δικαιοσθαι ανθρωπον as «allein durch den Glauben». In «An Open Letter on Translating» he answered Emser's objection regarding the addition of «allein», and explained its appearance in this way: «I knew very well that the word *solum* (solely) does not stand in the Latin and Greek texts, and the papists had no need to teach me that. True it is that these four letters *s-o-l-a* do not stand there. ...I wanted to speak German, not Latin or Greek, since I had undertaken to speak German in the translation. But it is the nature of our German language that when speaking of two things, one of which is granted while the other is denied, we use the word «solely» along with the word «not» or «no»» [24, p. 107].

However, considering Luther's emphasis on the doctrine of justification by faith alone, «it is difficult to not think this translation is influenced by doctrinal bias» [33, p. 69]. It is very likely that originally he added «allein» in order to clarify that the Christian is justified without the deeds of the law «by faith alone», because further in the letter he states: «I am only sorry I did not add 'alle' and 'aller,' and said 'without any (alle) works of any (aller) laws.' That would have stated it most effectively» [38]. His insertion can also be explained by Luther's belief that the Epistle to Romans is the prince of Gospel presentations among other epistles: «This epistle is really the chief part of the New Testament and the purest Gospel, which not only deserves to be known by heart by a Christian, word for word, but to be studied daily as the daily bread of the soul. It can never be read or studied too much and too well; and the more one deals with it, the more precious it becomes, and the better it tastes» [24, p. 989].

Therefore, «alone» was demanded not only by the German language, but it was also theologically necessary in Rom. 3:28, because it deals with one of the most important Christian doctrines «justification by faith *alone*».

Conclusion. To conclude, what was the value of Biblical Greek in Luther's theology and exegesis? Equipped with the knowledge of the Greek language, Luther was able to study the New Testament in the original which God used to work drastic changes in his spiritual life and theology. This led to the beginning of the much needed Reformation.

Second, he was able to translate the New Testament and to present it to the German nation and the church in such a way that it changed the hearts and lives of the thousands of people who read it in later years. This led later to the also much needed renewal of medieval Christianity. Third, Luther by his Greek exegesis attested that the Holy Spirit reveals His truth to those who study His Word passionately and faithfully. This, then, led to the beginning of true biblical scholarship.

Though Luther managed Hebrew much better than Greek, in his writings he spoke a lot of the value of using the Greek language. Thus, in 1524, addressing the councilmen of Germany, Luther especially encouraged the study of the biblical languages. He reminded them, that «we shall have a hard time preserving the Gospel without the languages», and

spoke of them in images: «The languages are the sheath in which this sword of the Spirit is contained. They are the case in which we carry this jewel. They are the vessel in which we hold this wine. They are the larder in which this food is stored» [24, p. 731].

Luther also believed that preachers without the knowledge of the biblical languages «will certainly make many a pretty mistake» [ibid.]. On the other hand in his «Table-Talk» he said that he «would not have preachers in their sermons use Hebrew, Greek, or foreign languages, for in the church we ought to speak as we use to do at home, the plain mother tongue, which every one is acquainted with» [42]. Exhorting young theologians Luther admonished them «to study Hebrew, to the end that they may be able to compare Greek and Hebrew words together, and discern their properties, nature and strength» [ibid.].

Taking into consideration the fact that Luther was able to manage his moderate knowledge of Greek in a proper way, and considering its results, it raises two questions for us: «What are we doing with our knowledge of the Greek language and with all the Greek tools we have nowadays?» and «What kind of Reformation might it have been if Luther did not use his knowledge of Greek, or did not know Greek at all?».

«Let us, then, foster the languages as zealously as we love the Gospel. For it is not meaningless that God caused His Scripture to be written in these two languages only: the Old Testament in Hebrew, the New in Greek. The languages, therefore, which God did not despise but chose above all others for His Word we, too, ought to honor above all others» [24, p. 731].

References

1. Atkinson, James. Martin Luther and the Birth of Protestantism. – Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1981.
2. Atkinson, James. Martin Luther: Prophet to the Church Catholic. – Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983.
3. Bainton, Roland H. «The Bible in the Reformation». In The Cambridge History of the Bible: the West from the Reformation to the Present Day. Vol.3. Ed. S. L. Greenslade, 1–37. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
4. Bainton, Roland H. Here I Stand: a Life of Martin Luther. – New York: The New American Library, 1957.
5. Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Danker, Frederick William, ed. 3rd ed. – Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.
6. Biblia Sacra. 4th ed. – Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
7. Black, M. H. «The Printed Bible». In The Cambridge History of the Bible: the West from the Reformation to the Present Day. Vol.3. Ed. S. L. Greenslade, 408–475. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
8. Boettner, Loraine. Roman Catholicism. – Philadelphia, PA: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1979.
9. Bornkamm, Heinrich. Luther in Mid-Career 1521–1530. – Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
10. Bornkamm, Heinrich. «Luther's Translation of the New Testament». In Luther, ed. H. G. Koenigsberger, 210–217. – New York: Hill and Wang, 1973.
11. Durant, Will. The Reformation: a History of European Civilization from Wyclif to Calvin: 1300–1564. – New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957.
12. Estep, William R. Renaissance and Reformation. – Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986.
13. Farrar, Frederic W. History of Interpretation: Bampton Lectures. – Grand Rapids, MA: Baker Book House, 1961. Reprint, New York: E. P. Dutton, 1886.
14. Fix, Andrew C., and Susan C. Karant-Nunn, eds. Germania Illustrata: Essays on Early Modern Germany Presented to Gerald Strauss.

Sixteenth century essays and studies. Vol.18. – Kirksville, MS: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1992.

15. Greenslade, S. L., ed. The Cambridge History of the Bible: the West from the Reformation to the Present Day. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

16. Hall, Basil. «Biblical Scholarship: Editions and Commentaries». In The Cambridge History of the Bible: the West from the Reformation to the Present Day. Vol.3. Ed. S. L. Greenslade, 38–93. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

17. Harran, Marilyn J., ed. Luther and Learning: the Wittenberg University Luther Symposium. – London–Toronto: Associated University Press, 1983.

18. Hillerbrand, Hans J., ed. The Protestant Reformation. Documentary History of Western Civilization. – New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

19. Krodel, Gottfried G., ed. Letters. Vol. II. Luther's Works. Vol.49. Gen. ed. Helmut T. Lehmann. – Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.

20. Lindberg, Carter. The European Reformations. – Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000.

21. Luther, Martin. Lectures on Romans. The Library of Christian Classics. Vol.15. Eds. John Baillie, John T. McNeill, and Henry P. Van Dusen. – Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956.

22. Ozment, Steven. The Age of Reform 1250–1550: an Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe. – New Haven–London: Yale University Press, 1980.

23. Pelikan, Jaroslav. Luther the Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings. – Saint Louis, MS: Concordia Publishing House, 1959.

24. Plass, Ewald M., comp. What Luther Says: an Anthology. 3 vols. – Saint Louis, MS: Concordia Publishing House, 1959.

25. Schaff, Philip. History of the Reformation, A.D. 1517–1530. History of the Christian Church. Vol.6. – Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1888.

26. Schultz, Samuel J., and Morris A. Inch. Interpreting the Word of God. – Chicago: Moody Press, 1976.

27. Schwarz, W. Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation: Some Reformation Controversies and Their Background. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

28. Traupman, John C., comp. Latin and English Dictionary. – New York: Bantam Books, 1995.

29. Volz, Hans. «Continental Versions to c. 1600: German Versions». In The Cambridge History of the Bible: the West from the Reformation to the Present Day. Vol.3. Ed. S. L. Greenslade, 94–109. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

30. Worth, Roland H., Jr. Bible Translations: a History through Source Documents. – Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, 1992.

31. Ziegler, Donald J. Great Debates of the Reformation. – New York: Random House, 1969.

32. Johnson, Alan F. «The Historical–Critical Method: Egyptian Gold or Pagan Precipice?» Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 26, no.1 (1983): 3–15.

33. Krause, Mark S. «Martin Luther's Theory of Bible Translation». Stone–Campbell Journal 2 (1999): 57–73.

34. Niemela, John. «James 2:24: Retranslation Required». Chafer Theological Seminary Journal 7 (2001): 13–24.

35. Scalise, Pamela J. «The Reformers as Biblical Scholars». Review and Theology 86 (1989): 23–28.

36. Schwarz, Wilhelm. «Examples of Luther's biblical translation». Journal of Theological Studies 6 (1955): 199–209.

37. Verhoef, Pieter A. «Luther's and Calvin's Exegetical Library». Calvin Theological Journal 3 (1968): 5–20.

38. Luther, Martin. «An Open Letter on Translating». <http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/luther/luther-translate.txt> (23 November 2016).

39. Luther, Martin. «Letter to John Staupitz Accompanying the «Resolutions» to the XCV Theses». <https://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/luther/nine5-staupitz.txt> (19 December 2016).

40. Melancthon, Philip. «The Life and Acts of Martin Luther». <https://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/melan/lifea-01.txt> (19 December 2016).

41. «Text der unrevidierten Lutherbibel 1545». <http://jesus-is-lord.com/germtoc.htm> (19 December 2016).

42. «The Table–Talk of Martin Luther Translated by William Hazlitt». http://www.reformed.org/documents/Table_talk/table_talk_8.html (19 December 2016).

Дятлик Т. М., *пошукач кафедри культурології Національного педагогічного університету ім. М. П. Драгоманова, голова правління ГО «Євро–Азіатська теологічна асоціація» (Україна, Рівне), tdyatlik@gmail.com*

Цінність біблійної грецької мови в богослов'ї та екзегезі Мартіна Лютера

Ця стаття присвячена вивченню цінності біблійної грецької мови у богослов'ї і екзегезі Мартіна Лютера, і ставить перед собою три завдання: (1) визначити можливий інструментарій Лютера по грецькій мові, (2) розглянути використання Лютером грецької мови в його екзегезі, і, нарешті, (3) показати вплив біблійної грецької мови на богослов'я Лютера. У своїй ранній кар'єрі Лютер був цілком задоволений Вульгатою і «з підозрою відносився до повернення до оригінальних мов Писання, віддаючи перевагу традиційним інтерпретаціям, ґрунтованим на Вульгаті». Лютер уперше використав грецьку мову, щоб краще зрозуміти текст Послання до римлян, коли читав по ньому лекції в 1515–16 рр. Проте навіть після багатьох років роботи з грецькою мовою він так і не зміг досягти такого високого рівня знання мови, як деякі з його сучасників, які швидше були прибічниками гуманістичної, а не схоластичної традиції.

Ключові слова: Мартин Лютер, Реформація, Вульгата, грецький Новий Завіт, богослов'я Реформації, спасіння, виправдання.

* * *

УДК 268

Gudyma I.,

a Master of Theology, a postgraduate student of the department of religious studies and theology of the National University «Ostroh Academy» (Ukraine, Ostroh), gileya.org.ua@gmail.com

A WOMAN AND A FAMILY IN THE CONCEPTS OF BIBLICAL TRADITIONS

The research opens God's plan for a woman, which promotes formation of spiritual and moral values, using the example of women in the Bible. The texts of the Scripture are thoroughly investigated in which the role of a woman in family is revealed. The image of a woman found in our study is an example of a positive formation of a person, moral consciousness and stimulation of a virtuous activity and behavior for a woman in the modern world. The materials and developments of the article can be used by specialists in the area of religious study, students, professors, while writing research papers, and also at lectures related to study of Philosophy and Religious studies.

Keywords: a woman, religion, a family, the Bible.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

The question of a woman's role from a religious point of view was referred to by philosophers and theologians of Middle Ages, Renaissance, New age era, and among them such Jewish wise men should be named first of all: Rashi, Rambam, Maimoneed; Fathers of the Christian church: Tertullian, Ignatius of Antioch, Iryniy and others [8; 9; 10]. German classical philosophy drew its attention to a problem of a woman. E. Kant, in particular, considered the problem of a woman to be more philosophical than that of a man [4]. The interest in the problem of a woman increased at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, but a Ukrainian woman was perceived as an ideal one, a characteristic of Ukrainian national character.

Spiritually–psychological functions of a woman may be viewed as original woman's ones in the society in general, in family and functions of a woman directly as a female, that plays a role of a mother, a wife, a daughter, a mother–in–law, etc. A protestant theologian J. Peisti considers that the highest calling of a woman is motherhood related to no less important calling of parenting [6]. A family must be «pure» from inside, that is in relationships between a husband and