

## Translation Strategies and Annotation Policies in two Maltese: Translations of Romans 3:1-8

Anthony Abela\*

### 1. Preliminaries

In this paper, the present writer means to study the contribution of the two main Bible translators of the twentieth century, Mgr. Prof. Peter Paul Saydon (1895-1969) and Mgr. Prof. Carmel Sant (1912-1992). The biography of these scholars has not been undertaken yet, and therefore the present writer cannot refer the readers of this paper to such publications; such biographies need to be written. Concerning the former, the monograph by Carmel Bezzina, *Saydon Biblista u Studjuż tal-Malti*<sup>1)</sup> in part fills this gap. But to the knowledge of the present writer, nothing or little has been written on the second.

This study forms part of a wider project, that of taking the cue from Mgr. Prof. Arthur Bonnici's paper "The Church and the Freedom of the Press in Malta"<sup>2)</sup> and Mgr. Prof. Peter Paul Saydon's own contribution to the history of Bible Translation in Maltese, his monograph, *History of the Maltese Bible*<sup>3)</sup>, and Prof. Sant's own papers gathered in his monograph *Bible Translation and Language*<sup>4)</sup> under the editorship of the present writer, and rewrite this history after due appreciation of the contribution of each translator to this translation tradition.<sup>5)</sup> In this essay we shall review both the translation strategies of the two

---

\* UBS Europ and the Middle East Area Translation Consultant, Part-time Professor of University of Malta.

1) Pubblikazzjoni Preca, Malta 2006.

2) *Melita Historica*, 2 (1957), 105-121. In this regard one should visit also his two other works, his pamphlet *Church and State In Malta 1800-1850*, Malta 1958 and his article "Protestant Propaganda in Malta 1800-1830", *Melita Theologica* XIII (1961), 6-64.

3) Malta 1957. This work has been republished by the present writer as an appendix in Carmel Sant's *Bible Translation and Language*, Malta 1992, 267-284.

4) *Melita Theologica Supplementary Series*, 2; Malta 1992.

5) The present writer acknowledges the influence of Rev Prof. Carlo Buzzetti's monograph *Traduzione e Tradizione. La Via dell'Uso-Confronto*, Edizioni Messagero, Padova 2001, on the present author's formulation of this concept, 'translation tradition history in Maltese'.

translators as they worked on this text as well as their annotation policies. The latter often reflects the translation strategies adopted by the translator, and in many ways they are two aspects of the same reality, and complement each other.

The reader would naturally ask how the present writer has arrived to the identification of 3:1-8 as a literary unit that may be isolated from its surroundings. As one would expect, the markers of delimitation and composition of the global literary unit which is the letter itself, the Letter to the Romans,<sup>6)</sup> are not external to the literary composition itself, they are linguistic features which are made to play a rhetorical function.<sup>7)</sup> This textual extension has been form critically defined as a diatribe, “a dialogical form of argumentation developed by ancient teachers ... in the Cynic schools of philosophy. It was a pedagogical discourse conducted in a lively debate and in familiar conversational style with an interlocutor. It was peppered with apostrophes, proverbs and maxims, rhetorical questions, paradoxes, short statements, parodies, fictitious speeches, antitheses, and parallel phrases.”<sup>8)</sup> The linguistic markers employed by Paul to delimit his discourse here include the interrogative particle τί followed by the conjunction οὐν which is described as ‘inferential and mainly transitional’<sup>9)</sup>: ‘What then?’ used in vv.1 and 9 where it marks the beginning of new paragraphs within the same discourse, and the adverb of time νυνὶ said to be further morphologically emphasized by the addition of the demonstrative suffix ι<sup>10)</sup> and followed by the particle δὲ ‘Now, then’ which is parsed as introducing a new section (3:21-4:25) within the letter after a general introduction (1:1-17), and a first part (1:18-3:20).<sup>11)</sup>

---

6) For the use of epistles in the Biblical world, cfr. Harry Gamble, “Letters in the New Testament and in the Greco-Roman world”, John Barton (ed.), *The Biblical World*, I (Routledge, London, 2001), 188-207

7) Roland Meynet’s essay on the ‘Relationships between linguistic Elements’ within a literary composition may be found useful. Cfr. Roland Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis. An Introduction to Biblical Rhetoric*, JSOT Supplementary Series 256 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 182-199.

8) Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, Anchor Bible, 33 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 91.

9) William F. Arndt & Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 597.

10) *Ibid.*, 548.

11) Cfr. Barclay M. Newman & Eugene A. Nida, *A Handbook on Paul’s Letter to the Romans* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1973), 64.

## 2. Romans 3:1-2

a) Paul opens his discussion in Romans 3 by allowing his imaginary opponent to formulate an objection to his final statement in the previous literary unit (at vv. 2:27-28). If the real Jew is the one who is inwardly such (expressed negatively: οὐ ἐν τῷ φανεροῦ), and true circumcision is spiritual not carnal (περιτομή καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι), what advantage is there in being an ethnic Jew? The interrogative particle τί syntactically linked to the nominal τὸ περισσὸν is further qualified by the conjunction οὖν, defined by Johannes Louw and Eugene A. Nida as a marker of result, often implying the conclusion of a process of reasoning, ‘so, so then, therefore, consequently, accordingly, then’.<sup>12)</sup> Versions and translations normally noticed and registered this link to what went before and at the same time the beginning of a new discussion. With 3:1 they normally start a new section, often marked also by a sub-title, but they also mark the link to what goes before in the text. ‘Then what advantage has the Jew?’ (NRSV, 1989); ‘What advantage, then, is there in being a Jew?’ (NIV, 1984); ‘Che cosa dunque ha in più il Giudeo?’ (LSB, 2008)<sup>13)</sup>.

The opening objection of Paul’s imaginary interlocutor within the letter and within this section is expressed in two parallel interrogative statements (v.1). One may speculate that the need of the second question: τίς ἡ ὠφελεία τῆς περιτομῆς linked to the previous question by the disjunctive particle ἢ, ‘or’, was felt by the speaker himself because the first question could be felt to be ambiguous: τί οὖν τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου:

The two questions may be experienced as perfect parallels as the genitival expressions τοῦ Ἰουδαίου and τῆς περιτομῆς suggest. If the second question was supposed to clarify what the first question really meant, this was perhaps due to the ambiguity of the subject of the first question, περισσὸν, which is the neuter nominative morphological form of the adjectival περισσοῦς which

12) J. Louw and E. A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, 1 (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), 89:50. In this manner while for Paul’s adversary Paul needs to return to his statement in 2:27-28. Paul sees this as a fitting introduction to the discussion he means to start in this chapter.

13) Abbreviations of Bible editions cited in this study: BE: *La Bible Expliquée* (2004); GNB: *Gute Nachricht Bibel* (1997); LSB: *La Sacra Bibbia* (2008); NBS: *La Nouvelle Bible Segond* (2002); REB: *The Revised English Bible* (1989).

according to Arndt & Gingrich, basically means ‘exceeding the usual number or size’(p.657). The word is often rendered as ‘advantage’ or even ‘privilege’.

The subject of the second question is the noun ἡ ὠφέλεια, sometimes written elsewhere ὠφελία, with the meaning ‘use, gain, advantage’; usually it requires the genitive of the linguistic elements it governs as we see here, τῆς περιτομῆς ‘use of circumcision’. This means therefore that the second question not only was supposed to make clear the first question, but it is also meant to narrow down the field of enquiry opened by the first question: the objector does not want Paul to discuss the advantages in general of being an ethnic Jew, but only the religious significance of being such; this religious aspect is represented by the issue of circumcision. “E qual è l’utilità della circoncisione?(LSB); “Or what is the value of circumcision?” (NRSV).

Paul’s answer to this double objection, originally was of one word: πολὺ, ‘Much’. But immediately he qualified his answer by an adverbial composite phrase, κατὰ πάντα τρόπον. The phrase κατὰ παντα is actually a fixed phrase meaning ‘in all respects’ which is then further qualified by the noun τροπος in the accusative morphological form as it enters under the governorship of the preposition κατά: ‘in every way’. The phrase maintains its emphatic role. Paul foresaw no manner in which Judaism could be seen under any negative light.

Paul then attempts to furnish the reader of his letter with motivations for his strong position; he initiates to describe a series of reasons, but in this paragraph he deals only with the first (πρῶτον) reason why for him ethnic Jews have advantages over non-Jews. The slight textual problems<sup>14)</sup> to which the γαρ within the brackets give rise to, testify to the uneasiness of the author himself or of that of later copyists at the unsmoothness of the sentence at this junction, as they felt this clause to be an explanation to the previous clause and hence in need of a causal link word to tie the forthcoming clause to the short general statement in verse 2. Probably the problem of the correctors of the manuscript was as to where to put the conjunction γαρ, especially in view of the presence in the text of anomalous μὲν without the δέ, for which reason it does not express contrast, and which could have been dropped by mistake or for some unknown

---

14) That were not worthy of note by the two standard textual commentaries, Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2000); and Roger L. Omanson, *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

motivation, thus rendering the grammatical structure of the clause not completely clear.<sup>15)</sup> For Paul, the first, or perhaps the main, reason which would give to the ethnic Jew's superiority over the non-Jew is that τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ have been entrusted (ἐπιστεύθησαν) to them.

A few comments: 1) It would appear that the subject of this clause is τὰ λόγια, the plural nominative neuter of the noun τό λόγιον, which originally meant a short saying originating from a divinity.<sup>16)</sup> What meant Paul by this word in this context? Authors differ on its precise meaning.<sup>17)</sup> Did Paul mean the word of God in some form as it was still in oral form? Or did he mean what Christians now call the OT? Fitzmyer thinks this latter meaning is to be preferred.<sup>18)</sup> However, the phrase itself does not make it clear at what stage of the traditional and redactional development the OT was by the time of Paul.<sup>19)</sup> Paul seems to be referring to the presence of the Word of God within the history of the Jewish people, whatever the form it may have reached in his time, and which was available in small and not so small manuscript forms which could be used by his addressees.<sup>20)</sup> For Paul, the presence of such word of God gave the Jews a clear advantage over non-Jews.

## 2.1. Romans 3:1-2 in Saydon and Sant's Translations

There exist four editions of Peter Paul Saydon's Bible Translation: there is the manuscript version which is still in the responsibility of the Malta Bible Society but which will soon be transferred to the responsibility of MUSEUM; there are pamphlet formats of the first edition published between 1929 and 1959; there is the elegant three volume second edition published by Librerija Preca in 1977, 1982 and 1990 under the general editorship of Rev Carmel Attard; and the one

---

15) Cfr. F. Blass & A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 232 paragraph 447.

16) Arndt & Gingrich, *Lexicon*, 477.

17) Cfr. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 326-327.

18) Ibid.

19) On this one may read Craig A. Evans, "The Scriptures of Jesus and His Early Followers", Lee Martin Macdonald & James A. Sanders, (eds.), *The Canon Debate* (Massachusetts: Hendrickson, Peabody, 2002), 185-195.

20) The present author refers the reader to his short reflection in "Short Exegetical Essays, 1: 2Tim 3:14-17", *Melita Theologica* 59/1 (2008) 37-44.

volume third edition also published by Librerija Preca in 1995. The present writer calls these different publications of the same Bible ‘editions’ because in each there are differences from the other ones which make each of these versions unique in several ways. So we have three editions of Saydon’s Bible beside the manuscript version. The changes made in each edition were meant mainly to make the text more user friendly with the readers of the late twentieth and the twenty first centuries.

The Bible of the Malta Bible Society had a long history as well. This translation was begun in the late sixties, with the earliest texts being translated for direct use in the liturgy of the Catholic Church; then when the liturgical texts were finished in the early seventies, the team, under the chairmanship of Rev Prof. Carmel Sant who was then the General Secretary of the Malta Bible Society and the Dean of the Faculty of Theology, continued with the translation of the entire Bible. This Bible was then published for the first time in book form in 1984. In its Preface (p.xi) by Sant we are informed who prepared the first draft of the various books of the Bible; but the final draft which we read in the published text was then the fruit of the work of the team of those biblical scholars and linguists who remained with Sant till the end, and of Sant’s editorial work. Sant is reputed to have prepared the first draft of Romans and hence we are attributing this translation to him although this text may have had a communitarian *Redaktiongeschichte* the reconstruction of which is for the time being beyond our means. For the Saydon version of the text of Romans we shall be using his first edition published in 1956 with the title *L-Ittri ta’ S. Pawl. L-Ittra lir-Rumani*<sup>21</sup>). As regards the translation, we shall not consult the later editions for the text; for the notes we may in part consult the second edition since there the notes were edited by Rev Fr Carmel Attard, and we need to distinguish Saydon’s policy for annotation from the contribution of Rev Attard.

In this section of the essay we shall describe and review the translation of both Saydon and Sant. For the latter’s translation we shall employ the 1984 edition which had two further successors since then, in 1996 and in 2004, under the editorship of the present writer. The Malta Bible Society is currently publishing the Fourth Edition (possibly 2009). In our study we shall review the translation strategies of each translator, his choices of vocabulary and syntax, the strength

---

21) Malta: The Empire Press, 1956

as well as the weaknesses of the final text in each case.

Saydon's rendering of the double question in Romans 3:1 is formal except for the constraints exercised by the receptor language. For instance, in the first question the subject is no longer the impersonal τὸ περισσὸν but 'the Jew'. *Mela xinhu ahjar il-Lhudi?* 'In what way is the Jew better?' 'He is better' means for Saydon that he has advantages or privileges. Of course, the statement is interrogative. The second question is formally closer in syntax to the Greek: *jew x'fejda fih il-htin?* The clause opens with the conjunction *jew*, 'or' that in the context introduces the second of the two alternative clauses, the second one being an explanation of the preceding alternative.<sup>22)</sup> This second clause has both a syntactical subject, which is the interrogative pronoun *xi* prefixed to the noun *fejda*, 'advantage', and the noun *il-htin*, literally 'the circumcision' because in Maltese the article is obligatory unless the noun is supposed to be indefinite. The noun *fejda* derives from root FJD and the verb *fied* which carries three possible meanings: to contribute to one's advantage, to prove useful or lucrative; to leave a profit, to prove lucrative, useful; to overflow.<sup>23)</sup> The first of the three meanings fit our context. The noun *htin* derives from the root HTN which appears fully in the lexeme *haten* that may be read both as a noun with the meaning of a kinsman or relative by marriage to the bride or bridegroom<sup>24)</sup>, or as a verb with the meaning of 'to circumcise'. *Htin* or *hatna* are the nouns from such root and verb, and mean 'circumcision'. While the noun for a relative by marriage, in its various morphological forms, is relatively commonly used, *htin* for circumcision is barely used in modern Maltese, also because this operation is rarely made in Maltese culture unless it is medically required. And in such cases, the modern noun *ćirkonćizjoni*, borrowed from Italian, is employed.

The version of Prof. Carmel Sant differs from that of Saydon on a number of scores. One main difference concerns translating the singular τοῦ Ἰουδαίου 'of the Jew' by the communitarian 'the Jews': *x'ghandhom iktar il-Lhud*, what do Jews have more? Sant kept the same connective *Mela* of Saydon to link this new paragraph to the previous. *Mela* renders the conjunction οὐν but comes first in the clause. For the rendering of the adjective περισσὸν Sant employs a different

22) Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, I, Midsea Books, Malta 1987, 599.

23) *Ibid.*, 335.

24) *Ibid.*, 519.

verbal structure. Instead of the existential clause *x'inhu ahjar il-Lhudi*, 'in what way is the Jew better?' Sant employs a construction made up of the preposition *ghand* + the possessive suffixes here the third masculine plural *-hom*, and means among other things, 'to have, possess'. Prof. Aquilina cites this idiomatic sentence: *ghandi ktieb li inti m'ghandekx bhalu*, 'I have got a book the like of which you have not got.'<sup>25)</sup> In our text the verb is governed by the interrogative pronoun *x'*<sup>26)</sup> *Iktar* or *aktar* is the comparative of an unused adjective *katir* from the verbal root *kotor*, 'to abound, increase'.<sup>27)</sup> Here it is used as a substantive: 'What more do the Jews have?' It is very difficult to say which of the two constructions, Saydon's or Sant's, is better. Probably Sant's version is better understood by modern Maltese speakers although Saydon's constitutes good classical Maltese.

The second colon of this verse is rendered as follows in Sant's version: *jew x'tiswielhom ic-cikoncizjoni?* Here we have the linking word *jew* as in Saydon's and the interrogative pronoun *x'*. Sant translates the noun ἡ ὀφέλεια by the verb *tiswielhom* which is a complex form of the verb *sewa* that basically means 'to cost, to be worth so much' but which idiomatically covers a number of other shades of meaning.<sup>28)</sup> Two of these probably fit our text: 'to cost in terms of result, consequences': *il-ghlieda switilna rebha*, 'the fight brought us victory'; 'to be useful', *lomm id-dar tiswa hafna*, 'a mother is very useful in her home'. These two nuances probably both fit our text but the first may be closer to what Paul meant. One should note that Sant does not use the nominal *htin* for circumcision but the modern noun *cirkoncizjoni*, in Maltese orthography, of course, and the article.<sup>29)</sup>

### (1) Verse 2:

The answer to the general question(v.2) in verse 1 is translated by Saydon and Sant in almost identical manner: *Hafna b'kull mod* (Saydon); *Hafna u b'kull mod* (Sant). Apparently, the only difference between the two translations is the addition of the conjunction *u* in Sant's rendering. But the addition of this

25) *Maltese-English Dictionary*, II, 967.

26) Cfr. Cremona, *Tagħlim fuq il-Kitba Maltija*, 221.

27) Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, I, 693-694.

28) *Ibid.*, II, 1300-1311.

29) For the colouring of the article's [l] as [ʎ] cfr. Cremona, *Tagħlim*, 212, paragraph 503.



conjunction in Sant's version means that while for Saydon the adverbial phrase *κατὰ πάντα τρόπον* stands in apposition to the adverbial *πολὺ*, in Sant's version it is parsed as a second alternative answer. Sant intensifies the answer in two ways. Circumcision was not simply useful for the Jew (this is what the Greek original and Saydon's translation imply). Sant's rendering implies that circumcision was not simply very useful, but also very useful in many dimensions. In Saydon the second intensification is included in, and explains the first intensification. In Sant's, the second intensification constitutes a second idea. The fact that in Greek the phrase *κατὰ πάντα τρόπον* stands in apposition to *πολὺ*, makes Saydon's parsing and translation more precise and probably closer to the Greek text.

The explicative part of Paul's answer (v.3b) is introduced in Greek by the adverbial phrase *πρῶτον μὲν* which both Saydon and Sant rendered by an adverb in Maltese: *l-ewwelnett*, (Saydon), *qabel xejn*<sup>30)</sup>, (Sant). The two adverbial phrases may be considered as synonyms<sup>31)</sup> with the meaning 'first of all' even if they may not be totally synonymous, as the second may also mean 'above all'. Romans 3:2 is one of those texts where Paul begins with *πρῶτον μὲν* without continuing the series.<sup>32)</sup> If this was a conscious use of the construction, the adverb was meant to emphasise the contents introduced rather than to enumerate the series of the elements. What characterises the Jewish people for Paul was the presence of the *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ* translated as *it-tahbir ta' Alla*(Saydon), *Forakli ta' Alla* (Sant).

A few comments on Saydon's and Sant's translation of the clause *πρῶτον μὲν [γὰρ] ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*. This causal clause has *τὰ λόγια* qualified by the genitival phrase *τοῦ θεοῦ* for subject. Saydon rendered this headword by *tahbir* while Sant chose the word *orakli* to render it in Maltese. According to B. Klappert<sup>33)</sup> the lexeme *τὸ λόγιον* is the diminutive of the adjectival *λόγιος* with the meaning 'formed, instructed' and originally meant

30) According to the latest decisions of the National Council for the Maltese Language, these two words should now be written as one lexeme, *qabelxejn*, Il-Kunsill Nazzjonali ta' l-Ilsien Malti, *It-Triq lejn Decizjonijiet dwar il-Varjanti Ortografici*, 1(25/7/2008), 15.

31) Cf. Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, II, 1100.

32) Arndt & Gingrich, *Lexicon*, 733.

33) 'Logos' in L. Coenen & E. Beyreuter & H. Bietenhard, (eds.), *Dizionario dei Concetti Biblici del Nuovo Testamento*, EDB, Bologna1976, 1175-1200, 1190.

‘short word, oracle’. This in part accounts for Sant’s choice of the word; he saw it as a technical term. But one should note that this word in Greek occurs only four times in the NT: Acts 7:38; Romans 3:2; Hebrew 5:12; 1Peter 4:11. A comparison between the ways the two translators deal with the phrase in these texts may give rise to some interesting observations:

	Saydon	Sant
Acts 7:38	<i>kliem tal-hajja</i>	<i>kliem il-hajja</i>
Rom 3:2	<i>tahbir</i>	<i>orakli</i>
Heb 5:12	<i>kelmict ta’ Alla</i>	<i>kelma ta’ Alla</i>
1Pt 4:11	<i>I-kliem ta’ Alla</i>	<i>I-kliem ta’ Alla</i>

From this panorama it would appear that Sant followed closely the exegesis of Saydon at least in the translation of these texts, but then rendered slightly differently the verbatim rendering of his teacher. In Acts 7:38 Sant prefers the construct state to the genitive by the particle *ta’*; in Romans 3:2 Sant prefers the more recent *orakli* to the semitic *tahbir* on the supposition that the former is better known, is technical, and is probably better understood by speakers of Maltese in the late twentieth century. In Hebrew 5:12 Sant opts for the singular *kelma ta’ Alla* to Saydon’s plural *kelmict*. In 1Peter 4:11 Sant’s is a verbatim reconstruction of Saydon’s, where this phrase is concerned. If it proves nothing else, Romans 3:2 shows clearly Sant’s strategy vis-à-vis the text of his predecessor: at least in these four texts Prof. Sant adopted the exegesis of Prof. Saydon. But was this the better decision he could have made?

The translation of the term τὰ λόγια by the term *tahbir* is not without its problems. Saydon presumes that the noun derives from the verbal root of the II form *habbar*, ‘to announce (good or bad news), foretell, proclaim’. But according to Aquilina, the nominal *tahbir* or *tahbir* is semantically narrower as it means ‘presage, presentiment, premonition, foreboding, prediction, omen’.<sup>34)</sup> The nuance ‘to announce’ is missing from this list. There exists instead a noun derived from the passive of the II form *habbar*, *thabbar*, the nominal *thabbir*, meaning ‘announcing’.<sup>35)</sup> But it would seem that Saydon presumed his noun derives from the first root listed above. When we take the formal resemblance in

34) *Maltese-English Dictionary*, I, 464.

35) *Ibid.*, 465.

pronunciation between *tahbir* and *tehbir* one immediately senses the danger in which Saydon leads his readers. Saydon would not have wanted to write that the advantage of the ethnic Jews was in that they were entrusted with the ‘premonitions of God’ (see the note to verse 3). He meant to say ‘announcements’ by *tahbir* as the note to verse 2 shows: “In their hands were entrusted the announcements by God not only the announcement of the Messiah, but all that there is in the OT: this is the mission of the Jewish people in God’s work for our salvation.”

Saydon’s text therefore proved to be ambiguous and this may explain Sant’s departure from his policy of employing Saydon’s vocabulary in his own translation. Instead of *tahbir ta’ Alla* Sant renders the Greek phrase under study by *Iorakli ta’ Alla*. But does *orakli* serves its purpose?

The noun *oraklu* (singular) *orakli* (plural) hails into Maltese directly from Italian: *oracolo*, ‘oracle’<sup>36</sup>), the first meaning of which, according to *The New Collins Dictionary and Thesaurus*<sup>37</sup>) is ‘a prophecy revealed through the medium of a priest or a priestess at the shrine of a god’, while the subsequent meanings involve the shrine and the person through whom the prophecy is given. In Maltese, the term *oraklu* seems to apply mainly to the person who is responsible for the saying rather to the saying itself. Aquilina cites one saying to explain what this word means in Maltese: *Meta jitkellem huk, qisu qed jitkellem Ioraklu* (‘when your brother speaks he does so with the authority of an oracle’). Besides, when this meaning of *orakli* is applied to our text, the OT prophetic background needs to be taken into account. Unfortunately, we shall not be able to define better from this phrase alone the grade of development of the OT prophecy tradition meant by the writer. Does he mean the prophetic tradition in its oral stage alone, or in its oral together with the written stages of this tradition? In view of this difficulty of identifying the precise nuance of the lexeme λόγια, the present writer would prefer to translate the phrase τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ in this text by *il-kelmiet ta’ Alla* ‘the words of God’.

The verbal element of the clause’s predicate in Greek, the verb ἐπιστεύθησαν, which is aorist passive of the verb πιστεύω creates a number of

36) According to Aquilina it was first registered as part of Maltese vocabulary by S. Mamo in his *English-Maltese Dictionary*, Malta 1885. Cfr. Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, II, 1017.

37) Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers, 1992, 696.

problems. Basically, this verb means ‘to believe’ but a secondary meaning developed, ‘to entrust’. Which is the subject of the verb in this clause? Apparently, it has been taken by translation tradition, not only Maltese, to be the phrase τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ: ‘quidem quia credita sunt illis eloquia Dei’ (Vulgate); ‘unto them were committed the oracles of God’ (NIV); ‘a loro sono state affidate le parole di Dio (LSB); ‘...c’est à eux que les paroles de Dieu ont été confiées’ (NBS); ‘... God’s messages were spoken to the Jews’ (CEV). Our two translations in Maltese followed this traditional parsing: Saydon: *lilhom merħi t-taħbir ta’ Alla*, Sant: *lilhom kienu fdati l-orakli ta’ Alla*. One should note though that Saydon’s is a participial clause with the verbal element of the predicate expressed by the passive participle *merħi* from the verb *reħa* which basically means ‘to let go’ but it can also mean ‘to leave something into someone’s trust (*erħi f’idejja* ‘leave the matter into my hands’). This verb is used for the nuance ‘entrusted’ only in certain contexts; but the present writer has some doubts whether this context where God entrusts his words to his own people would allow for the use of this verb. This exegesis had to provide the beneficiary of the action in the clause which the original in Greek was believed to have dropped as the context would make it easy to identify. But the dropping of the beneficiary, as well as the resilience of the verb πιστεῦω which allows the beneficiary to become the subject of the passive tense of the verb, made some translators think that an alternative parsing is not impossible. ‘The Jews were entrusted with the word of God’ (NRSV). In this case, the subject is taken to have been encoded in Greek within the morphology of the passive verb ἐπιστεύθησαν, but in translation it needs to be made explicit as in the NRSV text. Our two Maltese translators preferred to make explicit the beneficiary, *lilhom*, referring back to ‘the Jews’ while the phrase τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ is translated as the subject of the clause.

Actually there exists another possibility: the verb *fada* ‘to trust, show confidence in, to be sure of’ in Maltese allows for a syntactical construction very similar to what we have in Greek. The verb πιστεῦω in the passive carries the meaning of someone who has been entrusted with something by someone. In the First Letter of Clement we find the expression οἱ πιστευθέντες παρὰ θεοῦ ἔργον τοιοῦτο ‘those who have been entrusted by God of such work’. The participle πιστευθέντες governs the object<sup>38</sup>) in the accusative ἔργον τοιοῦτο.

In our text what is missing is the phrase who tells who entrusted the Jews with the word of God. It is dropped because this source of the privilege is clear enough and needs not to be stated. In Maltese we have the possibility of a similar structure. The verb *fada* allows ‘the Jews’ to be the subject of the new clause where the verb remains passive but where the verb governs the object, which remains the phrase τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, *il-kelmiet ta’ Alla* (where *kelmiet* is a plural of unities that may be counted<sup>39</sup>) through a different preposition, *bi*. The subject has to be emphatic: *huma kienu li ġew afdati bil-kelmiet ta’ Alla*. ‘they were the ones who were entrusted with the words of God.’ In this manner, the focus remain ‘the Jews’ and not the ‘words of God’ which constitute the reason for saying that the Jews enjoyed an advantage other people did not have.

## 2.2. Saydon and Sant’s Annotation policies for Romans 3:1-2

### (1) Crude facts

While Saydon introduced a note for each of verses 1 & 2, Sant allowed no notes at all for the entire chapter 3. How are we to explain this different behaviour between the two translators where annotation is concerned? Probably, this sharp difference in annotation, even with regards to these two verses depend upon the general policies which guided the two translators in their translation as a whole.

In a general comment he wrote as introduction to his entire translation project, and which was published as *Kelmtejn qabel*, introduction, with the publication of the Genesis pamphlet in 1929, p.viii, Prof. Saydon explained his annotation policy:

*Biex il-qari tal-Kotba Mqaddsa jkun tal-akbar fejda għal kulhadd, kemm ukoll biex inhares tusjiet il-Knisja, židt f’qiegħ kull faċċata tifsir žgħir, kemm jenħtieġ biex wiehed jaqra u jifhem. Qegħidt ukoll quddiem kull wiehed mill-kotba madħal žgħir, biex nuri min kiteb dak il-ktieb u f’liema žmien kitbu, u fuqxiex jithaddet il-ktieb. B’hekk aktar inhaffef f’hem il-ktieb,*

‘So that the reading of the Holy Scriptures be useful to one and all, as also to follow the instructions of the Church, I added at the bottom of

38) Arndt & Gingrich, *Lexicon*, 667.

39) Cfr. Cremona, *Tagħlim fuq il-Kitba Maltija*, 182-183.

each page short notes, as much as were necessary so that one reads and understands. Before every book I wrote also a short introduction, in which I show who wrote that book and in which age he wrote it, as well as what the contents of the book are. This was meant to add to the understanding of the text.’

From this comment one may conclude that Saydon’s notes were ‘reader oriented’: he wanted to make sure that his readers understand the text in the right manner. He mentions, besides, that this was the Church’s policy and that he wrote these notes also to abide by this policy. One understands that his abiding by this policy was not merely formal. In compliance with this policy, Saydon wrote a note for every verse of Romans 3 although for verses 10-18 he also wrote a global note (likewise on vv. 25-26) before touching on every one of these verses (cfr. p.9).

In the *Preżentazzjoni* to the 1984 edition of *Il-Bibbja* (p.x), Prof. Sant described the annotation policy the translation team that catered for the edition followed:

*Dahhalna żewġ xorta ta’ noti mfassla minni fil-qosor kemm jista’ jkun: l-ewwel introduzzjoni qasira għal kull ktieb; u t-tieni noti fil-qiegħ tal-paġna b’taġhrif ta’ kritika testwali, ġeografiku, arkeoloġiku, storiku, u teoloġiku... Dawn in-noti jservu biex jgħinu ’l- qarrej isegwi r-rakkont jew li-ħsieb tal-awtur sagru; ma kellna ebda ħsieb li niktbu kummentarju shih.*

‘We introduced two types of notes that were prepared by me; these notes were as short as possible. We wrote a short introduction to each book; secondly, we added at the bottom of each page notes with text critical, geographical, archaeological, historical and theological information... These notes serve to help the reader to follow the narrative or the thought of the sacred writer; we had no plan to write a complete commentary of the Bible’.

Prof. Sant informs readers that it was he himself who prepared these notes at the bottom of each page. These notes were text oriented, that is, were meant to help the text achieve the communication act it was meant to achieve but which would not have succeeded because of the time distance between it and the target audience of the translation. The notes provide supplementary information to the text of the translation which would thus ease its readability. The contents of

these notes may involve text critical, geographical, archaeological, historical, and theological information about parts of the text. The general editor of *Il-Bibbja* made it clear that the team never meant to write a complete commentary of the text.

Some general conclusions may be drawn about the two translations, concentrating on the text of Romans 3:1-2. Saydon's general policy forced him to enter a note on each of the two verses under study. On verse 1 he notes:

*Pawlu qal li pagan tajjeb ahjar minn Lhudi hazin. U madakollu l-Lhud, bhala poplu ta' Alla, kellhom hafna privileggi. X'jiswew dawn il-privileggi? Din hija l-mistoqsija li Pawlu jisthajjel maghmula minn Lhudi milqut minn kliem Pawlu.*

Paul said that a good pagan was better than a bad Jew. And yet the Jews as the people of God had several privileges. What was the value of these privileges? This is the question that Paul imagines being put to him by some Jew who has been impressed by Paul's own words'.

On verse 2 he annotates:

*Pawlu jwiegeb: Il-privileggi tal-Lhud jibqghu. U fost dawn il-privileggi jsemmi wiehed biss. F'idejhom merhi t-tahbir ta' Alla li hu mhux biss it-tahbir tal-Messija, imma kull ma hemm miktub fil-Kotba tar-Rabta l-Qadima: hu l-missjoni tal-poplu Lhudi fl-opra tal-fidwa taghna.*

Paul answers: the privileges of the Jews remain. And of these privileges he mentions only one. In their hands have been entrusted the announcements of God, not simply the announcement of the Messiah but all that is written in the Books of the Old Testament: it is the mission of the Jewish people in the work of our redemption'.

One should note here that: 1) That the note for verse 1 is rather a verbatim reformulation of the verse. The note for verse 2 contains more information than is contained in the verse itself: the meaning of *tahbir*, 'announcements', which for Saydon is wider than what is meant by messianic prophecies. The word *tahbir*, 'announcements' comprised all that exists in the books of the Old Testament: it is the mission of the Jewish people in the work of 'our redemption'. 2) Saydon therefore looks at the OT from the perspective of the OT

prophecy. 3) His notes are audience oriented in the sense he wants to ensure that the text of the translation is interpreted correctly, and that the reader would not venture upon another interpretive path. 4) Prof. Sant offers no notes upon these two verses taking for granted that his readers could interpret the text of the translation without difficulty, and that the text alone succeeds to communicate its message without props. He sees no reason, for instance, for introducing a note on the literary genre of ‘diatribe’. Sant did not feel the need to explain the meaning of *orakli* in verse 2 notwithstanding its ambiguity in Maltese, as we have seen.

### 3. Romans 3:3-4

Strictly speaking the writer of the letter offers no linguistic props that would justify isolating these verses as a subunit, a paragraph. Our delimitation is editorial and is mainly based upon contents and the syntactical forms used by writer. Paul’s imagined interlocutor puts a general question (v.3) to which Paul reacts (v.4). The interlocutor raises the issue as to whether the negative response of some (τινες) Jews to the mystery of salvation as concretised in Jesus Christ would not tie God’s hands as to the validity of the privileges mentioned in v.1. Paul excludes in an absolute manner such possibility on the logical level: μη γένοιτο, ‘Far be it!’ ‘God forbid!’ Paul borrowed this expression from the LXX Greek. In the LXX it is used to translate the exclamatory חַלִּילָהּ (Gen 44:7)<sup>40</sup> and Paul makes relatively frequent use of it in his argumentation.<sup>41</sup> Paul opposes a strong refusal of the argument put forward by his imagined interlocutor who seems to suggest that the privileges of the Jews stopped being so since the Jews or at least some of them refused to believe in Jesus. For Paul such argument cannot in anyway work: “God’s fidelity is not measured by human fidelity—this idea is basic in Paul’s teaching on uprightness. God is always upright and will justify Israel (3:26).”<sup>42</sup>

40) BDB, 321. cfr. also F. Blass & A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), 384.

41) Cfr. A. J. Malherbe, “*Μὴ γένοιτο* in the Diatribe and Paul” *Harvard Theological Studies*, 73 (1980), 231-240.



Next come two emphatic and contrasting statements where the subject ὁ θεός; ‘God’, stands in contrast to the subject πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ‘all men’, or ‘every man’ if one sees Paul’s statement being based upon human individual experience; there stand in contrast also the headwords in the predicate of the two clauses governed by the imperative γινέσθω, the adjectives ἀληθῆς predicated of ‘God’ and ψεύστης predicated of ‘every man’. For Paul, God is necessarily ‘true’ and all men are necessarily ‘liars’ because this is declared as such by Scripture. The proof from Scripture though comes next. One should note that Paul is here making different uses of the biblical texts. In the first half of verse 4 he formulates his own thought making use of Psalm 116:2 while he creates *ex novo* a first half of what Paul wanted to appear as a bicolon. The whole bicolon is governed by the imperative γινέσθω. The second colon is πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης ‘every man is a liar’, which Paul found ready in the Septuagint version of Psalm 116:2. This general statement is made to stand as the opposite of a similar statement in the first colon: ὁ θεός ἀληθῆς ‘God is (surely) truthful’. This is what Paul means to underline, the absolute veracity of God’s word. The adverbial ‘surely’ may be gleaned from the context, especially from the governance of the clause by the verb γινέσθω. Although Paul is using verbatim the Scripture text of Psalm 116:2 even in formulating these two truths, he seems to pretend that the bicolon is entirely his own formulation. As a matter of fact he introduces the citation formula καθὼς γέγραπται ‘as it has been written’, just after this double statement.

How was verse 4a treated by versions and translations? Just a sample of modern translations which reflect identical strategies: ‘By no means! Although everyone is a liar, let God be proved true, as it is written...’ (NRSV); ‘Certainly not! God must be true though all men be proved liars, for we read in scripture...’ (REB); ‘Jamais de la vie! Plutôt, que Dieu soi vrai et tout être humain menteur, ainsi qu’il est écrit’ (NBS); ‘Auf keinen Fall! Vielmehr wird sich am Ende herausstellen, daß Gott zuvertässig ist, die Menschen aber samt und sonders versagt haben!.... (GNB). Even from this short list it becomes clear that the entire half verse 4a is being taken as Paul’s text and words, without noticing if not in notes that the second statement is a verbatim reproduction<sup>43)</sup> of the LXX

42) Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 327.

43) It is not a case of simple allusion (contra Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 328).

version of part of Psalm 116:2. In this case we have here another instance of a composite citation where only part is referred to the original writer while the entire citation is referred to only one author (another such case is Mk 1:2-3<sup>44</sup>). Paul considers the whole text of verse 4a as his own because he composes the first statement about the truthfulness of God while he takes the second statement about the untruthfulness of mankind from Psalm 116:2 in its LXX version.

The rest of verse 4 consists of the biblical text upon which Paul bases his theological construction; it is introduced by the citation formula *καθὼς γεγραπται*

Ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς σου  
καὶ νικήσεις ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαι σε

Paul uses the citation to sustain his point that God is absolutely trustworthy. This citation is taken from Psalm 50:6 in its LXX version<sup>45</sup>; Paul cites this text almost verbatim except for a slight change. In the LXX version the verbs of the *ὅπως ἂν* clause are both in the subjunctive mood: *δικαιωθῆς* and *νικήσης*; Paul changes the mood of the second verb into the indicative future active, *νικήσεις*.<sup>46</sup> By this alteration Paul seems he wanted to ensure that the citation ‘proves’ his statement in verse 4a by enhancing the declarative character of the citation.

### 3.1. Romans 3:3-4 in Saydon and Sant’s translations

#### (1) τί γαρ

Peter Paul Saydon rendered this interrogative marker literally as if it was an interrogative statement: *Xinhu mela?* ‘what is it then?’ The cluster *xinhu* is

44) “Although it is defined as a citation of Isaiah, Is 40:3 is present only in verse 3; verse 2b is a mixed citation of Mal 3:1 and Ex 23:20; and it has its parallel in Mt 11:10/Lk 7:27 (Q tradition)…” Joachim Gnllka, *Marco*, trans. Gianni Poletti, Cittadella Editrice, Assisi <sup>2</sup>1987, 37

45) cfr. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 328

46) One should note that according to Fitzmyer, *Ibid.*, a number of mss have harmonized back Paul’s text to make it agree with the LXX subjunctive mood reading. This would prove that this variant is to be considered of certain importance and it is a pity that the textual commentaries of Metzger and Omanson have not deemed it worth mentioning.

actually the personal pronoun *hu/huwa* ‘he’ ‘it’ which assumes this form whenever it is found in interrogative scenarios, and it is preceded by the interrogative pronoun *xi* ‘what’ or the particle *kif* ‘how’ in questions and statements?<sup>47)</sup> Saydon combines *xinhu* to the adverbial *mela* ‘then’. These two lexemes are often combined to render exclamations that denote strong agreement or disagreement: *mela xinhu!* ‘Of course...!’ Saydon though inverts the order of the two lexemes to create a different effect: an emphatic statement though this expression is only loosely linked to the contents that follow it. Was Saydon’s attempt at literally translating the interrogative τί γάρ; really effective? Do τί γάρ and *xinhu mela* behave in the same manner in interrogative contexts? The present writer has his doubts about this. Sant decided to lessically ignore this interrogative marker, and translates the main statement straightaway: *X’jimporta jekk xi whud minnhom ma emmnux?* ‘What does it matter if some of them have not believed?’ but here we are already on the first main question.

## (2) εἰ ἠπιστησάν τινες...

The construction is basically a conditional clause<sup>48)</sup> where the protasis has taken place while the apodosis cannot take place because of God’s nature. In this discourse the author employs also word play. Saydon proceeds with his literal translation: *Jekk x’uhud ma emmnux, jaqaw jista’ n-nuqqas ta’ twemmin taghhom jaghmel fiergha l-emienna ta’ Alla?* ‘If some of them did not believe, will their lack of faith nullify the faithfulness of God?’ Comments: i) The literality of Saydon’s rendering of the text comprised choosing a rare word to render the noun πίστιν which in the context does not mean ‘faith’ as it normally has in the NT and early Christian literature.<sup>49)</sup> Instead πίστις in this context carries the meaning of ‘faithfulness, fidelity’ and πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ where τοῦ θεοῦ (of God) is not the object of the act of faith (as ἡ πίστις τοῦ ὀνοματι αὐτοῦ, ‘faith in his name’ (Act 3:16; cfr., Phil 1:27)<sup>50)</sup>, but the subject of the act of faithfulness, refers to the faithfulness of God. This translator recognised both

47) Cfr. Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, I, 460.

48) For a discussion of such clauses in NT Greek one may consult Eric G. Jay, *New Testament Greek. An Introductory Grammar* (London: SPCK, 1958), 227-231.

49) Arndt & Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 668-670.

50) *Ibid.*, 669.

the precise meaning of πίστιν as well as the use of word play. For this reason he chooses to translate this term through the word *emiēna* which Erin Serracino Inglott, the compiler of one of the two current dictionaries in Maltese, described as ‘not popular’.<sup>51)</sup> Serracino Inglott furnishes us with further several pieces of information: a) that the nominative singular reads *amiēna* but he recognises Saydon’s reading of the word as *emiēna*.<sup>52)</sup> b) The word derives from an Arabic root meaning ‘loyauté, bonne foi, sincérité’<sup>53)</sup> c) The word does not derive from the same root as the verb *emmen*, ‘to believe’<sup>54)</sup>, even though the two words are homonyms and serve the same purpose as the Greek words ἠπίσθησάν, ἀπιστία, and πίστιν in the same verse. Paul is using word play to underline his point. d) The word *emiēna* according to Prof. Aquilina means ‘state of faithfulness, loyalty, fidelity’.<sup>55)</sup> The choice of this rare word instead of more common terms was dictated by Saydon’s policy of keeping to only Malti safi ‘pure Maltese’: *barrejt ukoll dak il-kliem kollu ta’ nisel barrani, li daħal fil-Malti bla xejn ma naħteġuh* ‘I avoided all those words of foreign origin that entered Maltese without there being a need for them’.<sup>56)</sup>

Sant’s exegesis of this verse is almost identical to that of Saydon, but Sant differs from Saydon in the syntax of his translation: the vocabulary chosen, and the sentence structure, as well as the exegesis of certain words in the Greek text. *X’jimporta jekk xi whud minnhom ma emmnux? Jaqaw l-infedeltà tagħhom sa ġġib fix-xejn il-fedeltà ta’ Alla?* ‘What does it matter if some of them failed to believe? Will their unfaithfulness bring to naught the faithfulness of God?’ Comments: a) As one can see, Sant expressed the same thought but in two interrogative clauses. His is a much more dynamic translation of the text than Saydon’s. b) Instead of the difficult and rare lexeme *emiēna* employed by Saydon, Sant uses the more commonly used by Maltese speakers towards the end of the twentieth century, *fedeltà*, ‘faithfulness’ derived from Italian, and thus according to Saydon, it is ‘foreign’ and hence had to be barred from his

51) *Il-Miklem Malti*, I, Klabb Kotba Maltin, Malta 1975, 29.

52) It seems that Saydon has written a short study on this word in the review *Lchen il-Malti* 3/1938.

53) For this derivation Seracino Inglott cites Kazimirski de Biberstein, *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français*, Paris 1860.

54) As Prof Aquilina suggests in his dictionary *Maltese-English Dictionary*, I, 278.

55) *Ibid.*

56) ‘Kelmejn qabel’ *Ktieb il-Ġenesi*, The Empire Press, Malta 1929, viii.

vocabulary, while Sant used the vocabulary employed by the people in its daily use of the language.<sup>57)</sup> c) One should note that the Greek lexeme ἄπιστία in the text is translated differently by Saydon and Sant. Saydon rendered by the phrase *n-nuqqas ta' twemmien tagħhom*, ‘their lack of belief’ or ‘their unbelief’, while Sant renders the same word by the term *infedeltà tagħhom*, ‘their unfaithfulness’. Who is right in this context? If as we have seen πίστιν in this verse needs to be rendered by ‘faightfulness’, ἄπιστία, which is seen by the speaker/author as the opposite of πίστιν, must be rendered as ‘unfaithfulness’; hence Sant’s translation is superior and more precise than that of Saydon in this instance. May be Sant wanted to correct Saydon in this text.

### (3) μὴ γένοιτο

One should note that this strong negative assertion is found at the end of verse 3 in Saydon and the beginning of verse 4 in Sant. It is possible that Saydon is following the form critical observation that μὴ γένοιτο in the LXX usually translates the Hebrew לֹא יִלְלֵהוּ לִי, ‘far be it from me!’ that is usually followed by a longer sentence (cfr. Gen 44:7.17). But in Paul himself and in some other representatives of the early Christian literature, this expression which is considered as a negative oath, is found in dialogue where it is not part of a larger sentence.<sup>58)</sup> Therefore Saydon was not justified to change even if slightly the versification of the text in the standard texts.

More or less the two translators rendered this strong expression in the same manner, with a slight difference though. Saydon rendered it in this way: *Ma jkun qatt dan!* ‘May this never be’. Sant leaves out the final demonstrative pronoun *dan*: ‘God forbid!’ Saydon links this oath strictly to the context while Sant leaves in its general formulation. The present writer thinks Sant’s formulation is stronger than Saydon’s, and preferable.

57) But cfr. also Fitzmyer’s comments in *Romans*, 327. This is how Sant described his translation in the introduction to the first edition of the MBS Bible: *Fi ftit kliem din hi traduzzjoni ġdida xjentifika fl-isien tal-poplu mirqum skond is-sengħa letterarja, Il-Bibbja*, Malta Bible Society/Media Centre, Malta 1984, p. x [‘In brief, this is new translation, done on a scientific basis, in the parlance of the people (and) worked out according to literary art’...]

58) Cfr. verses 6.31; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 327-328; A. J. Malherbe, “*Mé genoito* in the Diatribe and in Paul”, *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980), 231-240.

**(4) γινέσθω δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής...**

The imperative γινέσθω which in NT Greek carries the meaning of optative<sup>59</sup>) is rendered by both Saydon and Sant by the jussive in Maltese<sup>60</sup>) though their translation strategy differs somewhat. Saydon's is formally closer to the Greek text: *Ikun Alla maghruf Alla tas-sewwa*. 'Let God be known as God of truth'. In this translation ὁ θεὸς is parsed as both the subject of

the verb γινέσθω and as the subject of the relative clause 'God is truthful' which appears without the relative pronoun to introduce it. The emphatic γινέσθω is rendered by the emphatic *ikun maghruf* even though the concept 'be known' is only implied in Greek. Saydon parsed the second clause πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης as being governed also by γινέσθω although again the relative pronoun *li* is dropped: *u kull bniedem giddieb*. 'and [that] every man is a liar'. One should also note that although the second statement is in Saydon coordinated with the first through the conjunction *u*, in Greek the second statement is separated from the first by the asyndeton. Is Saydon's the right parsing and exegesis?

There are three indications that may show that this second clause is not meant by Paul to be governed by the verb γινέσθω: there is first of all the asyndeton that separates the second statement from the first; then, as we have shown, this second clause is a verbatim citation from the LXX version of Psalm 116:2, and as such, for Paul it would be known worldwide; thirdly, the two statements about man and God are meant to stand in contrast. Paul actually presents the two statements as being both his own creation as a case of mixed citation where the second was being taken verbatim from Scripture; he actually formulates the first statement on the basis of the second. The verb γινέσθω is probably meant to govern only the first statement, while the second statement, the one about man, functions as adverbial clause qualifying the first statement: 'Let it be known that God is truthful just as (or 'even if') every man is a liar'. One may discuss whether the text of Psalm 116:2 in its LXX version should somehow be explicitly identified as a Scripture text: 'Let be known that God is truthful even

59) F. Blass & A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 384.

60) On the jussive in Maltese cfr. Cremona, *Tagħlim fuq il-Kitba Maltija*, 695, 272.

if, as Scripture says, every man is a liar'. The psalmist was amazed (ἐν τῇ ἐκστάσει μου) to realise the insincerity of the people around him and made a general statement in this sense. Paul took this statement without entering further into the psalm; his interest was just the wording of this statement which he uses in order to create the statement about God's absolute veracity. So Fitzmyer's description of this half verse about all men being liars as an 'allusion' to Psalm 115 (LXX) is perhaps not precise.

Sant's exegesis of this verse does not differ much from that of Saydon though their translations are slightly different: *Ha jkun jaf kulhadd li Alla hu sinécier u kull bniedem giddieb*. A number of differences between the two translations: i) Sant's rendering reflects an exegesis where the two statements appear more strongly governed by the verb γινέσθω: *Ha jkun jaf kulhadd li Alla hu sinécier u kull bniedem giddieb*. As one can see, Sant includes the two statements within one relative clause introduced by the relative pronoun *li*. What distinguishes the two statements is their form: the first statement is allowed to be a full clause with subject, *Alla*, 'God', the verb of the predicate, *hu*, which is the pronoun for 'he' that serves here as copula, and the adjective *sinécier*, 'sincere', the headword of the predicate. Structurally this clause is complete and makes sense. To this clause is linked through the conjunction *u*, 'and', another cluster, *kull bniedem giddieb* which may be parsed simply as a phrase, but it may also be read as a noun clause which has its verb element dropped either because it is meant to share the function of the copula *hu* in the first statement or because the translator prefers the second statement to appear also as a noun clause without a verb, without the verbal element which may be gleaned from the context; this noun clause is the object of the verb in the main clause *ha jkun jaf kulhadd* 'let every one know'.

The main clause *ha jkun jaf kulhadd* actually renders the impersonal clause in the Greek text made up only of the verb γινέσθω. Sant provides a subject *kulhadd* 'everyone, all' to avoid Saydon's passive *ikun maghruf* 'let it be known'. Also to avoid the awkwardness of the RSV's literal translation of the verb γινέσθω, 'let God be true', as if Paul is not making a statement about God but is voicing a request that God be true, Sant like Saydon, accepted the strategy of the translation tradition to add an introductory verb of saying/knowing<sup>61</sup>;

61) "In a number of languages one can speak of a 'true word' or 'speaking truly', but it is not

Saydon is more economical, *ikun magħruf*, ‘let it be known’ which is jussive of the auxiliary verb *kien* + the passive participle of the verb *għaraf* ‘to recognise’.<sup>62)</sup> The verb *għaraf* has several uses according to Aquilina, among which that of ‘recognizing the validity or genuineness of something’: *mhux il-gradji kollha ta’ kull università huma magħrufa*, ‘not all the grades of all universities are recognised’; or that of ‘knowing how to do something’, in this case the verb *għaraf* is often shortened to *jaf* ‘he knows’ [*jaf iġib ruħu sewwa miegħi*, ‘he knows how to behave himself with me’].<sup>63)</sup>

A definitive departure from Saydon’s has been Sant’s rendering of the adjective ἀληθής. Saydon translated this adjective by the phrase *Alla tas-sewwa*, ‘God of truth’. Sant rendered the adjective by another adjective, *sinċier*, that appears often in anthropological contexts but is rare if at all in theological ones, especially as applied to God: *li Alla hu sinċier* ‘that God is sincere’. The object of the verb of knowing *ha jkun jaf* is this relative clause which has God as subject, the predicate being made up of the copula *hu* and the adjectival *sinċier*. This adjective remains within the semantic context of the concept *faithfulness* contained in the phrase πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ (v.3) which Sant rendered by *il-fedeltà ta’ Alla* ‘the faithfulness of God’. The adjective *sinċier* is said of a man who does not betray you when he says or promises something. *Din l-opinjoni sinċiera tiegħi* ‘this is my sincere opinion’.<sup>64)</sup> Sant’s exegesis therefore is coherent as well as precise.

The statement about humankind’s universal insincerity opens to better scrutiny the strategies of the two translators. Saydon considers the second statement, that about mankind’s falsehood, as a second full statement. This he does by separating the two statements through the comma: *Ikun Alla magħruf Alla tas-sewwa, u kull bniedem giddieb*. In this construction the verb *ikun*

---

possible to say that a person ‘is true’. In rendering the statement God must be true one may have to introduce some verb of speaking –for example, ‘you may know that God always speaks the truth’. It is inappropriate in some languages to introduce an obligatory element such as must in connection with speaking the truth, since this would imply that God is under moral obligation to speak the truth rather than that by his very nature he always speaks the truth.” Newman & Nida, *Handbook on Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, 53-54. This is not an issue in Latin: *est autem Deus verax omnis autem homo mendax* (the Vulgate), although the emphatic role of γινέσθω is rather lost in this translation.

62) Cfr. Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, II, 974.

63) Ibid.

64) Ibid., 1319.



*maghruf* has two subjects, *Alla*, God and *kull bniedem* although the second subject is separated quite far from the governing verb *ikun maghruf* so that the sentence gives the immediate impression that *Alla* is the only subject of *ikun maghruf*. In a way Saydon's is very close to the construction of the Greek text, showing the same syntactical ambiguity. Sant improves the syntax somewhat by adding the relative pronoun *li* showing clearly that the two statements are the object of the initial verb of knowing, *ha jkun jaf kulhadd*. Sant does not include the comma after the first statement making it evident that the declaration about mankind's insincerity is not a separate statement but the same statement that involves man as it involves God. In Sant we have basically one statement: *Ha jkun jaf kulhadd li Alla hu sin'cier u kull bniedem giddieb*. 'Let everyone know that God is sincere and everyman a liar.' In this construction the two statements share the same copula *hu* as well as the relative pronoun *li* and the governing introductory formula *ha jkun jaf kulhadd*. In Saydon the two truths are separate, each forming a statement of its own, in Sant there is one truth, involving two separate subjects, though, and two contrasting predicates. The two truths are absolute, one, because verified by experience and is philosophically necessary, as Paul will try to show in the coming sentences, the other is found in Scripture and thus needs no verification. This second truth stated in Scripture is so well known by both Paul and his addressees that the provenance of the text (Psalm 116:2, LXX edition) needs not even be identified.

But if the use of Scripture in the second statement is implicit, with Paul borrowing the wording of the Bible text to formulate his own thought, the use of Scripture to sustain his theological argumentation soon appears.

The enunciation of the two theological principles is closely followed by a Scripture text introduced by a citation formula

καθάπερ γέγραπται  
ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου  
καὶ νικήσεις ἐν τῷ κρινεσθαί σέ

Saydon: *kif inhu miktub:*  
*Biex tidher fis-sewwa fi kliemek*  
*U tirbah meta jsir haq minnek*

Sant: *Hekk hemm miktub:*

“*Sabiex int tkun iġġustifikat fi kliemek*

*U tirbah meta tkun iġġudika!*”

A few comments: 1) Three considerations are to be made: i) These two lines actually constitute a bicolon in Hebrew; they are linked together by strict parallelism, so that they should be translated strictly together as one throws light on the other. ii) Form critical aspects have to be taken in due account of, otherwise the translation would miss the point. The language used in this bicolon is that of the judiciary. A translation where these form critical issues are not clearly taken into consideration is that of NIV: ‘so that you are proved right when you speak, and justified when you judge’. ‘When you speak’ seems to be translating the cluster in Hebrew בַּרְבֵּרָךְ, and seems to be referring to God’s defending himself in court, since the final cluster בְּשֹׁפֵטְךָ where the final ׀- is not possession but accusative marker: it seems to imply the meaning: ‘in judging you’. One translation which keeps these form critical aspects in view is that of Luis Alonso Schökel and Cecilia Carniti<sup>65</sup>): *I tuoi argomenti ti rendono giustizia, e risulterai innocente nel giudizio*, ‘your arguments will bring you justice, and you will be found innocent when you are judged’. 2) This quotation is taken from Psalm 51:6 of the LXX version of the psalter. One should note that the LXX translator had already slightly changed the meaning of the Masoretic Text version of this half verse.<sup>66</sup> Paul further changed the text a little bit, reading, for instance, the subjunctive νικήσῃς of the LXX text as future indicative νικήσεις. This alteration was probably done because of developments within the language itself he employed for his letter writing, Hellenistic Greek,<sup>67</sup> although one cannot exclude that Paul had semantic aims in adapting the text of the LXX to his own thought. 3) The translation of the Greek verb δικαιωθῆς. This is the subjunctive aorist passive of the verb δικαιώω, to ‘justify, vindicate, treat as just’. One of the texts that are closest in its use to this is Lk 7:35 where we read that wisdom ἐδικαιώθη ἅπο τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς ‘wisdom will be justified by all her sons’.<sup>68</sup> In our text, instead of the preposition ἅπο (for which see LXX Is

65) *I Salmi*, I, Borla, Rome 1992, 802

66) Cfr. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 328.

67) F. Blass & A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, 369.

68) The text offers some textual difficulties. Cfr. Omanson, *A Textual Guide to the Greek New*

45:25) to describe by whom will the subject be justified, we have the preposition ἐν probably because the justification of the subject comes not from a person but from an object, here ‘his words’.

Saydon’s translation of the verb corresponds to his rendering of the adjective ἀληθής, ‘Alla tas-sewwa’ ‘God of truthfulness’. Through his words God will appear (*tidher*, second person masculine) *fis-sewwa*, ‘in truth’. On the other hand, Sant employs a verb coming from Italian, *tkun iġġustifikat* to bring out the concept/word ‘to be justified’ accompanied by the auxiliary *ikun* (second person singular masculine, *tkun*). The lexeme *iġġustifikat* is the participle of the verb *iġġustifika*, deriving from the Italian ‘giustificare’, ‘to justify’ (*iġġustifika ruhek talli nqast mill-lezzjonijiet* ‘justify your absence from the lessons’).<sup>69)</sup> One has to admit that Sant’s version is more forceful and clearer, and agrees better with the language of the court, the context of the original Hebrew text. 4) The translation of the second line of the citation: Both translators rendered the verb νικήσεις, from νικάω, *u tirbaħ*, ‘and you will win’. The verb *rebaħ* is used in several contexts, among which the judiciary: *rebaħ il-kawża* ‘he won the law suit’<sup>70)</sup>. As said above, the terminology and concept in this half verse seem to have belonged to the judiciary. As Fitzmyer has noted, the Greek construction which technically speaking is governed by the conjunctive phrase ὅπως ἔν, has altered the original subjunctive to indicative future. Arndt and Debrunner suggest that this happened because of changes within Hellenistic Greek itself.<sup>71)</sup> Probably this alteration from modal to declarative morphology has had little effect on the translation proper; in both Maltese translations under study the verb is rendered by the present tense, although a future meaning is not far from the text. Strictly speaking it is now present indicative. The infinitive phrase ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαι σε could be slightly confusing unless one realises that the subject of

---

*Testament*, 121 for discussion and for solutions.

69) Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, I, 416. Erin Serracino Inglott defines the verb as follows: *xogħol ta’ min jiġġustifika; taħqiq; wiri b’xhieda, bil-provi, li l-haġa tkun ġusta, kif jixraq; għoti ta’ raġuni xierqa li kien sewwa (għemil, kliem); għoti ta’ raġun lil min kien deher li ma kellux iżda ma kienx hekk; twettiq (b’ċertifikat eċċ) ta’ xi mġiba, eċċ li xeraq tkun sgurata*, ‘the task of him who justifies; justification, showing with witnessing, by proofs, that something is just, as it should be; the giving of good reasons that some behaviour or words were good; showing that someone, who appeared not to be, was right; certifying by proofs of behaviour that needs to be certified.’ *Il-Miklem Malti*, III, 65.

70) Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, II, 1196.

71) *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, 369.

the infinitive is not God who is being addressed but anonymous subjects; God referred to in the text by the personal pronoun *œ* is actually the object of the act of judging mentioned: in judging you, or when are judged, or when you are put under judgement. Our two translators offer correct exegesis but express their ideas differently. Saydon: *meta jsir haqq minnek* ‘when judgement is passed upon you’ which implies the formal judiciary context in full. Sant’s is less direct in this aspect: *meta tkun iġġudikat* ‘when you are judged’; God may be judged in one’s thoughts, without the need to externalise one’s judgement. What one may say is that Saydon’s is more dramatic and formal, probably closer to the original Psalmist’s intention; Sant’s more personal and intimate and closer to the individual man of prayer’s piety.

### 3.2. Saydon’s and Sant’s Annotation Policy for Romans 3:3-4

The policy we noted for the previous two verses is maintained for vv.3-4 as well. Sant offers no notes at all. Saydon instead offers a short note for both verses, one for each. Verse 3: *Il-poplu Lhudi ta’ żmien il-Liġi l-Qadima, jew xi whud minnhom, ma emmnux, iżda b’daqshekk il-kelma t’Alla ma tiġix nieqsa; dak li wiegħed Alla għandu jseħħ*, ‘The Jewish people of the time of the Old Law, or some of them, did not believe, but this did not mean that the word of God could be brought to naught. What God promised will become a reality’. Saydon therefore excluded that Paul could be speaking about the Jews’ lack of faith in Jesus Christ. He refers explicitly in his note to the history of the Jews in the OT (the time of the Old Law, which is a complicated concept). Verse 4: *Alla hu verità, fil-bniedem hu in-nuqqas ta’ verità. Il-bniedem jista’ jikser kelmtu, Alla le. Kliem mehud mis-Salm 51:6 skond it-test Grieg. is-sens hu. Jekk il-bniedem u Alla kellhom ikunu mharkin quddiem imhallel, is-sewwa jkun dejjem fin-naħa ta’ Alla. Is-sens tal-Lhudi hu xort’oħra*. ‘God is the truth, in man is there lack of truth. Man may come less to his word, not so God. These words are taken from Psalm 51:6 according to the Grieg text. The meaning is: if man and God were to be arraigned in court before a judge, truth will always be on the side of God. The meaning of the Hebrew text is different.’ Saydon simply explains the text, especially making explicit the metaphor of the court case. He also notes the origin of the citation, gives the meaning of the Greek text and says

that this meaning is different than that of the Hebrew text, but does say what the Hebrew text says. He prepares his reader in case he goes to verify with a translation of the Hebrew text.

In the remaining four verses Paul continues his diatribe arguing with his imaginary interlocutor. The latter usually raises objections, mostly theoretical; Paul answers these objections often with very strong language. One may say that Paul, the speaker, divides this second part of this paragraph in two subsections: verses 5-6 and 7-8. Each subsection opens with the combination of the conditional particle εἰ with the other particle δὲ, a combination to mark the beginning of a new argument. Therefore in verses 5-8 the speaker/writer is going to treat two separate arguments within the wider theme developed in the paragraph present in verses 1-8.

#### 4. Romans 3:5-6

Basically, these verses contain two objections and two answers. The questions are rhetorical and could well be taken to be made by the same speaker without the need to distinguish two speakers. It is basically Paul arguing aloud and developing his thought. If our wrongdoing (ἀδικία) demonstrates (συνίστησιν) the righteousness of God (θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην), will God be unjust when he inflicts wrathful punishment (ὀργήν). Paul qualifies this line of thinking of his as all too human, in order to show that this cannot take place in any way. Then he gives his absolute denial to the statement made in the previous question: ‘God forbids’. His contrary argument comes next, in the form of a question. How would God then judge the world?

##### 4.1. Romans 3:5-6 in Saydon’s and Sant’s translations

Both Saydon and Sant felt the need to add to the original text a linking word to join the new paragraph to what went before. *Imma jekk*, ‘but if’. The conjunction *imma* ‘but, nevertheless’ can be used redundantly at the beginning of a sentence (*Imma x’taghmel?* ‘what can you do?’).<sup>72)</sup> So technically speaking,

72) Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, I, 569.

*imma* could be used by Saydon and Sant without semantically anything being added to the original text. On the other hand, it added another aspect to the ‘colloquial’ character of the text. Paul is talking his thoughts aloud.

The formulation of the conditional clause in the two translations is very similar, though some different translation options were made: *Imma jekk il-ħażen tagħna juri l-ġustizzja ta’ Alla, xi ngħidu?* (Saydon); *Imma jekk l-ingustizzja tagħna sservi biex tidher il-ġustizzja ta’ Alla, x’għandna ngħidu?* (Sant). One obvious difference between the two renderings involves the word/phrase ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν which in the context stands in sharp contrast to the phrase θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην. Saydon translates ἀδικία as *ħażen* ‘wrongdoing’ Sant prefers the word *l-ingustizzja* ‘the injustice’, to maintain on the lexical level the contrast with *ġustizzja* which translates the δικαιοσύνην of God. From the point of view of rhetoric, this option could appear praiseworthy, but *ġustizzja/ingustizzja* in Maltese may be understood as belonging rather to the judicial context, and hence not easily understood as referring to moral behaviour in general.<sup>73</sup>) The present writer would have preferred Saydon’s term *ħażen* for rendering ἀδικία and found a different word for translating δικαιοσύνην, even if for doing so he may have had to depart from translation tradition which always preferred the word ‘justice’ of God.

There is a slight difference in the way the two translators rendered the final rhetorical question τί ἐροῦμεν, what shall we say? Saydon translates literally: *Xi ngħidu?* ‘What shall we say?’ Sant changes the text somewhat: *X’għandna ngħidu?* ‘What should we say?’ From the literal point of view Saydon’s rendering may be the closer to the Greek text.

After the general statement in verse 4, further sustained by the proof text from Psalm 50:6, Paul himself raises an objection against his imaginary interlocutor (verse 5). His objection takes the form of a conditional clause based for its formulation, though the vocabulary is new, upon what went in the previous verses. If our ἀδικία demonstrates’ (συνίστησιν) the righteousness (δικαιοσύνην) of God, this does not mean that God is ἄδικος. The main clause is expressed as an indirect interrogative, negative statement: μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεός; the reason for this statement is given in a participial phrase attached to the nominal ὁ θεός ὁ ἐπιφέρων την ὀργήν which in the context seems to have the

73) As required by the general meaning in this sense of ἀδικία, cfr. Arndt & Gingrich, *Lexicon*, 17.

meaning of ‘inflicting wrathful punishment’.<sup>74)</sup> Of course if he punishes he must be just, so the adjective ἄδικος cannot be given to God on no account. Actually Paul tries to mitigate the possibility of attributing this label to God: ‘I am speaking as a human being.’ A few manuscripts changed this statement somewhat<sup>75)</sup>: ‘I am speaking like human beings, that is, in human language. It is a human way of arguing.

Saydon’s translation of verse 5: *Imma jekk il-ħażen tagħna juri l-ġustizzja ta’ Alla, xi nġhidu? Hu Alla nġust meta jerħi għadbu? Nitkellem ta’ bniedem.*

Sant’s translation of verse 5: *Jekk l-iġustizzja tagħna sservi biex tidher il-ġustizzja ta’ Alla, x’għandna nġhidu? Forsi Alla hu nġust jekk jikkastigana? Qiegħed nitkellem ta’ bniedem li jien.*

A few further comments: a) The contrast between *ħażen* (wickedness) and *ġustizzja* (justice) would not be immediately perceived by the normal speaker of Maltese, probably because of the specialized use of the latter term within the judiciary context. In the moral sense one understands the adjective *ġust* but not so much the nominal *ġustizzja*. The most one understands by the term *ġust* is the virtue of one who gives to each what is his due. It would appear that the meaning of the terms *ġust/ġustizzja* in the sense of δικαιοσύνη that starts to appear especially in the translations of the NT is a new semantic entry into Maltese.

In this case, the present writer prefers Saydon’s word *ħażen* to Sant’s *iġustizzja* and would have preferred if the two translators found a better word than *ġustizzja* to render δικαιοσύνη. How difficult the issue is comes out from Saydon’s accepting to translate the term δικαιοσύνη by a word coming not from a semitic background as he would have preferred but from romance sources. b) Saydon’s translation of the Greek participial phrase ὁ ἐπιφερων τὴν ὀργήν by *jerħi għadbu* ‘releases his wrath’ is more colourful, but Sant’s *jikkastigana* ‘he punishes us’ is more easy to understand by the standard Maltese speaker.

c) *Nitkellem/Qiegħed nitkellem*: Saydon and Sant parse and translate the verb λέγω in Paul’s aside comment about his own utterance, slightly differently.

74) Arndt & Gingrich, *Ibid.*, 304.

75) See apparatus criticus.

Saydon uses the *Temp Ewlieni* (the primary tense) of the *Imperfekt* while Sant uses the *Temp Kompost* (composed tense) which is normally formed with the help of auxiliary verbs, especially the participle *qiegħed* of the verb *qagħad*.<sup>76)</sup> Cremona calls this formation *Present Kontinwu*, ‘continuous present’ while the other form, that used by Saydon, he calls ‘present’. Is there any difference between the two? Probably not, really, but the present continuous seems to underline the oral nature of the utterance, while the other the written form of the utterance. Saydon looks at his text as basically a written text and hence he uses the present, while Sant reflects upon Paul’s dictation of his letter to a scribe who would then write it. In Sant, Paul himself reflects on his own act of composition as he dictates the contents and words of his letter to some Tertius (Rom 16:22 for the writer of Paul’s letter to the Romans).

### **Romans 3:6**

Paul’s reaction to the general statement negatively expressed, and somewhat attenuated by Paul’s parenthetic aside that he was only speaking in human terms, takes the form we met before of the negative oath, *μη̄ γενοιτο*<sup>77)</sup> which some translate ‘Certainly not!’. After that, Paul counteracts with the rhetorical question to show ‘from the Scriptures’ that God can in no way be *ἄδικος*, ‘wicked’: How could God judge the world if he were in anyway wicked? God as the world’s judge was a fundamental Jewish belief Paul found expressed already in the Scriptures (Gen 18; Is 66:16; Joel 3:12; Pss 94:2; 96:13). For Paul then this was an undeniable philosophical premise which would exclude absolutely his imagined interlocutor’s line of thought.

Saydon and Sant translated this verse in an identical manner: one may surmise that Sant considered his mentor’s rendering of this not so easy a text adequate and simply adopted it with a slight change. Saydon translated the text in this manner: *Ma jkun qatt dan! Inkella kif jista’ Alla jagħmel haqq mid-dinja?* Sant’s version differs little: *Ma jkun qatt! Inkella kif jista’ Alla jagħmel haqq mid-dinja?* Comments: a) The only visible difference between Saydon’s and Sant’s version involves the negative oath and word order: Sant drops the

76) cfr. Cremona, *Tagħlim fuq il-Kitba Maltija*, 49-60; Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, I, 1123.

77) cfr. Blass & Debrunner, *Greek Grammar*, 384.



demonstrative pronoun *dan*, ‘this’ which is the subject of the negative verb *ma jkun*. Of course, *dan* in Saydon’s translation would refer to the statement in verse 5. Strictly speaking, this demonstrative pronoun does not exist in the Greek text. What Saydon does is that he contextualises the negative oath  $\mu\eta\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$  which in Greek is an absolute expression of refusal. b) The present writer found Saydon’s rendering of the conjunction  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$  by the adverb *inkella* rather interesting. *Inkella* is a complicated vocable. The conjunction  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$  together with  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\eta$  and the other form of it,  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\pi\epsilon\rho$  have been described by Johannes Louw and Eugene A. Nida as ‘markers of cause or reason, often with the implication of a temporal element’.<sup>78)</sup> But they imply also an alternative line of thought to what was being said in a previous sentence. It is often translated ‘otherwise’ which in Maltese is rendered by the adverb *inkella*. According to the dictionaries of Joseph Aquilina and Erin Serracino Ingloft the etymology of the word is unsure. The new sentence introduced by *inkella* goes counter to the line of thought expressed in negative interrogative statement  $\mu\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu$  (v.5b). In verse 6 Paul answers that this was absolutely impossible since God is the judge of all human beings. To express this metaphysical impossibility Saydon allowed in his translation of the verb  $\kappa\rho\iota\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  the nuance ‘can’ which Hebrew Gramarians noticed in the Hebrew verb.<sup>79)</sup> *Inkella kif jista’ Alla jagħmel haqq mid-dinja?* ‘Otherwise how can God judge the world?’

#### 4.2. Annotation Policy for Romans 3:5-6

Saydon’s and Sant’s policy for annotation of the text has not changed for these two verses. For both vv. 5 and 6 Saydon writes a note meant to exegete the verse. For verse 5 he writes this note: *Jekk il-Lhud bin-nuqqas ta’ twemmin tagħhom iservu biex aktar juru l-gustizzja ta’ Alla, mela Alla ma jmissux jikkastigahom talli ma jemmnux? Din hija l-mistoqsija li Pawlu jagħmel bħala wieħed li ma jifhimx fil-hwejjeġ ta’ Alla.* ‘If the Jews through their lack of faith serve to show better the justice of God, then God should not punish them for their lack of faith? This is the question that Paul makes as one who does not

78) J. Louw and E. A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, I (New York: United Bible Societies), <sup>2</sup>1989, 89:32

79) Paul Joüon & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2006), 1131

understand the matters of God'. For verse 6 he annotates: *Pawlu jwieġeb: Kieku Alla ma jikkastigax il-Lhud talli ma emmnux, ma jista' jikkastigha lil ħadd, għax kull midneb jista' jgħid li d-dnub tiegħu serva biex aktar juri l-gustizzja ta' Alla.* 'Pauls answers: If God does not punish the Jews for their lack of faith, He cannot punish anyone as every sinner may say that his sin served to show the justice of God'. One comment: Saydon simply retells the contents of the two verses in his own words. Such notes of his were therefore not necessary unless Saydon considered the text of his own translation to be ambiguous and in need of explanation. It is possible, however, that what we read today as a statement in the note to verse 5, however conditional, *Jekk il-Lhud bin-nuqqas ta' twemmin tagħhom iservu biex aktar juru l-gustizzja ta' Alla, mela Alla ma jmissux jikkastigahom talli ma mnemnu, x*, was actually meant to be an interrogative statement. Saydon himself defines this statement as a *mistoqsija*, 'question' in the following sentence, but instead of an interrogative marker at its end we have a fullstop. This note is duly reproduced *tale quale* in the first volume of the second edition of Saydon's translation, the first of the three volumes of the *Bibbja Saydon*, published by the Societas Doctrinae Christianae in 1977. If the exchange of the punctuation mark with full stop was a sheer mistake by the proof reader, who for the first edition was Saydon himself, one would have expected this to be corrected in the publication of the second edition. But this service was not offered.

## 5. Romans 3:7-8

Paul's imaginary interlocutor raises a further objection. Here the contrast is between 'my lie' (τό ψευσμα ἐμὸν) and the truthfulness of God (ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ). In the NT and contemporary literature, τό ψευσμα is not a very common word though it is well attested. It denotes the sense of lying, untruthfulness, and undependability.<sup>80</sup> The interlocutor's objection runs as follows in verse 7: if by (instrumental use of the preposition ἐν, that governs the phrase 'my untruthfulness') my untruthfulness (ψεύσμα), God's truthfulness became extremely rich or abundant (intransitive use of the verb περισσεύω, 'be

80) cfr. Arndt & Gingrich, *Lexicon*, 900.

more than enough')<sup>81)</sup>, why I am still condemned as a sinner?

Paul himself then reformulates (cfr. the use of the initial και) the question in verse 8, and gives his answer. He actually renders the issue more difficult at least on the expression level, for he introduces two statements within statements. Paul insinuates that he has been defamed (βλασφημούμεθα) by τινες who remain unidentified; these attributed to him the saying ὅτι Ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά, ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγατά, 'that we do evil so that good will come'. Paul brings the period to an end by a declarative statement: their judgement (κρίμα but with the meaning of κατακρίμα, 'condemnation' of Rom 2:2-3<sup>82)</sup>) is deserved. And in this manner he judged the statement attributed to him as being unacceptable.

Saydon's rendering of the particles complex εἰ δὲ that opens the syntactical unit in verse 7 is probably to be preferred to Sant's. Saydon translated the particles in this way: *Imma jekk*... 'But if...' Sant drops the adversative *imma* and renders the clause as a simple conditional one that introduces a new period: *Jekk il-verità ta' Alla*... 'If the truth of God...'. In a way, Sant's exegesis and translation are correct since as we have seen εἰ δὲ has been used by the writer as segmentation markers, with vv. 5 and 7 being where new paragraphs or thought units were supposed to start. Scholars have noticed the relationship between the two verses. Fitzmyer annotates that verse 7 stands in contrast to verse 5; while on the one hand, Paul is in verse 7 repeating the argument he has built in verse 5, just changing the divine attribute, he opens his argumentation in verse 7 by the adversative εἰ δὲ to put in contrast the latter verse to the former. Probably this was the reason why the copyists of a number of manuscripts changed the particle δὲ into the conjunction γὰρ.<sup>83)</sup> Neither Saydon nor Sant started a new paragraph with either verse 5 or 7; they ignored therefore the writer's signal for segmenting the text at these junctures. They consider the adversative character of the conjunctions as part of the argumentative system and nothing more (though Saydon seems to consider verse 5 as paragraph initial).

Contrary to verse 5, the subject in the statement in verse 7 is a divine attribute which stands in contrast to a human negative quality; differently than what happens in verse 5, the divine attribute anticipates the human attribute. In verse

81) Ibid.,

82) cfr. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 330.

83) cfr. the apparatus criticus and Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 448; Omanson, *Textual Guide*, 294.

7, the divine attribute is put in contrast to the human attribute; not only that, in this statement Paul involves his own personal life in the argumentation: ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεύσματι ἐπερίσσευσεν ‘If the truth of God has shown to be supremely great in my untruthfulness’. According to Arndt & Gingrich<sup>84</sup>), the nominal ψεύσμα in the NT and related literature of the first century AD, denotes human lying, untruthfulness, undependability.

Saydon rendered the phrase ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ by *is-sewwa ta’ Alla* while Sant opted for the more modern *il-verità* instead *is-sewwa*. This nominal derives from the root SDJ which we find beneath the verb *sewa* which basically means ‘to cost, to be worth so much’.<sup>85</sup>) The noun *sewwa* means ‘truth’; in Maltese it is mainly a masculine but in some instances it appears as a feminine noun. Aquilina reports the idiom *Imieri is-sewwa magħruf*, ‘he contradicts whatever you say even when you are evidently in the right’; and the proverb *Is-sewwa għalkemm taħbiha tidher dejjem għax titla’ f’wiċċ l-ilma*, ‘Though you may hide Truth, Truth will always appear, for it will come up to the surface’. From the verb *jidher* in the conditional clause the noun *sewwa* appears as masculine while Sant’s *verità* is feminine.<sup>86</sup>) The main verb in the conditional clause is ἐπερίσσευσεν aorist of the verb περισεύω, ‘to be more than enough, to be present in abundance’;<sup>87</sup>) this verb is qualified by the adverbial phrase of manner ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεύσματι, ‘in my untruthfulness’. One should note that Saydon and Sant translate the phrase by different though semantically related lexemes. Saydon renders the phrase *bil-gideb tiegħi* while Sant translates *minhabba l-gidba tiegħi*. The preposition ἐν that governs the entire phrase has been parsed as carrying a causal meaning.<sup>88</sup>) And in this the two translators agree even if they use different prepositions to render the preposition ἐν; Saydon renders it by the preposition *bi*. The first meaning listed by Aquilina<sup>89</sup>) for this preposition is ‘with’ indicating instrument or means. *Qatluh b’sikkina*, ‘They killed him with a knife’; *Rajtek b’għajnejja*, ‘I saw you with my own eyes’. In our text we are told

---

84) *Greek-English Lexicon*, 900

85) Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, II, 1300.

86) *Ibid.*, 1504.

87) Arndt & Gingrich, *Greek-English Dictionary*, 656.

88) Max Zerwick & Mary Grosvenor, *Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1988), 464.

89) *Maltese-English Dictionary*, I, 113-114.

that God's truthfulness became exceedingly abundant *through* my lying; my untruthfulness made God's truthfulness extremely abundant. Human untruthfulness made God's truthfulness extraordinarily evident and clear. Sant employed a different syntactical structure; he uses the preposition *minhabba* 'on account of, because of', the etymology of which is still debated as one may deduce from the entries in the dictionaries of Aquilina and Serracino-Inglott. That God's truthfulness shines out when put side by side with my untruthfulness does not mean that the preposition *êv* refuses to be interpreted as a case of direct instrumentality. It simply means that when man compares his lack of truthfulness to the truthfulness of God, the latter comes out more strongly, more clearly. This means that Sant's option of *minhabba* is probably better than Saydon's *bi* which is however better linked to direct instrumentality. The Greek term *ψεῦσμα* is translated by two different though closely related nominals in the two translations. Saydon rendered the phrase in Greek by another phrase, *bil-gideb tieghi*, 'by my lying'; the headword of the phrase is *gideb*, a singular, collective noun, actually a verbal noun denoting the act of lying, of telling untruth.<sup>90</sup>) Sant instead employs the singular noun *gidba*, 'lie' which is the singular of both the collective noun *gideb* and the plural *gidbiet*. The difference between the nouns *gideb* and *gidbiet* is that the latter is conceived as being capable of being counted while the former cannot be counted. While in Saydon the act of lying is perceived as typical of human life, in Sant the emphasis is on the single lie which a human being may tell and which stands in sharp contrast to the absolute truthfulness of God. The single lie is enough to confirm man to be a deceiver, and in the comparison between God and Man, the former will surely come out the better, even where dependability is concerned.

The structure of the conditional clause in Greek is rather complex as the head word of the predicate, the verb *ἐπερίσευσεν* is flanked by two prepositional phrases that qualify it. This made the structure of the translation slightly difficult to build. Saydon: *bil-gideb tieghi aktar jidher ghall-glorja tieghu*, 'through my lying appears better for his glory'; Sant: *tidher aktar minhabba l-gidba tieghi ghall-glorja tieghu*, 'appears better because of of my lie for his glory'. Comments: 1) Both Saydon and Sant translated the verb *ἐπερίσευσεν* through the verb *deher* qualified by the comparative *aktar*. The verb *deher* basically

---

90) Ibid., I, 435.

means ‘to appear, to come/to be in sight’. Aquilina lists a number of uses of the verb: *Wara tlitt ijiem tbahħir dehret l-art*, ‘After three days sailing, land was in sight’; *Ma deherx aktar*, ‘he has disappeared/was never seen again.’<sup>91)</sup> The last example is interesting as it is similar to our text in Saydon, only it is negative. In our texts the imperfect *jidher* is used; the readers are to remember that in Saydon the subject of the verb is *is-sewwa ta’ Alla* ‘the truth of God’ which is masculine, while in Sant the subject is *il-verità ta’ Alla* ‘the truth of God’ which is feminine; the difference in gender of the two words for truth explains the slight difference in the spelling (morphology) of the verb in the two translations: *jidher/tidher*. The adverbial *aktar* actually derives from the adjective *katir* which appears only in the comparative *aktar* and the superlative *l-aktar*. 2) Saydon managed to maintain the harmony of the Greek structure, with a prepositional phrase coming ahead of the verb *aktar jidher* ‘appears better’ and with the other prepositional phrase coming just after the verbal phrase: *bil-gideb tiegħi aktar jidher għall-glorja tiegħu*. When Sant opted for the preposition *minhabba* he had to give away also this structural harmony. In his edition of the clause, the verb *tidher* precedes the two adverbial phrases and the second phrase has to be slightly strengthened by an emphatic use of the adjective *stess*, ‘self’<sup>92)</sup>: *tidher aktar minhabba l-gidba tiegħi għall-glorja tiegħu stess*. In this edition, the centre of gravity is not the verb as in the original Greek and in Saydon but the phrase *minhabba l-gidba tiegħi*; Sant is more pessimistic than Saydon or even than Paul.

The main clause of the conditional complex which is verse 7 consists of an interrogative statement: τί ἔτι κἀγὼ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι; this interrogative picks up the reference to the personality of the speaker himself which we have met in the conditional clause. This adds pathos. Saydon and Sant translate this interrogative almost in the same way. Saydon: *Għaliex għandu jsir haqq minni bhala midneb?* Sant: *Għaliex isir haqq minni bhala midneb?* The only difference between the two translations is the nuance of obligation in Saydon’s: Why should I be judged (*għandu*) as a sinner? Sant’s rendering instead takes the verb κρίνομαι literally as present *isir haqq minni* ‘am I judged?’. The nuance of obligation is not represented in the morphology or the syntax of the clause in Greek. But Saydon feels it should be reproduced and

---

91) *Maltese-English Dictionary*, I, 221.

92) *Ibid.*, II, 1363.

rendered the verb κρίνομαι *ghandu jsir haqq minni*, ‘should I be judged’. Why such difference not only in translation strategy but also in exegesis? Saydon was not the only translator to notice this nuance and to include it in his translation. “... pourquoi devrais je encore être condamné comme ‘pécheur?’” (BE); “... then why must I still be condemned as a sinner?” (Fitzmyer). But neither was Sant alone who left this obligation nuance out: “... why am I still being condemned as a sinner?” (NRSV); “... why am I still condemned as a sinner?” (NIV); “... pourquoi, moi, serais-je encore jugé comme pécheur?” (NBS); “... perché anch’io sono giudicato ancora come peccatore?” (LSB). Is this nuance language specific of the receptacle languages? The variety of the languages cited as well the types of Bible translations included in this short list would show that both exegetical positions are possible and that one may choose which understanding of the text he wishes.<sup>93)</sup>

Verse 8 This verse is complicated as it contains two utterances within a text. Paul laments that some (τινες) have defamed (βλασφημούμεθα) him attributing to him a doctrine he has not taught. This doctrine was that even if one does evil, good will ensue. Paul denies he taught such doctrine; for the reasoning behind such philosophical thinking is unacceptable. Paul’s line of reasoning here is slightly complicated as the attributed doctrine is included within his own line of thought as side lines of reasoning. The teachings which Paul laments these unknown enemies attached to his name are mentioned in the two καθώς clauses; the two καθώς clauses are actually parallel (the second και coordinates them although technically the second clause is meant to explain the first, especially the verb βλασφημούμεθα. The second clause actually contains the doctrine Paul refused to have attached to his name: ὅτι Ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά ἵνα τὰ ἀγαθά. This statement is an interrogative one introduced by μή while the current particle ὅτι had to be employed because of the verb of saying λέγειν that is the verb of the καθώς clause that has φασιν for verb; λέγειν is the verb of the subordinate clause with ἡμᾶς for subject. It would seem that the verb

---

93) In a private communication, my friend and colleague Dr. Thomas Kaut, translation consultant for the United Bible Societies, told me that he thinks this ‘should’ nuance was due to Martin Luther’s exegesis and translation of the verse in his 1534 translation: ‘Dann so die warheit Gottes durch meiner lügen herrlicher wird zu seinem preis/ warumb solt ich denn noch als ein sunder gerichtet warden?’ He considers this exegesis as mistaken as the Greek in the text makes no allowance for it.

ποιήσωμεν is playing two grammatical functions: it is the main verb of the interrogative clause introduced by negative marker μή and the verb of the ὅτι clause. Whether this grammatical analysis is possible or not, in translations the verb appears only once: Saydon: *ha naghmlu d-deni biex jigi t-tajjeb*. ‘Let us do evil so that good may come’; Sant: *ha naghmlu l-hazin halli johrog it-tajjeb*. ‘Let us do what is evil that the good may come out’. The main difference between the two concerns the translation of the noun τὰ κακά ‘evil’ which Saydon renders through the term *id-deni*, a noun which is derived from the verbal root *denna*, ‘to fester or infect a wound’. The noun basically means ‘fever’ (*ghandu deni ta’ ziemel*, ‘he is running a dangerously high temperature’); but it is used figuratively to mean ‘harm, mischief, evil, misfortune’ (*qatt taghmel deni lil ghajrek*, ‘never harm your neighbour’).<sup>94</sup> Sant’s term *hazin* is an adjective deriving from the verbal root *hazzen*, of the second form, which basically mean three things: ‘to make physically bad’, ‘to make morally bad, to corrupt’, ‘to become shrewd, cunning, crafty’.<sup>95</sup> In our text the second meaning is adequate. *Hazin* is a substantival adjective that stands in contrast to *it-tajjeb*, ‘the good’, and it means ‘morally bad, wicked’. Basically the two translators are saying the same thing though they use different terms to refer to ‘wickedness, evilness’.

The entire verse as a whole in the two translators: Saydon: *Jew kif uhud ighajjrana u jghidu li ahna nghidu. ‘Ha naghmlu d-deni biex jigi t-tajjeb?’ Dawn haqqhom il-kundanna*. Sant: *Ghaliex ma nghidux- bhalma hafna uhud ighajjrana u jghidu li ahna qeghdin nghidu: ‘Ha naghmlu l-hazin, halli johrog it-tajjeb?’ Dawn haqqhom il-kundanna*. A few more comments: 1) One may note how the two translators structured the main and the secondary clauses differently. Saydon maintains the form of the Greek to a high percentage while Sant treats the καθώς clauses as secondary clauses almost as aside comments. Sant formulates an interrogative statement about the central subject matter of the period, even though the main interrogative as formulated by Sant is not formally found in the Greek text: *Ghaliex ma nghidux ... ‘Ha naghmlu l-hazin, halli johrog it-tajjeb?’* This is the subject matter of the period, but it is not formulated in this way in the Greek text. In the Greek text it is formulated as one finds it in Saydon. 2) The present passive βλασφημούμεθα has been translated by both

94) Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, I, 231-232.

95) *Ibid.*, 527-528.



Saydon and Sant by the term *ighajjrana* which Sant corrected somehow to *ighajjrana*. Two questions evidently need to be answered: was this choice a good one? How are we to explain the slight difference between Saydon and Sant regarding the orthography of the verb in the two translators? The verb *ighajjrana*, to write it with Saydon's orthography, is the present tense of the verb *ghajjar* from the root *GhWR*, a trilateral verbal with the second radical being a 'weak' consonant. This verb of the second form means 'to revile, disgrace, to call someone names'.<sup>96)</sup> Which is not exactly what we have in Greek where we find the verb βλασφημέω, which, when it governs as object human beings, means 'to injure the reputation of someone, revile, defame.'<sup>97)</sup> The two words are not semantically unrelated but they are not equivalent. The verb *ghajjar* suggests the scenario of public debates where one side who has no arguments against its opponents resorts to calling names in order to injure them and harm their cause. Paul does not describe this scenario but he could well have this *sitz im leben* when he uses the verb βλασφημέω in this context; so that even if the Maltese verb may not be semantically equivalent to the Greek, it can suit the text under study. . (Please note that in Sant the verb *ighajjrana* has a double subject *hafna uhud* which is evidently an editing mistake. It should be either, *uhud* seems the better candidate for the Greek τινες though in the later editions of *Il-Bibbja* the verbal noun *hafna* was chosen<sup>98)</sup>).

This explains Sant's decision to maintain the verb. But why does he write it differently? This slight difference reflects a long and acrimonious debate among Maltese grammarians concerning the so-called 'weak' consonants 'j' and 'w'. Official orthography has ruled that in morphological scenarios where these consonants find themselves hemmed in between two consonants, as in the case of gemination, the second occurrence of the consonants should be dropped. The verb *ghajjar* in our text furnishes one such case. The plural of the present tense should be *jghajjrana*. The second [j] within the verb is found between the consonants [j] and [r]. According to official orthography this is not possible for every consonant needs the presence of a vowel for pronunciation. For this reason the second [j] is normally dropped as is shown in Sant's version. Saydon

96) Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary*, II, 974.

97) Arndt & Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 142.

98) cfr. the Third Edition (2004). On the lexeme *Jafna* cfr. *Ibid.*, 474-475.

maintained on the other hand that radicals are never dropped in semitic languages and hence the second [j] needs to be kept even when the vowel, before or after the consonant is not found; hence his spelling.<sup>99)</sup>

### 5.1. Annotation Policy for vv. 7-8

There is no change of policy regarding annotation for these two verses. Saydon entered a note for each of the two verses while Sant wrote none. It is interesting to review the note to verse 7 as it shows that Saydon and Sant were understanding the verse differently even if their translation differs only slightly. For verse 7 Saydon wrote this note: *Imma l-Lhudi anqas ma jrid jemmen li hu midneb. In-nuqqas ta' twemmin tieghu serva għall-glorja ta' Alla; kif jista' mela jkun meqjus bħala midneb? Dan hu kliem il-Lhudi.*

'But even the Jew refuses to accept that he is a sinner. His lack of faith serves for the glory of God; how can he therefore be considered as a sinner? These are the words of the Jew'.

Comments:1) In his note Saydon links this verse to the negative reaction of the Jews to the Christ event. They refused to believe in Jesus Christ but this should not be reputed to them as sinful. The problem with this exegesis is that the question imagined by Paul as being raised by his interlocutor is much wider than what Saydon implies by his exegesis offered in his note. It is not meant in Paul to be linked to the problem of the Jews' unbelief in Jesus which Paul does not treat in this unit though he treats it in Romans. If Saydon's notes to the single verses were meant to make his exegesis extremely clear, and we have seen this in the notes to the previous verses, here in verse 7, either does his exegesis in the note rather differ from his exegesis in the translation, or his explanation of the verse is somewhat wrong. 2) This would make Sant's rendering of this verse preferable for it suggests that Paul's discussion sticks to the level of general moral principle and is not interpreting historical events like the Jew's refusal to accept Jesus in faith.

Beneath verse 8 Saydon writes this note: *Xi wħud kienu jgħidu li Pawlu kien iġhallem li wieħed jista' jagħmel il-ħażin li minnu johroġ it-tajjeb. Pawlu jiċħdu*

---

99) On this issue cfr. Cremona, *Tagħlim fuq il-Kitba Maltija*, 73-77; Azzopardi, *Gwida għall-Ortografija*, 34-35; Bezzina, *Saydon. Biblista u Studjuż tal-Malti*, 179-180

*tagħlim bħal dan, u jżid iġħid li min għandu din il-fehma haqqu l-kundanna.*

‘Some people used to say that Paul was teaching that one may do evil from which good may come out. Paul denies he was giving such teaching, and adds that whoever had such ideas merits condemnation’

In this note Saydon attempts to clarify his translation of the verse and adds no new information. But Saydon does not clarify how the query in verse 8 is to be considered as an alternative to verse 7 as his translation of the conjunction *koł* at the beginning of verse 8 by the adversative conjunction *jew*, ‘or’, suggests. This conjunction normally introduces the second of two or more alternatives.<sup>100)</sup>

## 6. Partial Conclusions

Seeing the limited extend of text we discussed in this essay, we cannot pretend to arrive to definitive conclusions as to the value of either Saydon’ or Sant’s translations. We arrived only at partial conclusions and further studies are called for. But from this study one may arrive to the conclusion that Saydon tends to offer a form-critical translation while Sant offered a translation that is closer to a meaning based translation.<sup>101)</sup> At times, Sant improves the translation of his mentor Saydon; in other parts he simply follows Saydon verbatim; often their translations differ somewhat though each renders the original Greek impeccably. Both are masters both in the knowledge of the text as well as in handling the receptor language. One may say that Saydon was concerned most of all to show that Maltese can reproduce the original Greek, Sant was concerned mostly in making the text understandable to the Maltese of the second half of the twentieth century. Both were masters in the art of rendering the Bible in Maltese.

<Keyword>

Translation Strategy, Annotation Policy, Maltese Bible, Bible Translation, meaning based translation, form-critical translation.

100) Aquilina, *Maltese English Dictionary*, I, 599.

101) For these terms describing translation types cfr. Wilt.

<References>

- A. Abela, “ Short Exegetical Essays, 1: 2Tim 3:14-18”, *Melita Theologica* 59/1 (2008), 37-44.
- Luis Alonso Schökel & Cecilia Carniti, *I Salmi*, Rome: Borla, 1992.
- Joseph Aquilina, *Maltese-English Dictionary I & II*, Malta: Midsea Books, 1987, 1990.
- William F. Arndt & Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Christian Literature*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Carmel Azzopardi, *Gwida għall-Ortoġrafija*, Malta: Klabb Kotba Maltin, 2003.
- Carmel Bezzina, *Saydon. Biblista u Studjuż tal-Malti*, Malta: Pubblikazzjoni Preca, 2006.
- Kazimirski de Biberstein, *Dictionnaire Arabe-Française*, Paris, 1860.
- F. Blass & A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Francis Brown & S.R. Driver & Charles Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907, 1974. Referred to as DBD.
- Carlo Buzzetti, *Traduzione e Tradizione. La via dell'uso-confronto*, Padua: Edizioni Messagero, 2001.
- L. Coenen, E. Beyreuter & H. Bietenhard, (eds.), *Dizionario dei Concetti Biblici del Nuovo Testamento*, Bologna: EDB, 1976.
- A. Cremona, *Tagħlim fuq il-Kitba Maltija*, Book Two, Malta: Lux Press, <sup>7</sup>1962.
- Graig A. Evans, “The Scriptures of Jesus and His Early Followers” in Lee Martin Macdonald & James A. Sanders, (eds.), *The Canon Debate*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002, 185-195.
- Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, Anchor Bible, 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Harry Gamble, “Letters in the New Testament and in the Greco-Roman world”, John Barton, (ed.), *The Biblical World*, I, London: Routledge, 2001, 1988-207.
- Joachim Gnilka, *Marco*, (trans. Gianni Poletti), Assisi: Cittadella Editrice, <sup>2</sup>1987.
- Eric G. Jay, *New Testament Greek. An Introductory Grammar*, London: SPCK,

1958.

Paul Joüon & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2006.

Johannes Louw & Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, I & II, New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.

A. J. Malherbe, “*Mê genoito* in the Diatribe and Paul”, *Harvard Theological Studies* 73 (1980), 231-240.

Roland Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis. An Introduction to Biblical Rhetoric*, JSOT Supplementary Series, 236, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft & United Bible Societies, 2000.  
*The New Collins Dictionary and Thesaurus*, Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishing House, 1992.

Barclay N. Newman & Eugene A. Nida, *A Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans*, New York: United Bible Societies, 1973.

Roger L. Omanson, *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bible gesellschaft, 2006.

Peter Paul Saydon, *L-Ittri ta' San Pawl. L-Ittra lir-Rumani*, Malta: The Empire Press, 1956.

Peter Paul Saydon, *Ktieb il-Ġenesi*, Malta: The Empire Press, 1929.

Carmel Sant, *Bible Translation and Language*, Malta: Melita Theologica Supplementary Series, 2; 1992.

Erin Serracino-Inglott, *Il-Miklem Malti*, I-IX, Malta: Klabb Kotba Maltin, 1975-1989.

<Abstract>

## 로마서 3장 1-8절에 대한 두 개의 몰타어 번역에 있어서의 번역 전략들과 각주 원칙들

안토니 아벨라 박사  
(세계성서공회연합회 유럽 중동 지역 번역 컨설턴트)

이 글의 목적은 20세기의 중요한 성경 번역자, 사이돈(Peter Paul Saydon, 1895-1969)과 산트(Carmel Sant, 1912-1992)의 공헌을 연구하는 것이다. 두 번역자는 모두 본문의 지식에서나 수신자 언어들을 다름에 있어서 대가들이다.

이 연구로부터 우리는 사이돈은 본문 비평적인 번역을 제공하는 경향이 있고, 산트는 의미 전달에 기초를 둔 번역에 가깝다고 결론지을 수 있다. 때로는, 산트는 그의 스승인 사이돈의 번역을 향상시킨다. 다른 부분에서 그는 단순히 사이돈의 말을 그대로 따른다. 종종 그들의 번역들은 각각 그리스어 원문을 결함 없이 번역하였다 할지라도 다소 다른 것을 제공한다. 사이돈이 무엇보다도 그리스어 원문을 재생산해 낼 수 있다는 것을 보여주는 데 관심이 있었고, 산트는 20세기 중반의 몰타어로 본문을 이해할 수 있게 만드는 데 가장 관심이 있었다고 결론을 내릴 수 있다.