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The gap between the biblical canon's relative closure and the formulation of church teaching has, since the seventeenth century, been regarded as a historical truism. Since the rise of biblical criticism, the dogmas of the church have been challenged, criticized and eroded by historical arguments.1 History has been privileged as the terrain on which the reasonableness of the Christian religion and its doctrines are demonstrated; dogma and dogmatic claims concerning its authority are banished beyond the bounds of reasonable assent. Both popular opinion and scholarly consensus concede to historical criticism the better arguments, leaving the burden of proof on dogmatic theologians to articulate theological positions that would filter the Christian tradition through categories evident to reason. Within the historical paradigm, the trinitarian dogma is rendered problematic on two accounts. One argument denies the legitimacy of the Old Testament as a warrant for the Trinity. Neither Christ nor the Spirit of Christ appear historically prior to Christ's birth from Mary. The typological or figurative preparations of the Trinity in the Old Testament are rejected on historical grounds;2 only the New Testament can accurately be appropriated as a point of departure for reflecting on the Jesus-Abba relationship.3 With the revitalization of trinitarian theology in the twentieth century, the question of the unity of the God straddling both testaments has been raised.4 Soulen has pointed out the erasure of the God of Israel in classic trinitarian theological proposals.5 The Old Testament is not rejected on strictly historical grounds. Rather, YHWH is determined entirely in terms of the triune name, "Father, Son, Spirit", a designation
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reflecting the supercessionism indigenous to Christian theology as a whole.4 A second argument admits the distance between the proto-trinitarian formulations available in the New Testament and the articulation of trinitarian dogma in the fourth century. Proposals have been advanced to close the gap by providing either historical or theological reasons.5 The move from historical contingency to dogmatic necessity, however, represents the difficulty gnawing at the biblical-theological field since Lessing. "[A]ccidental truths of history can never become the proof of necessary truths of reason."6 The dual exegetical and theological interests in the Trinity reflect the split between two distinct argumentative paths.

With the retreat of theological claims to accommodate the results of historical criticism, the question of how the Old Testament can inform Christian theology continues to be posed. The question is even more pressing in light of the early twentieth-century controversy concerning the Old Testament's status within the Christian Bible.7 It was this criticism that prompted some scholars, notably Wilhelm Vischer, to reprise the pre-Enlightenment position in order to raise the issue of christological referentiality in Old Testament texts.8 Although the project stumbled on the rock of a quasi-allegorical interpretation, the effort inspired a renewed look at Luther's Old Testament interpretation.9 Both H. Bornkamm and J. S. Preus investigated Luther's turn to the literal sense of the Old Testament and his arguments for a semantic equivalence between biblical texts and the early church's trinitarian and christological dogmas.10 It is the purpose of this essay to orient the discussion to Luther's explication of the trinitarian doctrine and its exegetical foundation in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. Neither does Luther reduce the Old Testament to a series of trinitarian proof texts; nor does he raise the semantic level of the text to accommodate an allegorical interpretation, thereby relativizing the textual anchor. Rather, Luther articulates a complex trinitarian hermeneutic that moves between a trinitarian semantics and the Hebrew text. In the first section, I will map out a possible historical explanation for Luther's concern to tie the Trinity to the Old Testament. By connecting the Holy Spirit to the text, Luther advocates a semantics of the inner-Trinity that imbues the Hebrew with a special dignity. The privileged status of the Hebrew original informs Luther's ongoing revisions to his Old Testament translations. In the second section, Luther's trinitarian hermeneutic will be discussed in view of both the specific translation into German of the Hebrew names for God, and the semantic claims justifying the translation. Finally, I will argue that Luther roots his trinitarian understanding in the grammatical and syntactical features of the royal Psalms. The Psalms' speech structure renders a trinitarian grammar of transparency. The triune mystery is one in which the divine essence is transparent through the characteristics distinguishing between the three persons.

1. Text and Sense

Luther's late revisions to his translation of the Old Testament reflect his intensified concern with the trinitarian doctrine. In this section, I focus on a particular historical controversy that may explain Luther's insistence on preserving the trinitarian semantic referent of the literal Hebrew text. For Luther, the referent of the text is the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit. Only on the basis of this claim can the turn to the Father and Son be made.

In Luther's lifelong preoccupation with the Old Testament, the academic lectern, rather than the preaching pulpit, provided the forum.12 Luther began his teaching career by lecturing on the Psalms (1513–1516), a book he was to interpret two more times (1519–1521; 1532–1535).13 Two commentaries on the penitential Psalms were published in 1517 and 1523.14 Throughout the middle portion of his career, Luther lectured on the twelve minor prophets, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah and the Song of Songs.15 The Book of Genesis occupied a full ten years of Luther's academic efforts (1535–1545),16 while the last lectures he published were devoted to Isaiah 9 and 53, and Hosea 14:12–14.17 Not only the object of the lectures and commentaries, the Old Testament text was the particular focus of Luther's canonical modifications. Luther followed Jerome, not Augustine, in advocating the canonical authority of the Masoretic text.18 This move seems to have been motivated by early doubts concerning the appeal to Deutero-canonical books. Particularly in the disputation with Eck in Leipzig (1519), Luther had raised the issue of biblical warrants for the doctrine of purgatory. Luther argued against the church's teaching on purgatory by denying the canonical authority of 2 Maccabees 12:46.19 There is, furthermore, enough evidence for the later Luther's doubts concerning the canonicity of the apocryphal texts. In his Bible translation, at least after 1534, he marked them off as the "Apocrypha,"20 recommending their use for pious edification, not for church teaching.21 He insisted that these books were not to be regarded as equal to the canon, a claim he also interpreted to have made for four New Testament books: Hebrews, James, Jude and John's Apocalypse.22 Luther's position is neither to be misunderstood as a simple privileging of the canon over church teaching; nor is it to imply a consistent rejection of the canonical status of these texts. Rather, canonicity is determined by the subject matter; the text is servant to Christ that it must convey.

Flexibility characterizes Luther's canonical decisions, but in a way that cannot undermine the literal text. In discussions of Luther's Bible translations, there is scholarly consensus regarding Luther's sense to sense method of translation.23 Luther promoted the accessibility of the text's subject matter through a translation reflecting vernacular use, while also taking great care to "conserve the [original] letter".24 The insistence on accessibility in the mother tongue must be interpreted together with Luther's conviction regarding the anchor of the subject matter in the text. Particular passages
convey the promises of Christ in a way creating certainty. With respect to the
christological referent, the Old Testament differs from the New Testament
only according to the temporal orientation to Christ. The New Testament is
written from the perspective of the Christ who has come, whereas the Old
Testament is the cradle of Christ, conveying the Christ who is to come.7
Following this principle, Luther took great care to translate the Old Testa-
ment into German. Luther added major revisions to the Old Testament as
late as 1539–15418 that he included in the last Bible published during his
lifetime (1545).9 When analyzing the records of the translation process,
especially at its later stages, it is curious to note that Luther moves beyond
a christological commitment. Documented is an explicit interest in rooting
a trinitarian sense in the translation. The following question needs to be
addressed. Why does Luther skew his translation in the direction of a
trinitarian interpretation? The issue turns not on a christological, but on a
pneumatological pivot: the historical dispensation of the Spirit.
Although the historical reasons for Luther’s later interest in the Trinity
are not entirely clear, a possible explanation can be reconstructed. In the
1544 doctoral disputation of Major and Faber, Luther discusses the Trinity
in view of two seemingly distinct issues. The context of the disputation is
established by the first thesis. In the thesis, Luther cites Matthew 17:5. “God
the Father desired that all disputations concerning the articles of faith
should cease. Therefore he said concerning God his Son, ‘Listen to him.’”10 In
other texts, Luther joins disobedience to the Son with the denial of the Son’s
divinity. Both Arius and the devil represent, for Luther, a similar disobedience
and consequently a similar heresy.11 By equivocating the refusal to hear
the Son with the rejection of the eternal co-equality between Father and
Son, Luther is insisting on the doctrinal requirements for true hearing. The
document of co-equality determines the way in which Christ’s speech must
be received. In another section of the disputation, Luther turns to the second
issue, the biblical moorings of Christ’s speech. At this point, a curious polemical
erupts against two Catholic theologians, Johannes Eck and Johannes Cochlaeus
that is connected to an attack against both Michael Servetus, the theologian
who was burnt at the stake on charges of the antitrinitarian heresy, and
Wolfgang Campanus. Luther unites the orthodox with the heretical faction
by complementing the issue of obedience to the Son with the Spirit’s dis-

cipation in the Old Testament.

The context of Luther’s explicit argument against both Servetus and
Eck concerns the issue of technical trinitarian terminology in scripture. In
the disputation’s preface, Luther mounts a specific attack against Servetus.
According to Luther, Servetus and Campanus say that “this article [of the
Trinity] is not represented before John the Baptist, and [hence] they mock the
scriptures”.13 During the disputation, the charge against Eck is also preaced
by the issue of terminology, yet the difficulty seems to be heightened by
the insertion of an additional argument regarding church authority. With

respect to Eck and Cochlaeus, Luther claims that they establish the doctrine
of the Trinity on the authority of the doctors and the pope, not on scripture.14
When Eck’s own treatise, Enchinatio of Commonplaces, is considered, it
appears that Eck advances an argument on the church’s authority without
specifically mentioning the issue of biblical terminology. Eck explicitly refers
to the Holy Spirit’s dispensation to the church, and in a separate proposition,
to the authority of the church for interpreting scripture.15 Eck claims the
historical precedence of the church over scripture in order to argue that the
church attests to scripture’s authenticity, and not the other way around.16
Using the argument on the church’s authority, Cochlaeus writes that Servetus’
position cannot be combated by scripture, but by the church that establishes
the articles of faith.17 When Luther accuses both Servetus/Campanus and
Eck/Cochlaeus of undermining the Trinity, he seems to be equivocating
the two theological positions on the historical articulation of the doctrine
after the canon’s fixation. Luther collapses two distinct arguments to make one
point. Although for different reasons, both Servetus and Eck tie the trinitarian
doctrine to the church, rather than anchor it in scripture. Servetus rejects the
trinitarian doctrine by de-territorializing its articulation to its creational formu-
lations in the third and fourth centuries,18 while Eck restricts scripture’s authority
by amplifying the church’s authority in view of the Holy Spirit’s guiding activity.
Luther sees a structural similarity between a position that relativizes church
teaching on historical grounds and a position that establishes dogmatic truth
by limiting the Spirit to a historical dispensation after Christ’s ascension.
In order to combat his opponents’ views, Luther must explicate the relation
between the trinitarian subject matter and the Old Testament text.

In the Major disputation, only one side of the argument is formulated. The
issue of doctrinal distance and terminological discrepancy from scripture is
counterbalanced by elevating the discussion to the level of the res itself. The Trinity
“est res supra nostrum intellectum posta”19 and its truth overrides any
doctrinal formulation. “Rem mussen wir behalten, wir redens mit Vocabin,
wie wir wollen.”20 Luther’s translation strategy that frees the res from the
literal letter reappears in the context of debate on scripture’s relation to
church doctrine. In another doctrinal disputation, Luther sharpens his position
by alluding to Augustine and Lombard. One discussion in the Fabricius
disputation concentrates on the relation between the temporal diversity of
rites and the unity of faith. Luther’s statement on the identity of the faith that
is preserved throughout differing historical epochs is a direct allusion to
Lombard, who also addresses the possibility of introducing change into the
object of faith by means of representational verbs.21 Lombard cites Augustine in claiming that
tensed verbs do not posit change in the content of the faith. “[N]ec tamen
diversa credimus nos et illi, sed eadem. ‘Tempora enim, ut ait Augustinus,
variata sunt’, et idem verba mutata, ‘non fides’.”22 In spite of temporal
distinctions at the level of linguistic tense, the res remains the same in eternity.
Luther’s allusion to Lombard can help explain his concern in the Major
disputation with the transcendent res, whose truth is preserved in spite of terminological flexibility. The res is conveyed as the semantic referent of a diversity of terms and descriptions. When Luther appeals to the transcension argument, he is neither advocating laxity in language, nor appealing to the argument that locates doctrinal authority solely in church tradition. Rather, Luther makes the point that, although language is inevitably historically located, it cannot be understood to introduce diversification into the subject at the semantic level. What this element of the discussion shows is Luther's concern with preserving the trinitarian res as an eternal unity, above time and beyond reason. The argument then shapes Luther's handling of the Trinity in relation to the time prior to John the Evangelist.

The issue of the textual basis for the Trinity can only be treated once the argument for the trinitarian res in the Old Testament is advanced. The point of entry into the semantic question is established by the first thesis in the Major disputation: the Father's injunction to listen to the Son. With respect to the Trinity before John the Evangelist, the thesis opens up the question of how the Son can be heard historically prior to the appearance of Jesus of Nazareth. Given the paucity of interpretative clues within the disputation itself, Luther's position must be reconstructed from other texts in view of the Old Testament's access to the Son's speech. For Luther, access to the inner-trinitarian mystery is granted solely by the third person of the Trinity. In the Old Testament, the Spirit's inspiration of the prophets serves to open up the trinitarian res. In order to ground this claim, Luther equivocates the referent of the third article of the Creed with the Old Testament prophecies. In the treatise, "Von den letzten Worten Davids (1543)", Luther cross-references the passage, "Doch Geist des HERRN hat durch mich geredet" (2 Samuel 23:2), with both 2 Peter 1:21 and the phrase in the Nicene Creed, "Der durch die Propheten geredet hat." In order to emphasize the semantic equivalence between scripture and the Creed, Luther unifies his translation of the relevant passages by using the term "reden". The philological choice captures the semantic equivalence pertaining to the Spirit, whose eternity is not disrupted by her temporally diverse dispensations. Even the 1541 revision to his Old Testament translation marks this uniformity. For 2 Samuel 23:2b, Luther changes "Woort" to "Rede" in order more clearly to expose the verse's semantic equivalence with the Spirit's "speaking" through the prophets. The self-same Spirit inspires the human author of the Psalms, David, so that he speaks not anymore as the "Son of Jesse, born in sin", but as the one awakened by God to be a prophet. The Spirit creates the historical actuality of access into the divine subject matter. By virtue of the Spirit's self-same identity throughout history, Luther can, on the one hand, advocate agreement between biblical authors, specifically Moses and John, on the semantic referent of their writings. On the other hand, Luther can valorize the distinct ways of referring to the Trinity. Luther does not raise the semantic level of the Old Testament to suit the referent of the New Testament in order to force a trinitarian interpretation at a spiritual level removed from the text. Rather, he privileges pneumatological equivalence in order to claim the dignity of various dispensations at their distinct historical sites. The Old Testament's dignity is grounded at the semantic level, that in turn guarantees the identity between prophetic utterances and the Spirit's own speech.

Access to the semantic referent is a second element driving Luther's hermeneutic. Luther discusses the Spirit not only in terms of semantic equivalence, but he also begins with the Spirit as the trinitarian person who facilitates access to the inner-trinitarian mystery. What no eyes have seen, nor ears heard is the subject matter of scripture and the Creed to which the Holy Spirit has access by virtue of her identity with the divine nature. The content of the Spirit's speech is the "God of Israel", a referent that cannot be attributed to human or angelic knowledge, but to one who plumbs the depths of the divine Majesty itself. For Luther, authorial agency must be divine because of the subject matter that is eternal. When Luther describes the text from the perspective of its eternal referent, he attributes authorship to the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the author who warns, writes, teaches, comforts, brings to remembrance. On the other hand, Luther ties access into the mystery to historically concrete sites. The literal speech of the prophets, apostles and church is valorized because the Spirit is responsible for creating these tangible means to access the mystery. The referent opens up historical speech to unseen things, thereby establishing the dignity of the speech's written records.

The text's referent ascribes dignity to the literal level of scripture. Luther's trinitarian-theological presupposition regarding the Spirit's epistemological function grounds the claim that the external text is capable of referring to a subject matter too high for human words. In Luther scholarship, the text's relation to the referent is often understood as an identity of constitution. According to this view, the tangible and localized word of the promission constitutes the actuality of its meaning. The question that begs to be answered, however, concerns the power of the constituting function of the word. For Luther, the word constitutes the spiritual reality only by virtue of its divine authority. Authorial agency provides the explanation for the word's dignity. With respect to the biblical text, Luther privileges its trinitarian semantics that consequently establishes the original Hebrew, not the translation, as the vehicle for trinitarian knowledge. Hebrew is the language the Spirit uses to refer to a theological subject matter. The meaning of the Hebrew terms differ from meanings given to the same words in different fields of philosophy or astrology. For example, Hebrew terms referring to time connote feast and festivals; philosophical terms of time refer to motion. Concentrated listening to the Hebrew words, its grammar and syntax is required as a first step in grasping the trinitarian reality.

The epistemological point of entry into the trinitarian mystery is guaranteed by the semantic referent that ascribes dignity to the Hebrew text. Luther
presupposes the trinitarian work of the Spirit in order to ground the text's dignity, but conversely, Luther makes strong claims regarding the text's avenue into the mystery of co-equality between Father and Son. Text and Trinity are intimately connected.

2. The Names for God

Once the text's epistemological capacity is established, a fuller trinitarian semantics can be developed. The Holy Spirit opens up the eternal mystery of the Father and the Son. In the following section, I will show how Luther refers to the Father and Son by translating the two Hebrew names for God, YHWH and Adonai. By representing the distinction in the German translation, Luther determines the semantics of the terms in order to interpret the speech pattern of the royal Psalms as the hermeneutical basis for his trinitarian understanding.

The trinitarian supressionist model, as Soulen argues, erases the Hebrew name YHWH and as a result, determines the God of Israel according to the trinitarian rule of faith, Father, Son and Spirit. Whereas the thesis may accurately describe the majority of trinitarian representations, Luther's Old Testament translation proves to be a surprising exception. One text in which Luther expresses his principle for translating the Hebrew names for God is the series of sermons, held on Psalm 110 in 1535. Known by Old Testament scholars as a royal Psalm, Psalm 110 was acknowledged as an ascension Psalm by medieval theologians who noticed the citations of this Psalm in the New Testament. Luther translates verse one as follows: "Der Herr sprach zu seinem Herrn: Setze dich zu meiner Rechten." (Ps. 110:1). The two references to "Herr" at the audible level of perception suggest agreement with the LXX and the Vulgate. The latter texts also use one term to stand in both locations, respectively κύριος (LXX Ps. 109:1) and dominus (Ps. 109:1). When the audible sound of Herr is compared with Luther's visual text, however, a difference can be observed. At the visual level of the text, Luther represents a distinction between the terms that is immediately evident in the Hebrew original: the distinction between YHWH and Adonai. For YHWH, Luther uses four capital letters: HERR; for Adonai, Luther capitalizes only the first two letters: Herr. The visual difference in the German between the two representations of Herr reveals the distinction in the Hebrew, a rule Luther admits he follows throughout his translation of the Old Testament. What Luther has succeeded in doing is recover the original Hebrew distinction and to recover, at the visual level, the Greek and Latin eminence of the distinction. Luther's principle is retained in editions of the Luther-Bibel, as well as in the King James Version of the English Bible. The Weinman Ausgabe of Luther's works also reproduces Luther's practice, whereas Walch's German edition of Luther's writings does not.

The Hebrew distinction between YHWH and Adonai denotes, for Luther, a distinction in referent. In his writings, Luther refers to YHWH as the sacred tetragrammaton, the divine Majesty. Following standard medieval pointing of YHWH with the vowels of Adonai, Luther identifies the term Jehovah with the sublime name for God. This identification is predicated on the speech structure in which the distinction in names is embedded. In cases where a distinction between speaker and addressee is found, such as the royal Psalms, the rule of referentiality is different from cases in which only one speaker is present. When one person speaks about or to another, the rule demands the predication of Jehovah to the speaker. When only one speaker is present, Jehovah can be predicated of that person, namely Christ, "without injustice." With respect to the distinction in the speech situation, Luther identifies the trinitarian referent of the first Lord as the Father. He argues that this person is the true God, the origin of the inner-trinitarian relations. The order of inner-trinitarian speaking mirrors the relations of origin. A differentiated claim must, however, be made regarding the determination of the first Lord in terms of a strict trinitarian referent. In the exegetical text, "Von den letzten Worten Davids", Luther explicitly interprets 2 Samuel 23:1–7 as a warrant for the Trinity. The trinitarian context shapes the overdetermination of the speaker as the Father or the first person of the Trinity. In exegetical commentaries on the Psalms, Luther is more reticent in overdetermining the speaker. For example, in his interpretation of Psalm 110:2, Luther does not identify Herr with the first person of the Trinity, but tends to refer to this Lord as God, God of Israel, or with the pronoun, "Er." The underdetermination may disclose Luther’s retention of the literal Hebrew, while at the same time, showing that the distinction in speakers is the literal ground for any further trinitarian claims.

On the other hand, Luther consistently and strictly identifies the second Lord with Jesus Christ. Luther takes the second Lord, "Adon", to mean the common German name by which servants and subordinates call the lord of the house, or the lord of the land. The reason for this exclusive denotation of the second Lord is given by the possessive pronoun "my". Literally translating the Hebrew Adonai, Luther takes the possessive pronoun "my" to distinguish both grammatically and semantically the second from the first Lord. The subject of my determines the christological denotation. Not part of the address' content, my is located in the narrative formula introducing the address: "Der Herr sprach zu meinem Herrn: ..." This location indicates the subject of my to be, not the first Lord, but another. For Luther, the introduction is narrated from the perspective of someone who is witnessing the scene: the author of the Psalm. Witnessing the inner-trinitarian conversation, David narrates what he sees. Luther further justifies the christological referent of "my Lord" by semantically equivocating the Old Testament passage with the Creed and the New Testament. In his explanation to the second article of the Creed in the Large Catechism, Luther converts the confession of faith into an oblique description of who Christ is. "Ich glaube, das Jesus Christus, wahhaftiger Gottes son, sey mein Herr worden."
Jerome's translation of "pure" as the Latin adjective "purus" is to be the point of departure for his own translation of both the verb and the adjective. The exegetical strategy of "Antonomasia", Luther claims, is correctly applied to this case because it fits the way a Hebrew adjective functions. Luther argues that the adjective "purus" must be taken as a proper noun that stands as the exemplary representative of its class. With this move, Luther detours around both the LXX and the Vulgate in order to arrive at the adjective's original Aramaic sense as the noun "son". On the basis of this specification, Luther turns to the verb, agreeing initially with the sense Jerome conveys when translating "adorate" as "adorare. With osculamini, Luther retains the ceremonial connotation of "adorare" but adds to Jerome by stressing the intimacy of an adoring posture. It is the inner-trinitarian milieu that overarches Luther's translation. Love perfectly characterizes the Father's disposition towards the Son. By semantically equivocating Psalm 2:12 with New Testament passages disclosing the Father's address of love to the Son (Mt. 3:17; Mt. 17:5; John 3:35), Luther specifies "purus" to be the beloved Son of the Father. Specified as the Father's object of love, the Son is conjugated through the Psalm's perspective to arrive at "my Lord" as the object of the Psalmist's love. The Psalm refers to "my love, my pure one, my elected one, the one in whom I rejoice, my heart and my joy". Luther chooses "osculamini" in order to capture the double posture of intimate love and adoration towards "my Lord". By conjoining a technical point from Hebrew grammar with an argument of semantic equivalence, Luther specifies the Psalm's christological referent once again in terms of the divine and the human nature.

The royal Psalms seem to provide the biblical model for Luther's trinitarian hermeneutics. The increasing attention paid to this model is evident in exegetical restrictions that Luther imposes on classic trinitarian proof texts, for example, Genesis 18, the story of the three men visiting Abraham at Mamre. In the 1535 Genesis Lectures, Luther passionately argues at great length for the text's exhortation of Christian hospitality, not for a trinitarian interpretation. In an almost apologetic manner, he finally gestures to a trinitarian reading, permitting it only as a decoration of a trinitarian faith grounded, with more certainty, elsewhere. Even more dramatic is the difference between Luther's 1527 exegesis of Genesis 1:3, 6 and the later Genesis Commentary. In 1527 and still visibly under the aegis of Augustine, Luther correlates God with the Father, "spoke" with the Son, and the entire phrase, "God saw that it was good" with the Holy Spirit. In the Commentary of 1555, Luther claims that unrestricted access to Scripture distorts its sense, results in exegetical products of human fantasy, and eliminates any power the text might have to comfort and establish certainty. Luther explicitly turns to the literal, "clear testimony" of Scripture in order to base the trinitarian exegesis on the literal meaning of the Hebrew root "פָּדַּשׁ פָּדִּשׁ", meaning a spoken word (verbum prolatum), is used in Genesis 1:6, rather than "פָּדִּשׁ", which signifies an essence-thing (res). The christological
Luther's Trinitarian Hermeneutic and the Old Testament

Luther is no exception in the theological tradition that mines Psalm 2:7 for its theological significance. In his 1532/1546 Commentary, Luther translates the passage as follows. 

"Prædicabo statutum, quod DOMINUS ad me dixit: Filius meus Tu, Ego te hodie genui."

The translation, Luther argues, should not confuse the reader. Although the text's sense is rendered less penetrable, the shifts in the pronouns marking each clause of the verse are common in Hebrew. The pronominal density in German reproduces the original Hebrew distinction between the subject of the introductory narrative formula ["Ich wol von einer solchen Weise predigen, Das der HERR zu mir gesagt hat, ..."] and both the subject and object of the direct speech ["Du bist mein Son, Heute hab ich dich gezeuget"]. The unfamiliar shift in persons from "Ich" in the first part of the verse to "Du" in the second part is used in order to retain what is perfectly normal in Hebrew. Luther is not blind to his stretching the rules of German syntax. Rather, the change in person marks the shift from an indirect narrative style to direct speech. By translating literally the pronominal shift to reflect a change in subject, the switch from the narrative genre to direct speech is emphasized. Luther entertains an alternative that would render the text's sense more easily in translation. In order to apply pronominal consistency throughout verse seven, Luther refers back to verse six, translating as follows. "Ego constitui Regem meum super Zion montem sanctum meum, ut prædicet decretum meum, Quod sit Filii meus, quem hodie genui." After toyng with this possibility, Luther rejects the transparency of sense for the transparency to the original Hebrew grammar. Even though he admits a distortion in sense, Luther insists on accentuating oneself to the Hebrew idiosyncrasies in their translation. The text conveys a meaning that is imposed by the change in persons.

One key trinitarian hermeneutical question consists of identifying the one who speaks. The complication in verses six and seven is due to the insertion of a second "I" in verse 7a. The question concerns the identity of the "I" in verse six, its relation to the second "I" of verse seven, and the "I" speaking in verse 7c. The distinct difficulty in verse six has to do with identifying the speaker of a narrative section. Luther's trinitarian hermeneutical distinction between speaker and addressee seems to be complicated by a narration that admits only of an indirect distinction between a speaker and "my king". Given the difficulty, Luther directs his attention to the speech's content. According to the precedent set by this royal Psalm, the one speaking is identified by the name YHWH. This Lord (HERR) is the divine Majesty, the one who laughs in derision of his enemies (Ps. 2:4), who threatens to destroy those who plot against him (Ps. 2:6). Is the speaker not the one who "created heaven and earth out of nothing, everything by the power of his word"? The speaker is the one who has all power over humans and over Satan. After using the speech's content as the clue to identify the one initiating speech, Luther turns to the referent of "my king". The narrative style

referred is grounded solely by the literal Hebrew word רְשָׁע, not as its allegorical sense.

The above example shows how Luther equivocates the christological semantics of both the Genesis/Johannine model and the royal Psalms' model of the Trinity. According to the speech structure, the two models differ. For both Genesis 1 and John's Prologue, God and the word are distinguished as speaker and spoken word, whereby the word is identified with its content. In the royal Psalms, the addressee is distinguished from both the speaker and the speech's content. Although the two models differ in terms of a monological and a dialogical type, Luther identifies the oral aspect of the royal Psalms with the literal translation of רְשָׁע in his Genesis 1 interpretation. In both cases, the word is a spoken word. By recovering the oral connotation of רְשָׁע, Luther relates the Genesis/Johannine identity between word and content to the dialogical speech situation marking the royal Psalms. By this move, Luther departs from the classic Augustinian tradition of translating λόγος as verbum internum, possibly appropriating Tertullian's translation of the Greek term into the Latin sermo. In both cases, the oral nature of the speech situation supplies Luther's trinitarian hermeneutics with the distinction between speaker and a second person. The exegetical controls for theological interpretation are located in the text itself.

Luther's particular contribution consists in his recovery of the Old Testament for trinitarian theology, specifically Hebrew terms, grammar and the royal Psalms. The trinitarian underdetermination of YHWH as speaker preserves the distinct Old Testament perspective, while the overdetermination of the addressee discloses the christological scope unifying both testaments. By concentrating on the Hebrew text, Luther on the one hand restricts allegorical exegesis that would raise the semantic level of the Old Testament to conform to the New Testament. On the other hand, he privileges the text's sense (res) that establishes the trinitarian framework within which philosophical study is executed. A close study of language, however, cannot be limited to philology. Luther's trinitarian hermeneutics demonstrates the essential connection between language and its referent. The question of semantics engages the theological dimension that infuses the text with richer meaning. Conversely, the text itself exercises hermeneutical controls on the degree to which the text opens up the theologically determined referent. At the literal level, text is inextricably bound together with the Trinity.

3. Hebrew syntax and trinitarian semantics

In addition to terms and grammar, Hebrew syntax plays a further role in Luther's trinitarian hermeneutic. In this section, I will show how Luther recovers the syntactical foundation for a trinitarian understanding from the Hebrew text, preserving it in his German translation. The royal Psalms will once again form the exegetical basis.

stresses the immediate relation of the content to the speaker. No literary wedge is driven between the I and my king. Instead, the narrative transparency signifies the special relation between the king and the divine Majesty whom the latter alone establishes on Mount Zion. The possessive pronoun my distinguishes this king from all other human kings, and the noun king refers to the power given to this king by the “eternal Father”. The literary structure of narration, coupled with the term my king, is semantically determined as the co-equality between the divine Majesty and Jesus Christ. Once this trinitarian relation is fixed, the question arises as to the identity of the I in verse 7a and b. In this verse, YHWH is mentioned, not as the origin of speech, but in an introduction prefaced by the oblique form, “quod DOMINUS me dixit”. Another I has been inserted into the narrative.

The determination of the I’s identity represents a sophisticated feat of trinitarian exegesis. Luther mines an entire trinitarian theology from Psalm 2:7, grounded in the shift from one speech to the speech of another. The question concerns the identity of the second I who speaks. Luther lays the building-blocks of his interpretation by first turning to the text’s subject matter. In this regard, Luther agrees with the medieval tradition. The passage’s subject matter is the divine decree in eternity. Luther then determines the content of this decree by analyzing the term statutum (Prædictabo statutum) in order to arrive at its christological referent. After mentioning the wide range of meaning that the term statutum covers, Luther settles on the equally wide German word, “Recht”. The speech’s content is a new sermon on the new “right”, which signifies, for Luther, the preaching of the abolition of the law. The speaker of the gospel is Christ. It is not a spiritual, silent, inner word, but a verse recounted in the direct form of a sermon. By insisting on spoken speech, Luther brings the immediacy of the Hebrew syntax into the foreground of his trinitarian hermeneutic. Christ’s oral sermon introduces the speech concerning the divine decree, that itself is conveyed as YHWH’s direct speech to the Son. The seamless transition from one speech to another signifies the transparency of the relation between Father and Son. The immediacy of the transition signifies the transparency of the trinitarian relation. The Son refers his entire speech exclusively to the Father; and the Father does nothing without the Son.

As Christ’s speech refers immediately to YHWH’s speech, so too does YHWH’s speech refer directly to the Son. The speech’s content is not a teaching on a topic, but its content identifies the addressee in the form of direct speech. “Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee (KJV).” Although this phrase is considered to be, at least since Lombard, a classic trinitarian proof text, Luther concentrates on the passage’s terminology and form in order to tease out his particular interpretative angle. The fact that the Father speaks has, for Luther, the trinitarian significance of identifying the Father as the active source of the Son, and the eternal generation as the identifying marker of the Son. According to classic trinitarian theology, only the relations of origin, such as active and passive generation, serve as the characteristics distinguishing between Father and Son. These relations of origin are eternal, not temporal. Luther discusses the two terms in verse seven, hodie and the verb genui in view of their signification. Although the terms are inevitably temporalized, they are not to be understood as introducing change into the divine essence. Borrowing from Augustine’s understanding of eternity as uninterrupted by past or future, Luther locates hodie beyond time. Even the perfect past tense of genui signifies a “complete and perfect” generation in eternity that knows only an eternal present. In addition to its eternal referent, the form of the direct speech is saturated with a trinitarian claim. Luther entertains an alternative formulation before considering the significance of the literal text. For pronominal clarity, the Son could have said “I am the Son”, rather than introducing the Father’s address, “You are my Son”. Luther rejects the alternative, claiming that the switch in speaker is crucial to conveying the passage’s trinitarian meaning. The literary exchange signifies the trinitarian reciprocity between the Father who alone introduces the Son, and the Son who alone introduces the Father. The Son introduces the Father in a way relating all he is and has to the Father. Conversely, the Father introduces the Son, expressing his desire to be known exclusively through the Son. The mutual introduction signifies the transparency of the divine essence held in common between Father and Son, and the distinct speeches signify the way in which the nature is distinguished through the relations of origin. Perfect unity is marked by the way in which the Son speaks “through the mouth of the Father”, and conversely the Father, who speaks “through the mouth of the Son”. For Luther, the text’s immediacy of direct speech signals the deep mystery of inner-trinitarian reciprocity. The Son is perpetually attuned to the Father; he cannot for a moment look away and refer to the origin of his being in the third person. Conversely, the Father’s gaze is fixed solely on the Son, his delight and love.

The final trinitarian hermeneutical claim concerning textual transparency refers back to the earlier view of the Holy Spirit. Luther attributes the composition of the entire passage to the Holy Spirit who grants epistemological access through the text to the inner-trinitarian intimacy. The paradigmatic example of the Spirit’s special grammar is the seamless transition from Christ’s speech to the Father’s speech in Psalm 2:7. Luther refers to the Father’s speech as an “inner sermon”, spoken exclusively to the Son. The direct form “Du” (verse 7c) designates the Son as the only intended hearer. This inner-trinitarian speech can be heard and understood only by the speaker and addressee. That this sermon is communicated beyond the inner relation between Father and Son at all is a function of Christ’s direct speech, spoken to another audience, the hearers of the text (verse 7a–b). The Son’s “outer” sermon functions as the literary embrace to the Father’s speech, thereby rendering the inner accessible to be heard, although not understood, on its outer side. By its embeddedness in Christ’s speech, the Father’s
speech is “brought to us out from the inapproachable light in which God dwells.” Both the inner and outer speech are brought to literary light by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit attributes the inner words to the Father in order to expose the central mystery of the Father’s relation to the Son. The Spirit also attributes the outer speech to the Son in order to show Christ’s desire to refer all that he has to the Father. Through the seamless literary transitions from one speech to another, the Spirit reveals the transparency between Father and Son. God desires to speak and act through the Son, and the Son offers all he has and does to the Father. The inner-trinitarian transparency is the ground for the certainty of salvation. Christ “loves us and dies for us in complete accordance with the eternal Father’s will.” In her role of granting access to the Father–Son relation, the Spirit participates in the transparency marking the trinitarian reciprocity. The Spirit is transparent to the text, retreating from any direct self-revelation by pointing to the Father–Son semiotics. Luther solves the distinct binitarian difficulty with the royal Psalms’ dialogical model by enclosing the Spirit in the structure of reciprocal transparency. The Spirit speaks of the eternal mystery through the prophets. What has been heard in eternity is spoken through the prophets in time. Neither separated from the inner-Trinity nor from her prophetic voice, the Spirit renders eternity transparent to time and time transparent to eternity.

The speech structure renders transparent the inner-trinitarian relations. Textual transitions permit each distinctive voice to be heard, yet the distinctiveness is mediated through the seamlessness of the transitions. The Father’s intimate inner speech is woven into the Son’s outer speech, the outer speech discloses its speaker only by referring to the content of the inner speech. The outer speech reveals the inner-Trinity to be constituted by the relations of origin. By its embeddedness in the outer speech, the inner is revealed to be truly the inner side of God. Access to the innermost heart is granted solely through the Son. The complex between inner and outer speech is further rendered to be truly outer by the Holy Spirit’s identification with the text. No wedge is driven between the prophet’s word and the Spirit’s word that would render the revelation opaque. Rather, the text is transparent to its inner-trinitarian referent in such a way as to disclose the Spirit’s relation in the inner-Trinity. The Spirit, who knows the innermost depths of God, moves from inner-trinitarian silence to outer-trinitarian speech by building a seamless bridge to the speech recorded in the text. The Spirit knows no other speech than Christ’s speech, yet the Spirit has no other words than the prophet’s words. The same seamless transition marking the inner-trinitarian relations characterizes the transition from the inner to outer-Trinity. All three persons are transparent to each other, yet the location of the transparency discloses the personal characteristics, marking the way the essence is circulated among them.

Luther’s trinitarian hermeneutic represents a speculation on the inner-Trinity that itself is fed by the speech structure of the royal Psalms. Almost anticipating Schleiermacher’s severe antipathy towards the Trinity in the Old Testament, Luther insists on the Old Testament’s distinct voice, sounding out the speculative dimension to trinitarian theology. Without this testament’s living voice, the whole gospel would become dead history. The Old Testament writing refers to speech, not silence. This testament’s voice is fixed by the text’s semantics, and its referent is moored in textual transparency.

Conclusion

A close study of the Hebrew text, its terms, grammar and syntax discloses Luther’s exegetical focus that is intimately coupled with a trinitarian semantics. Grounded in the royal Psalms of the Old Testament, Luther’s trinitarian understanding centers on their speech structure as the bearer of the inner-trinitarian mystery. With this view, Luther is perhaps pointing to what the philosopher Walter Benjamin has also articulated. The Hebrew language is the bearer of revelation. The goal of this essay was to claim that literary features could not be isolated from semantics. By showing that a trinitarian hermeneutic was, on the one hand, regulated by literary rules, and on the other hand, invested with referential capacity, I considered how it might be possible to bring philology in closer proximity to Christian doctrine. Luther’s trinitarian hermeneutic of the Old Testament provided an intriguing example of a literary semantics in reciprocal relation. By mooring a semantics in the text, Luther was able to mine the peculiar textual features for their specific trinitarian significance; by orienting the text to its referent, Luther was able to suspend many textual features in their trinitarian light. The exclusive focus on the literary text points out the lack of any analogy to comprehend the referent. With respect to the Trinity, the only material is the letter that points beyond itself, to a subject matter in eternity. The transparency of the letter to the Spirit renders transparent the inner-Trinity to its outer side. Language itself becomes the vehicle of communicating the mystery of the essential transparency through the distinguishing marks of three persons. This is Luther’s insight: the mystery of the eternal word, incarnate in the Hebrew text.
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Luther follows the traditional medieval view, since Lombard, that designates the church father in the Old Testament according to the name of the Christian. For example, cf. WA 41, 61, 30 (Preface to the sermon series on Psalm 110, 1535).

Lohse writes that the 1539–1541 revisions to the Old Testament translation did not concern the apocryphal books. Lohse, p. 229, citing Voit, WADB 12, lv.
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“Basiel seu Zosimus und Ccelesteis, qui non per scripturam sed per docentur et papam articulum ecclesiae declaravit. Dies ist erlogen.” Ib., A 305, 24–26. Luther participated in early debates with both Eck in Leipzig (1519) [cf. footnote 20].

John Eck, Enchiridion of Commonplaces, Against Luther and Other Enemies of the Church (1541), trans. by Ford Lewis Battles (Grand Rapids: MI, Baker Book House, 1979), ch. 1, p. 2, pp. 9–10 and ch. 1, p. 4, pp. 11–17. In the dissection to the objections against proposition 4, Eck refers to the Trinity in the context of New Testament, not Old Testament passages, such as Matthew 28:19.


WA 39/II, 290, 12–13 (Major, Preface).

Ibid., A 305, 22–23.

“Semper est et fuit et eadem invocavit et una fides, sed tempore fuerunt dissimili, alii qui sunt et furent, alii qui sunt et fuerunt.” Ibid., 270, 1–2 (Doctoral Dissertation of Theodor Fabricius and Stanislaus Rapaparulos, May 28, 1544).

Loband, Sent. I, d. 41, c. 3 (385). The citation from Augustine is found in the treatise of John 10:1–10. “Tempora variata sunt, non fides. Quae et ipsa verba pro tempore variantur, cum varia declinatur.” In: Joannes Evangelic tractatus, tr. 45 (9) [FL, 55, p. 1722].
80. Oswald Bayer isolates the *promissio*, the constituting word of promise, to be the content of Luther’s Reformation breakthrough and the center of the Reformer’s theology. A summary of Bayer’s interpretation is the following: “The *promissio* is constituted by the identity between the linguistic sign (grammatically), the abstraction based on Matthew 16:19, and the content (re), the forgiveness itself.” Christine Helmer, “The Subject of Theology in the Thought of Oswald Bayer,” Lutherian Quarterly 14/1 (Spring 2000), p. 24.

81. *Oeperet enim nos servare pharisae scripturæ sanctæ, et manere in verbis Spiritus sancti, ...* WA 42, 25-26; 25-24 (Lectures on Genesis, to Gen. 1:6). For Luther, the chapters are shared among various discursive regions. The meanings of the terms are, however, particular to the region on which they are used. Cf. Ibid., 35, 30-36 (to Gen. 1:14). In the theological region, the term “word” can denote either the uncreated word or a creature created by God. “Ad haec modum igitur vidimus Spiritum sanctum sanctamque Ecclesiam esse unam et sanctam, necpe quod Deus dicere contulit omnium et per omnem operatum est, et omnis eius opus sancta verba quasdam Dei, per omnem inimicum inimicum creat.” Ibid., 35, 37-40. Regarding the distinction between a Hebrew and a philosophical determination of time, cf. Ibid., 36, 7-11.

82. Soulen diagnoses the supercessionist trinitarian model as follows. “When the canon’s witness to the gospel is interpreted as the transcendental of the traditional trinitarian rule of faith (the one God is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit), God’s identity as the God of Israel is made ultimately dispensable for the purposes of articulating God’s eternal identity and God’s enduring and universal purposes for creation. What results is a patently gnosticizing account of the canon’s theological and narrative unity.” Soulen, p. 47.


84. WA 41, 82, 23-22.


86. In the sermon on Psalm 110:1, Luther claims that he writes the first letter with capital letters. “Dominus dixit.” Es ist unterschieden: ‘Pier’ 1. Mit grossen Buchstaben, ....” WA 41, 82, 4-5 (R). Luther underlines the same principle in “Von den letzten Worten Davida”, “Deus hie stehet der gross name Gottet Jehovah, den wir in unser Biblia mit diesen grossen Buchstaben Schreiben: HERR, zum unterschied der andern namen, ....” WA 45, 47, 4-6. See also Luther’s Prebace to the 1522 translation of the Old Testament in WADB 8, 19-28.


89. Ibid., 282, 14 (Dr). Cf. WA 39/II, 225, 3-4 (Docentura Disserationis Erasmii Alberici, Aug. 24, 1543, thesis 20).

90. Luther’s trinitarian hermeneutics is based on the distinction between speaker and addressees. “Und zwar, wer so viel versteht in der Schrift, ... das er merken kann, wo die Person eine von der andern redet, als wer mehr denn eine da, der hat bald erschen die unterscheid, welches das Vetores oder des Sons person ist, ....” WA 45, 85, 36-56, 4.

91. Luther: “Ein jeder meine die Propheten fur sich, lese mit voets drincken und mercke, wo der HERR von Jesus Christus, unterscheidet redet, oder wo aan voet te gedacht wordt .... Wo aber die Person nicht unterschiedlich sich mit reden offenbart, Das es scheinet keine mehr denn Eine person sein, Da magesta die Regel halten, droben geben, das du nicht unrecht trauer, wo du den names Jehovah deutet auf unserm HERRN, Jesum Christum, Gottes Son. ....” Ibid., 85, 29-51, 85, 20-23.
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91 Luther criticizes Jerome for translating the Hebrew "q" as the adjective "pure." Ibid., 299, 21-24.
92 Cf. Ibid., 299, 21-22, 298, 24.
93 Ibid., 299, 28-30.
94 The Psalm speaks, "Ipse est meum dilectum, meum purum, meum electum, quo unice gaudeo, meo hertz, mei frende." Ibid., 299, 31-32.
95 Cf. WA 45, 11, 18-14, 17.
97 Cf. WA 42, 18, 14-15 (Lectures on Genesis, to Gen. 1:5).
98 Against Augustine, Luther states that Moses spoke "literally, not allegorically or figuratively." Ibid., 5, 15-16 (Introduction).
99 Ibid., 18, 14.
100 Luther notes the distinction in the Hebrew that is not maintained by the Latin synonyms "homo" and "hominis." According to Luther, Moses uses the term "homo" meaning the spoken word, in order to expose the distinction between the one who speaks, the Father, and the word that is spoken, the Son. Cf. Ibid., 13, 19-29 (to Gen. 1:3).
101 See footnote 95.
102 Luther remarks on the familiarity of this verse in churches and monasteries. However, these words are "nullo modo intellecta, quod tam ponderosa sint et tam magnas res complectantur." WA 40/II, 242, 27-28.
103 Ibid., 242, 24-25. Luther translates the verse into German. "Ich will von einer solchen Weise predigen, dass der HERR zu mir gesagt hat, Du bist mein Sohn, Heute hab ich dich gezeugt." WADB 10/I, 109 (1545). The KJV reads, "I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee."
104 WA 40/II, 244, 30-31.
105 Ibid., 244, 33-34.
106 Cf. Ibid., 244, 35-37.
107 "(6) Ego autem constiuti Regem meum super Zion montem sanctum meas. (7a) Praedictabo statutum, (7b) quod DOMINUS ad me dixit: (7c) Filius meus Tu, Ego te hodie genui." Ibid., 244, 30-31. 242, 24-25.
108 The biblical text does not explicitly name this one who laughs at his enemies. Cf. Ibid., 218, 33-34 (to verse 4). In his remarks to verse six, Luther claims that the divine Majesty threatened to destroy all those who oppose God's word. Cf. Ibid., 234, 32-33.
109 Luther asks the familiar question of identity. "Quis enim est, qui dicit: Ego?" The answer is given as a question. "An non Dominus coelci et terrae, qui omnibus virtute verbi sui ex nilo condidit?" Ibid., 236, 22-23.
110 "Sed huissu Regis domus est ipsum coelest, ubi nec hominem nec Sataanae potestas aliquis valet." Ibid., 218, 31-32.
111 Luther shifts to the trinitarian language of Father when describing the relation of coequality between the two persons. "Sed hic Rex, Dominus postes Iesu Christi, immediato ab ipso Patre eterno ordinatur, ut Rex sit, et vocatur Rex Patre, seu a Patre constitutus Rex." Ibid., 236, 32-34.
112 "... sic sitem Psalmus hic inspiratus, Praedicat, narrare de Dei decreto." Ibid., 244, 22-23.
113 Ibid., 245, 37.
114 Cf. Ibid., 242, 28-29.
115 "Nam hic locus omnino de vocali praedicatione et non de spirituali intelligentia est." Ibid., 245, 26-27.
116 Cf. Ibid., 245, 16-17.
117 Cf. Ibid., 256, 26-31.
118 Luther claims that "hodie genui" can refer only to an event beyond time. "Est Deus extra tempus," ..." Ibid., 250, 34. Luther agrees with Augustine's comparison between the verb's past tense and the present tense implied by the adverb. The discussion concludes by asserting that in eternity, all things exist in the present tense. Cf. Ibid., 257, 21-27. See also a similar discussion on hodie genui in the Major disputation: WA 39/II, 293, 6-13.
119 WA 40/II, 257, 25.