

6-1-1934

## The Story of the German Bible

P. E. Kretzmann

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kretzmann, P. E. (1934) "The Story of the German Bible," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 5 , Article 52.  
Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol5/iss1/52>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

drink." "The colored stole is both the badge of *pastoral authority* and the symbol of the yoke of righteousness." Solche Aussprüche sind wohl nicht recht bedacht, gehen jedoch über die rechte lutherische Mitte hinaus.<sup>13)</sup>

Aber wir möchten in der nächsten Nummer noch einige Gebräuche und Einrichtungen der römischen Kirche besprechen, die durch liturgische Bewegungen auch in andere Kirchen Eingang finden, und damit diese Artikelreihe abschließen. L. F.

## The Story of the German Bible.

A Contribution to the Quadricentennial of Luther's Translation.

### XIII. Early Imitators of Luther.

In his thirteenth sermon on the life of Luther, Mathesius remarks: "In my youth I saw an un-German German Bible, undoubtedly translated from the Latin, which was very dark indeed; for at that time the learned men did not have much regard for the Bible. My father also had a German postil, in which, besides the Gospels of the Sundays, several passages from the Old Testament were explained in postil form, from which I often read to him with great delight." At the same time the father of this pupil of Luther often expressed the wish that he might see the entire Bible in German.

With the publishing of Luther's New Testament in 1522 the great need of the German people in this respect was met in part, and with the completion of his great work in 1534 every German had a medium by which he could search the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation and thus truly become wise unto salvation by faith which is in Christ Jesus.

13) Vor einiger Zeit hatte ich eine Unterredung mit einem Pastor einer andern lutherischen Körperschaft. Er ist, wie ich mich überzeuge, durchaus hochkirchlich, ritualistisch, und bemerkte, er habe es seiner Gemeinde vorgelegt, ob sie "low church", "broad church" oder "high church" in den Gebräuchen und Zeremonien sein wolle; sie habe sich für das Hochkirchliche entschieden, und nun fühle er sich endlich wohl. Ich hoffe, er hat die Worte nicht so schlimm gemeint, wie sie lauten, aber mir kam bei weiterem Nachdenken fast unwillkürlich die traurige Entwicklung Newman's in den Sinn. Nachdem nämlich Newman seit Ende des Jahres 1841 davon gesprochen hatte, daß er „als Anglikaner auf dem Sterbebett liege“, vollzog er am 9. Oktober 1845 seinen Übertritt zur römischen Kirche, an demselben Tage, an dem der französische Gelehrte Ernest Renan diese Kirche verließ. Dort fühlte er sich sicher und geborgen. Wie? Er sagt selbst: „Sich umgeben fühlen von allen heiligen Waffen und Verteidigungen, von den Sakramenten in jeder Woche, von den priesterlichen Benedictionen, von gesegneten Kränzchen und Rosenkränzen, von Weihwasser, von Räuchen und Handlungen, auf welchen Indulgenzen ruhen, überhaupt von der ganzen Rüstung Gottes — was kann man mehr verlangen und erbitten?“ Dazu bemerkt der auch auf diesem Gebiete wohlorientierte verstorbene Rostocker Professor Fr. Hahagen treffend: „Eph. 6, 11—17 kennt freilich eine andere Gottesrüstung.“ (Theol. Literaturblatt 43, 190.)

As might have been expected, Luther's success in translating the Bible proved a spur to other men to imitate him in his work. Thus Luther had rivals even during his own lifetime, some of whom had the impudence to plagiarize in a most shameless manner and then to allege superior excellence for their products. Others seem to have been actuated chiefly by jealousy, since they could not bear to have Luther receive the honor which came to him from all sides when the value of his work was recognized.

The first man who tried to compete with Luther was *Johann Boeschenstain*, who was his senior by eleven years, having been born in Esslingen in 1472. He became professor of Hebrew at Ingolstadt in 1505 and went to Augsburg in 1513. It was here that Luther visited him in 1518, when he was cited to appear before Cajetan, and gained him for the university at Wittenberg. But Boeschenstain remained for only a very short time, as we learn from a letter of Luther to Spalatin, dated January 10, 1519. (21a, 138 f.) Although he possessed a good measure of Hebrew learning, Boeschenstain was not a theologian. He later lived in various cities, chiefly Heidelberg and Zuerich, and died in 1540.—Boeschenstain translated several parts of the Old Testament, namely, the seven Penitential Psalms (*Septem Psalmi Poenitentiales ex Hebraeo . . . translati*) in 1520, the Prayer of Solomon in 1 Kings 8 in 1523, the Book of Ruth in 1525, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah, together with the prayer of Daniel in chapter 9, in 1529. The following is a sample of the translation made by Boeschenstain, taken from Ps. 32:—

Selig ain erhabner von boszhait, ain bedeckter vor suend:

Wol dem menschen nit er wirt achten der herr zu jm boszhait, vnd nit in seim gemuet betrug:

Dann ich hab ton schweigen, es seind verfaulet meine gebain in meinem geschray alle tag:

Dann tag vnd nacht sie wirt beschwaeren auff mich dein handt, ist worden verkert mein feuchte in duerrungen des summers allweg.

His competition, as the sample shows, was not of a very serious nature.

The second man whose work comes into consideration is *Caspar Ammann*, a pupil of Boeschenstain. He was born in Belgium, entered the monastery at Lauingen, became provincial of the Augustinian Order in Swabia, and at that time made his translation of the psalms:

Psalter des kueniglichen prophetten dauids geteutschet nach warhaftigem text der hebraischen zungen. 1523.

How well Ammann succeeded in his attempt to produce the psalms of David in German may be seen from the following section of Ps. 38, 2—4:—

O got nit wellest mich straffen in deinem zorn, oder in deinem grymmen wellest kestigen mich.

Dann deine pfeil send gehoefft in mich, vnd hast gedruckt auff mich dein hand.

Es ist kain gesundthait in meinem flaisch von wegen deines zorns, vnd ist nit frid in meinen gebainen von wegen meiner suend.

It is possible that the independent work of Ammann was spoiled by his high regard for his teacher, whom he copied somewhat too slavishly. He died in 1525.

The third man to attempt the translation of larger parts of the Bible into German was *Ottmar Nachtgall*. He was born at Strassburg in 1487, where he also became vicarius and organist in 1515. He was instrumental in introducing Greek into his native city. In 1523 he came to Augsburg, under the patronage of the Fuggers, who provided him with a place as preacher. After an unfortunate sermon in 1528 he was deposed and went to Freiburg, where he died in 1537. — Nachtgall's work included chiefly a rendering of the Psalms from the Septuagint into German, in 1524, and a German Gospel harmony in 1525. The former work appeared in Augsburg with the title: —

Der Psalter des kinigs vnd propheten Dauids, ain summarischer vnd kurtzer begryff aller hayligen geschriff durch Ottmarum Nachtgallen Doctorem, von grund aus den lxx vnd hebreischer sprach art vnd aygenschaft zu verstendigem vnd klarem hochteutschen gebracht . . . ,

and the latter was almost as ambitious: —

Die gantz euangelisch hystori wie sie durch die vier Euangelisten, yeden sonderlich, in kriechischer sprach beschriben, in ain gleychhellige vnzertalte red ordentlich verfasst, sambt ainer erleuterung der schweren oerter, vnd gutem bericht wa alle ding hin dienend, Durch Ottmaren Nachtgall Doct. . . .

Although Nachtgall says that he referred also to the Hebrew text in his translation of the Psalms, his basis was clearly the Septuagint, and his work was not very satisfactory, as the following section, taken from Ps. 18, 9 ff., will show: —

Es ist ain rauch aufgangen in seinem zorn vnd das feur wuert sich vor seinem angesicht entzunden, die kolen haben von im anheben zubrynnen.

Vnd er hat die hymel hinab gebogen vnd ist abgestygen, auch ist die dunckle vnder seinen fuessen.

The first part of Ps. 23 is rendered by him as follows. —

Der herr ist mein hyrt vnd mir wuert nichts gebrechen.

er hat mir an der stat da gute wayd ist, ain wonung gemacht. An dem wasser der ruwe hat er mich auffgezogen,

mein seel hat er herwider bracht. Er ist mein wegweiser gewesen auff den fuszsteygen der gerechtikayt vmb seines namens willen.

Of his work in the New Testament the following may serve as sample, from John 2, 1 ff.: —

Vnd den dritten tag nach dem sabbath hat man hochzeyt gehalten zu Cana in dem land Galilea gelegen, auf soellliche hochzeyt oder brautlaufft ist der herr mit den jungern geladen worden, dann seyn mutter was auch da selbst, die inn auch anlanget so bald weyn zerram vnd sprach, Herr sie habend kayn weyn . . .

As Walther remarks, Nachtgall was able to write a relatively good German, although his attempts did not measure up to the excellent work of Luther. Yet both books published by him seem to have had only one edition, while other translations, whose merit was far beneath that of Nachtgall's, were printed a number of times.

A man who attempted the work of translating from the Greek

text even before Luther undertook his New Testament in German was *Johann Lang*, the friend to whom Luther addressed a letter of encouragement on December 18, 1521, at the very time when he himself engaged in the task. (15, 2555; 21a, 372.) Lang was just about as old as Luther and, like him, had studied at Erfurt. In 1507 he entered the Augustinian monastery in Erfurt, and he and Luther became friends after the latter's return from Wittenberg, in 1509. From 1512 to 1516 the two men were together at Wittenberg, after which Lang became prior of the monastery at Erfurt. A careful study of Luther's position caused Lang to embrace the views of the Reformer, and his treatise *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* of 1520 suggested the translation of the New Testament to him. He finished the Gospel according to St. Matthew on June 23, 1521. The title reads:—

Das heilig Euangelium Matthei aus Kricherssprach, vnd bisweilen aus des hochgelerten hern Erasmi von Roterdam translacion Vnn durch den wirdigen doctoren Johannem Langium von Erfurt Augustiner ordens yns deutsch gebracht . . .

That Lang had some linguistic ability appears from sections such as Matt. 12, 14 ff.:—

dy phariseier aber seint er ausgangen, vnd haben rat genumen wider yn, aufdas sy yn mochten vertreiben.

Als das aber Jhesus erfarn hat, ist er von dannen gewichen, vnd seint im grose scharen nach gefolget, vnd er hat sy alle gesunt gemacht . . .

sich disz ist mein sun, den ich erwelt hab der mein gelibter ist, vber wilchen mein seel einen wolgefallen gewonnen hat.

The awkwardness of Lang's translation appears especially in his use of the tenses, a failing of which he seems to have become aware when Luther's translation was placed on the market. He quoted from the *September-Bibel* rather than from his own work. It was formerly thought that Lang continued his translation of the New Testament; but this supposition has been shown to be unfounded.

Another man who was prominent in the field of German Bible translation is *Nicolaus Krumpach*. Little is known of his life except that he studied at Leipzig and that he afterwards was pastor at Querfurt. His plan of translation matured in 1522, when he began with the letters of Peter, which bear the date February 24, 1522. On March 18 the letters of St. Paul to Timothy followed. And before the end of the year he also had the Gospel according to St. John on the market. The work of Krumpach was largely dependent upon Erasmus, but he studied Luther's writings as well. The nature of his work may be seen from his translation of 1 Pet. 5, 1 ff.:—

Die priester die vnder euch sein bite ich flehlich der ich bin selbs ein priester vnd ein gezeuge des leydens Christi, vnd auch selbs ein mitgenosse der glorien die geoffenbart wird werden

als vil an euch ist weydet die herdt Christi, habt sorge vor dieselbigen, vnd tuth das nicht aus getzwange, sondern gutwilligklich, nicht suchende schoeden geniesz oder nutzunge, Sunder ausz guetigem hertzen.

Or this sample from John 12, 3:—

Maria nam ein pfundt vngents von edlem probirten Nardo, vnd salbete die fuez Jesu, vnd trueckenet abe seine fuez mit ihrem haer. Das hausz aber ist erfüllet worden vom ruche oder schmack des vngents.

These examples indicate the main weakness of Krumpach's work, namely, that he is so circumstantial in offering two or more synonyms or synonymous expressions that his translation often reads more like a circumlocution. He frequently uses a Latin word besides the German designation, so that the reader is apt to become confused. All in all, he could hardly be considered a rival of Luther.

In this connection mention must be made of several anonymous translators of parts of the New Testament. The gospels of Mark and Luke were handled several times by such anonymous translators, who seem to have been familiar with the work of Krumpach and probably of Luther. Another anonymous translator published a rendering of St. Paul's Letter to the Galatians in 1522. The work does not compare with Luther's simple translation, as we see from the opening of chapter 3:—

O ir vnsinnige torichte Galater mith was gespenst seytr yr betrogen, nicht tzu folgen der warheit? Vor welcher augen Jesus Christus als sichtbarlich vorgebildet vnnnd in euch gekreuzigt.

Doch wil ich disz von euch erlernen, ob yr meinet, das ir den geyst aus den wercken des gesetzte Moysi, oder aus dem gehore des glaubens (durch meyn predigen) entpfangenn habth?

Of a more dangerous nature were other attempts to offer a Bible in German, particularly such as were made to discredit or to displace Luther's Bible. The first work of this kind was that by *Hieronimus Emser*, secretary of Duke George of Saxony, at whose instigation a translation of the New Testament was issued in 1527. The outstanding feature of this translation was its plagiarism, since Emser did not hesitate to copy entire sections of Luther's translation, changing the text only in the interest of his schismatic position. Wherever he offered a translation of a section from the Vulgate, his work was decidedly inferior to that of Luther. For that reason the latter spoke rather sharply of the Roman plagiaristic practises when he penned his letter of defense, his *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* of 1530. He writes: "I should really like to see the papist who might excel in this respect in translating an epistle of St. Paul or a prophet into German, provided he did not use Luther's German and his translation. There one would see a fine, beautiful, praiseworthy German or translation. For we have seen the scribbler [*Sudler*] of Dresden [*Emser*], who mastered my New Testament (I don't want to mention his name in my books any more; he now has his judge, and it is otherwise well known). He confesses that my German is sweet and good, and he noted well that he could not do better, and yet he wanted to bring shame upon it; therefore he proceeded to take my New Testament, almost word for word, as I made it. He omitted my preface, gloss,

and name, added his own name, preface, and gloss, and thus sold my New Testament under his name. O my dear children, how that hurt me, when his prince in a horrible preface condemned the New Testament of Luther and forbade the reading of the same and yet commanded to read the New Testament of the scribbler, though this is the same that Luther made." (19, 971.) Luther then proceeds to show the unethical position of Emser, while at the same time he rejoices that the translation had gone out, even in this way, in the interest of the spread of the truth.

The New Testament of Emser had such a wide circulation that the wish for a translation of the entire Bible by some Roman author was expressed. The work was undertaken by *Johann Dietenberger*, Inquisitor-General at Mainz (died August 30, 1534). His translation appeared in Mainz in 1534 and enjoyed quite a few editions. He also condemns Luther strongly, but reproduces the New Testament according to Emser and the Old Testament according to Luther's translation, with certain changes based on the Vulgate. His translation of the Old Testament apocrypha is practically a copy of the Reformed Bible of Zuerich, to which we shall presently refer. Thus Luther's Bible was circulated throughout Germany under a strange flag.

It is probably due to the reception accorded to this edition that Duke William and Duke Ludwig of Bavaria commissioned *Dr. Johann Eck*, the well-known adversary of Luther, to make a German translation from the Vulgate, without any reference to the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek original. Accordingly, Eck issued his work in 1537, but in a German which was so clumsy and difficult to understand, especially in the Old Testament, that it found few friends, even among the Catholics, and came to an end in 1550 with a second and final edition.

Among translations published on the so-called Protestant side during the first decade after the beginning of the Reformation which made use of Luther's translation as far as it had appeared, with the missing parts supplied either from other translations or by an independent rendering, we name first of all the *Anabaptist Bible*, in which the translation of the prophets by Hans Denk and Ludwig Haetzer was the outstanding feature. This version, which was the first to use the word *Biblia* in the title, has been praised for scholarship and style. It was printed by Peter Schoeffer in Worms, the complete edition appearing in 1529.

Another "composite" Bible published about this time was the so-called *Zuerich Bible*, as first prepared under the direction of Leo Judae by the preachers of Zuerich. They used Luther's work as far as then available (1529), adding the Prophets themselves and the Apocrypha as translated by Leo Judae himself. Judae was born in Alsace in 1482 and died in Zuerich in 1543. He was a college-mate and friend of Zwingli, and it was upon his request that Judae produced this translation of the Bible in the Swiss German, or the

**Alemannian dialect.** As early as 1524 three editions of Luther's New Testament in this dialect had appeared in Zuerich. The entire Bible was published in 1530, clearly under the editorship of Leo Judae. Luther refers to this work in a letter to Wenzeslaus Link: "It is surprising of what little value is the translation of Leo Judae of Zuerich, which he apparently made at the instigation of Zwingli." (21a, 1303.) This letter was written in May, 1529. In 1531 came the Zuerich edition of the Bible in two volumes, with many revisions and a new, independent translation of the Psalms, the Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon. This edition was made basic for all subsequent work. It also occupies a very prominent position in Germanic philology, since it, in its various revisions, especially that by Breitingger in 1629, but also in those of 1817, 1860, 1868, and 1882, reflects every change in the Alemannic dialect for several hundred years, until the language gradually became that of the modern High German, especially in the revision of 1893 (Riggenbach).

Other editions of the Bible in German which appeared about the first decade after Luther began his work are the Strassburg Bible of Wolf Koeppl of 1530, which offered the Prophets in the version of Haetzer and Denk and the Apocrypha in that of Leo Judae, and the Frankfort edition of 1534, published by C. Egenolph, in which only a part of the Apocrypha was not given in Luther's version.

As for Luther's Bible, it was taken in hand by *Georg Roerer*, who prepared a new edition shortly after Luther's death, in 1546. Roerer, born in 1492, had for many years been an intimate friend of Luther and had also enjoyed the hospitality of the latter's home for long periods of time. He became diaconus in Wittenberg in 1525 and acted as proof-reader and corrector while Luther's Bible was being printed. During the later years of his life he was librarian at Jena, where he died in 1557. He introduced certain changes into the text of the Bible as published by Luther, insisting that these were made in keeping with the notes which he took down in his capacity as corrector. His work has been much criticized, and Elector August of Saxony was even induced by Coelestinus to have a revision of the text made in order to restore the purity of the final edition prepared under Luther's personal supervision. Recent investigations seem to have established the fact that Roerer was not guilty of falsifying the text, and most of his changes have been retained. Therefore Roerer is not, properly speaking, an imitator of Luther, since his interest was merely to complete the work of the group of which he had so long been a member. Attempts of a similar nature, to eliminate certain harshnesses in Luther's translation, will be discussed in chapter 15. We offer only one sample of a change made by Roerer, in 1 Cor. 13, 8:

Luther, in 1545: Die Liebe wird nicht muede; es muessen aufhoern die Sprachen, und das Erkenntnis wird auch aufhoern.

The edition of 1546: Die Liebe hoeret nimmer auf, so doch die Weisungen aufhoeren werden und das Erkenntnis aufhoeren wird.



#### XIV. The Influence of Luther's Work upon the Translations of Others.

Luther's work of translating the Bible from the Greek and Hebrew into German was the outstanding performance of a career which was rich in unusual deeds and attainments. It showed a surprising understanding of the original languages and of their respective idioms, a remarkable grasp of the divine thoughts presented in these languages, and an amazing genius for transferring the inspired account into idiomatic German. Small wonder that students of the Scriptures everywhere took note of the work of Luther and tried to emulate his achievement. That various German theologians and writers made use of his translation we have already seen; but there were men in almost every country where the spirit of the Reformation took hold who were anxious to have their own countrymen receive the benefit of a similar rendering in their respective tongue.

The first scholar of this type, whose work is, incidentally, of peculiar interest to English-speaking people the world over, was *William Tyndale*. The early life of this man is hidden in obscurity. As far as can be ascertained, he was born about 1484 in Gloucestershire and enjoyed some rather extraordinary educational advantages, being brought up, as Foxe remarks, in the University of Oxford, where he was "singularly addicted to the study of the Scriptures." From Oxford he went to Cambridge, where he likewise made good use of his opportunities. As Westcott states: "He returned about 1520 to his native county as tutor in the family of Sir John Walsh of Little Sodbury. Here he spent two years, not without many controversies, in one of which he made his memorable declaration to 'a learned man' who 'said we were better be without God's Law than the Pope's': 'I defy the Pope and all his laws'; and said, 'If God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plow shall know more of the Scripture than thou doest.' The boast was not an idle phrase." (*History of the English Bible*, 24 f.)

Due to conditions in his home county, Tyndale found it advisable to come to London, where he hoped to interest Tunstall, the Bishop of London, in his proposed translation of the Bible, upon which he had resolved. Here in London he found one friend, namely, an alderman of the city, Humphrey Munmouth, who in 1528 was thrown into the Tower for the favor which he had shown Tyndale. As for the latter, he himself soon had a definite conviction thrust upon him: "In London I abode almost a year and marked the course of the world . . . and understood at the last not only that there was no room in my lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament, but also that there was no place to do it in all England." Accordingly he went over to the Continent, where he lived for some time at Hamburg. But there can be little doubt that he also went to Wittenberg and was even

enrolled in the university of Luther, for there is a matriculation list of 1524 which has the name "Daltin," evidently a pseudonym of Tyndale for the purpose of throwing his enemies off his scent. In 1524 he published a translation of the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark. The next year he went to Cologne, where he began the printing of the entire New Testament. He had managed to have ten sheets in quarto run off the presses, when his work was stopped by the intrigues of Cochlaeus, an inveterate enemy of the Reformation, who had invited some of the printers to his house and treated them with wine until they divulged the secret of the work being done. The printers were restrained from proceeding with their work on the English New Testament; but Tyndale and Roye, a trusted companion, took their printed sheets and escaped to Worms by ship. It was in this city that the first editions of Tyndale's New Testament appeared, an octavo edition being finished first, but then also the quarto, whose printing had been interrupted at Cologne. Westcott writes: "There is not, however, any reasonable doubt that the quarto edition was completed about the same time as the first octavo, and therefore it seems likely that it was completed at Worms and by Schoeffer. Two editions, a large and a small, made their appearance simultaneously in England." (*Loc. cit.*, 33.)

For our present purpose it will suffice to summarize the further work of Tyndale. Although his translation was condemned and copies of his New Testament were burned in Antwerp and London and Oxford, it was spread throughout England by numerous agents. Meanwhile Tyndale continued his work, for he intended to complete also the Old Testament, and it is known that he proceeded as far as the Book of Jonah. But he was betrayed to his enemies in May, 1535, and died at the stake in October of the following year, at Vilvorde in Belgium, his last prayer being: "Lord, open the King of England's eyes!"

Much more might be related of Tyndale and his work, but we are interested chiefly in his relation to Luther and the German translation of the Bible prepared by the great Reformer and his friends. We are here immediately confronted by the fact that some of the contemporaries of both men associate their work in unmistakable terms. Thomas More, in 1529, distinctly identified Tyndale's Testament with that of Luther, the former being derived from the latter. The report of Cochlaeus, dated 1549, reads in part: "But two English apostates who sometime had been at Wittenberg, not only were seeking to ruin their own merchants, who secretly were fostering and supporting them in exile, but they were even hoping for all the people of England, whether the king were willing or unwilling, soon to become Lutherans, through Luther's New Testament, which they had translated into the English language."

The inquiry is justified at this point on what basis such asser-

tions were made. The answer is given in part by Westcott, who points out that many of the marginal notes of the so-called Cologne edition of Tyndale's Testament are based upon Luther's work of the same nature. But this eminent scholar did not want to concede that Tyndale was dependent upon Luther's work beyond this point. The most thorough study of the question was published by Gruber as a contribution to the quadricentennial of the beginning of the Reformation, from which the following facts are presented.

The so-called Cologne Fragment, the quarto edition of Tyndale's first attempt to publish his translation of the New Testament, containing 31 leaves of St. Matthew's gospel, was discovered in 1836. A careful examination of this fragment showed it to have been the work of Peter Quentel of Cologne, and the glosses or marginal notes referred to by many biographers of Tyndale have been carefully studied, especially on the basis of a facsimile reprint by Edward Arbor. This study has revealed and definitely demonstrated that the Worms edition, the small octavo, was the first to appear on the market. But the Cologne edition, which seems to have been finished to the end of St. Mark even before Tyndale had to flee from the city, contained both a prolog and the marginal references and glosses which have offered such an excellent basis for comparisons. It appears from such a comparison that the *Vorrede*, or Introduction, of Luther, in his *September-Bibel* of 1522, served as the basis for the prolog of the Cologne edition of Tyndale's Testament. The beginning of a few of the paragraphs in the two prefaces is here offered:—

*Luther:* Solch geschrey vnd trostliche mehre odder Euangelisch vnd Gotlich newzeyttung heyst auch eyn new testament darumb daz gleych wie eyn testament ist wenn eyn sterbender man seyn gutt bescheydet nach seynem todt den benandten erben aus zu teylen Also hat auch Christus fur seynem sterben befolhen vnd bescheyden solchs euangelion nach seynem todt aus zuruffen ynn alle welt. . . .

*Tyndale:* This evangelion or gossell that is to saye suche ioyfull tyd-ings is called the newe testament. Because that as a man when he shall dye apoynteth his goodds to be dealte and distributed after hys dethe amonge them which he nameth to be his heyres. Even so Christ before his dethe commaunded and apoynted that suche evangelion gossell or tyd-yngs shoulde be declared through oute all the worlde. . . .

*Luther:* Nu hat Gott solchen glawben zu stercken dises seyn Euan-gelion vnd testament viel felltig ym alten testament durch die propheten ver sprochen. . . .

*Tyndale:* To strength such feythe with all god promysed this his evangelion in the olde testament by the prophetts in the holy scripturs. . . .

*Luther:* Item Gen. 22 versprach ers zu Abraham ynn deynem samen sollen alle geschlecht auff erden gesegnet werden Christus ist der same Abrahe. . . .

*Tyndale:* Agayne gen. xxij. god promysed Abraham sayings: in thy seede shall all the generations of the erthe be blessed. Christ is that seede of Abraham. . . .

Further evidence is offered also by the table of contents, as Gruber shows, and in particular by the notes or glosses. A careful comparison of these marginal notes in Matt. 1, 1—22, 12 shows that of the 92 glosses concerned 57 are entirely or almost literal translations of Luther's notes, and these are the notes of importance for the understanding of the text. A few samples will amply demonstrate the agreement between the two translations:—

*Luther* (Matt. 1, 1): Abraham vnd Dauid werden furnemlich antzogen darumb das den selben Christus sonderlich verheysen ist.

*Tyndale*: Abraham and David are fyrst rehearsid because that christe was cheffy promysed vnto them.

*Luther* (Matt. 1, 10): Das ist er wolt sie nicht zu schanden machen fur den leuten als er wol macht hatte nach dem gesetzte. . . .

*Tyndale*: That is he wolde not put her to open shame as he wel might hae done bi the lawe.

*Luther* (Matt. 5, 5): die welt vermaynt die erden zu besitzen vnd das yhr zu schutzen wenn sie gewalt vbet aber Christus leret das man die erden alleyn mit senfftmutigkeyt on gewalt behalt.

*Tyndale*: The worlde thinkethe too possesse the erthe and to defend there awne when they vse violence and power: but christ teacheth that the world must be possessed with mekenes only and with oute power and violence.

*Luther* (Matt. 9, 15): Es ist zweyerley leyden. Eins aus eygner wal angenomen als der monch regulen &c. wie Baals priester sich selb stachen. . . .

*Tyndale*: There is payne ij maner awayes. oone waye of a mennes awne choyse and election as is the monks rules and as baals prests prickyd them selves.

This comparison could easily be extended to show that Tyndale followed Luther's third (and in part his second) edition to the point of including the printer's errors in the very place where these are found in Luther's text, all of which conclusively proves that Tyndale made use of Luther's version, and that very closely, in the matter of outward form, introductions, marginal notes, and other external appendages.

As for the text itself, it may well be conceded that Tyndale worked much more independently in his translation. But to go as far as Westcott in denying practically any and all influence of Luther's version upon Tyndale's text would be doing violence to the evidence. The following passages and expressions from Luther's text of 1524 and that of Tyndale of 1525 are characteristic of the latter's work:—

*Luther* (Matt. 1, 1): Dis ist das buch.—*Tyndale*: Thys ys the boke.

*Luther* (Matt. 1, 18): Die gepurt Christi war aber also gethan.—*Tyndale*: The byrthe of Christ was on this wyse.

*Luther* (Matt. 5, 13): Es ist nu nicht hynfurt nutz.—*Tyndale*: it is thence for the good for nothyng.

*Luther* (Matt. 8, 29): Ach Jhesu du son Gottis was haben wyr mit dyr zu thun.—*Tyndale*: O iesu the sonne of god what have we to do with the.

*Luther* (Matt. 11, 7): woltet yhr eyn rhor sehen.—*Tyndale*: Went ye out to se a rede.

*Luther* (Matt. 13, 54): wo her kompt disem solche weyszhyt vnd macht?—*Tyndale*: whence came all thys wysdom and power vnto him?

*Luther* (Matt. 16, 5): hatten sie vergessen brod mit sich zu nemen.—*Tyndale*: they had forgotten to take breed with them.

While it is true, then, that the translation of Tyndale was undoubtedly based upon a number of versions, the Greek text of Erasmus, the English version of Wyclif, the Latin of Erasmus, and the Latin Vulgate, it cannot be denied that the German version of Luther was the translation which served as a guide to Tyndale in a great many passages, that he used it far more than any other translation, very likely next to the Greek text itself. This is far from stating, however, as has been asserted, that Tyndale's translation was practically nothing more than a translation from Luther. He used it as one might to-day employ a previous translation of a book, but always under the guidance of his own judgment. Tyndale followed Luther and learned much from him, but he did not slavishly imitate or copy him. Thus his use of Luther's printed edition does not detract from Tyndale's proper and important position in the history of the English Reformation and in that of the English Bible. It was very likely the virility of the German diction in Luther's version, so closely akin to that of the Anglo-Saxon, that caused Tyndale to take over so many expressions, and this fact gives to the Authorized Version, which is so largely dependent upon Tyndale's work, its powerful appeal to this day.

But the English Bible of Tyndale was not the only one to be influenced by the classical German version as prepared by Luther. The first translation of the New Testament into Danish was made by *Hans Mikkelsen*, a former burgomaster of Malmö. It was a mixture of Danish and German, which appeared in Leipzig in 1524, the language being somewhat uncouth, due to the translator's attempt to remain close to his model. Five years later appeared a translation by *Christen Pedersen* († 1554). The New Testament in Danish, as rendered by Pedersen, was printed at Antwerp in 1529, a second edition being printed in 1531, the same year in which he published his translation of the Psalms. All these renderings were based chiefly upon the Vulgate, although they also referred to the Greek edition of Erasmus and to Luther's version. After *Hans Tausen* († 1561) had translated the Pentateuch from the text of Luther, the first complete Bible in Danish was published at Copenhagen in 1550, the greater part of the work being done by Christen Pedersen with the assistance of a number of professors. In this case the instructions of King Christian III specifically stated that the translators were to follow Luther's German version as closely as possible. A new edition was prepared in 1589, and a reprint of this edition was issued in 1633.

When the Reformation came to Iceland, it was received with great

joy, and *Odd Gottskalkson* translated the New Testament into the old Norwegian-Icelandic tongue. This was published at Roskilde in 1540. The entire Bible was translated on the basis of Luther's version by Bishop *Gudbrand Thorlakson* in 1584. This translation was used till the first part of the last century. In Sweden likewise the influence of Luther was felt; for after the New Testament had been translated by *Lorenz Andreae* with the assistance of *Olaus Petri* and published at Stockholm in 1526, the more ambitious undertaking of translating the entire Bible was successfully carried out by *Lars Petri*, Archbishop of Upsala, who printed his work in 1540—41. This Bible was based upon the work of Luther and for a long time remained the church Bible of Sweden. Thus the light which had been lighted in the little university town on the Elbe shed its rays far beyond the borders of Germany, and thousands of souls who were hungry for the truth basked in its warmth.

#### XV. Other German Translators since Luther and the Later History of His Text.

About one hundred years after the work of Luther had appeared, new versions of the New Testament or of the entire Bible were attempted by men who belonged to the Evangelical party. Among these the name of *Piscator* stands first both in point of time and of importance. *Johann Piscator* (Fischer) was born at Strassburg in 1546. He studied at Tuebingen under *Andreae* and *Heerbrand*, where the former noted his inclination to Calvinism and brought about his dismissal from the instructional staff which he had joined after his graduation. After some further vicissitudes *Piscator* was called, in 1584, to the University of Herborn, where he, with *Olevianus*, drew up the statutes and where he taught without intermission till the time of his death, in 1625. In the history of dogma *Piscator* is known for his denial of the redemptive power of the active obedience of Christ. His translation of the Bible appeared in its first edition in 1602—3, the third edition being published in 1624. A quaint description of this translation, dated 1710, states: "Whether, now, he translated from the original languages or, as some believe, after the good Latin rendering of *Junius* or *Tremellius* (although he made use of these only for his assistance), he nevertheless gives occasion for many unusually good readings, since he uses many convenient German words and expressions, which strike the right meaning well, not to speak of the fact that he noted many points in his translation which had been overlooked by previous workers out of general weakness." As a matter of fact, the *Piscator*, or *Herborner Bible*, as it was also called, is characterized by an almost slavish faithfulness in rendering the original; for the translator was anxious to present each and every thought of the Hebrew and the Greek with the utmost fidelity. For

that reason he adds an occasional explanatory phrase, as in Mark 8, 12: "Wann diesem geschlecht ein zaichen wirdt gegeben werden, so straffe mich Gott," whence this Bible, in the history of theological literature, has received the name "Straf-mich-Gott" Bible. He also has a doctrinal and practical application after many chapters of his Bible, some of which contain interesting material. In 1610 Piscator issued an appendix to his Herborn Bible, in two quarto volumes, giving a summary of doctrinal and ethical truths, also the usual material contained in a good Bible dictionary, chronology, weights and measures, money, etc. The Piscator Bible found favor especially in the Swiss canton Berne, so that it was introduced officially for use in church and school and was printed as the German Received Text in 1648, 1697, 1719, 1728, and 1784. But its popularity decreased at the end of the eighteenth century, and the last Piscator Bible appeared in 1848. As early as 1830 a new "Order for Preachers" acknowledged the Lutheran Bible beside the Herborner, and it was left to the pastors whether they wanted to use the more idiomatic work of Luther.

A translation which was quite in vogue for a while was one prepared by *Johann Heinrich Reitz*, a strong representative of Reformed pietism. After studying in Leiden and Bremen, he was pastor at Freinsheim, later at Asslar, and then in Homburg. His translation of the New Testament appeared at Offenbach on the Main in 1703. He was strongly influenced by the translation of Luther, so that his version passed through three editions. His own explanation of his work appears in the introduction of his version: "Whence I made it a point not to follow my own good pleasure and inclination in the translation, but only what the Holy Ghost Himself has prescribed; wherefore I, if that was at all possible and if the German idiom permitted it, retained the Spirit's manner of speaking, so that I occasionally expressed a Greek word in more than one German word, rather than to leave what the Spirit of God has prescribed, since it behoves us to learn from the Spirit of God how we ought to speak of the divine mysteries of our eternal salvation, and not to change and twist His sayings according to our pleasure." The translation of Reitz is preserved in a five-column New Testament printed by Holle, in Wandsbeck near Hamburg, in 1710, the columns offering the New Testament in the Catholic translation of Caspar Ulenbergius, that of Luther, that of Piscator, that of Reitz, and a Dutch translation made by a number of theologians of Leiden and published in 1636.

Some rather pretentious translations of the Bible were issued in the first half of the eighteenth century, largely on the basis of original work in rendering the original into the German language as then in use. The *Berleburg Bible* appeared in eight volumes (1726—1749). It was prepared in the interest of mysticism and shows this influence

in many instances. It is also extensively quoted by scholars with that trend of thought. The *Wertheim Bible*, on the other hand, was issued in the interest of rationalism. It appeared in 1735.

To give a detailed account of all the later translations would lead us too far afield, for an increasing number of scholars felt that they ought to make improvements in the existing versions or present renderings of their own. Of the versions which were perhaps the most influential the following may be listed: that by J. D. Michaelis in fifteen volumes (1768 ff.), that by Moldenhauer in twelve volumes (1774 ff.), that by Simon Grynaeus in five volumes, a paraphrase rather than a translation, with many abridgments (1776—7), that by Griesinger (1824), that by Augusti and De Wette (1809—14), the second edition by De Wette alone, in three volumes (1831), also versions by Bunsen, Holtzmann, Weizsaecker, Bertholet, Hermann Menge, and others. The remarks of De Wette in his introduction to the second edition of his translation is characteristic of many of the translators: "Adhering closely to the language and the tone of Luther's translation, which has not only come into ecclesiastical, but into popular use and has incorporated into our language many features of the Hebrew, . . . I wanted to render both the Hebrew and the Hebrew-like form of the thoughts to the extent in which they can be fitted to the German language without becoming obscure and violating good taste. . . . I have worked for two classes of readers. First of all I wanted to provide some assistance for those who occupy themselves with the original text of the Biblical books in order to facilitate the understanding, especially with regard to lexicons and grammars. . . . In the second place, I desire that my work may be of value also for the unlearned Christians, who want to read the Bible with understanding." Like most of the modern translations, that of De Wette is printed in the form of paragraphs rather than that of individual verses. He frequently refers to variant readings, which he translates in footnotes. If some of these translations are properly used by the student of the Bible, he will no doubt be able to derive a good deal of blessing from such study; but on the whole they can hardly be said to possess the idiom and the rhythm which make Luther's translation so popular.

The later history of Luther's German text offers many interesting features; for it suffered much at the hands of publishers and printers. It was Feyerabend, a printer of Frankfurt, who included the passage 1 John 5, 7 in an edition of 1574, although Luther had not accepted this verse, since it is evidently not genuine, but a later addition, or gloss, in explanation of the context. This same Feyerabend also inserted a translation of the so-called third and fourth books of Esdras, although Luther had emphatically refused to give them a standing even equal to the apocrypha which he had translated. As one printer



after the other published the version of Luther, changes were made, many of which were unnecessary and even misleading. Where a more modern spelling was introduced, no objection can be raised. But such changes as *Suendflut* (flood as a punishment of sins instead of *Sintflut* (great or general flood), *Freudigkeit* (joy) instead of *Freidigkeit* (openness, courage), *Ehrenhold* (honorable messenger) instead of *Ernhold* (herald), and others are unwarranted, except on the basis of ignorance, and hence are inexcusable. It is a pity that many of the changes falsely made have been retained in the modern reprints of the Luther Bible.

Before the end of the seventeenth century special efforts were made to obtain a uniform text of the Luther version. Yeoman's work was done by Dr. Johann Diecmann (1647—1720), who was Superintendent-General for Bremen and Verden. He not only made some very careful studies in the text of Luther, but he added his own researches in Greek and Hebrew in establishing doubtful passages, where the text had become hopelessly corrupt. His edition, known as the *Stader Bible*, was issued in 1690, and it was the printing of 1703 which formed the basis of the celebrated Canstein text. Carl Hildebrand von Canstein (1667—1719) was a man of unusual culture and of an outstanding moral rectitude, who formed a close attachment with Spener. By this interesting and inspiring friend Canstein was introduced to members of the university faculty at Halle, among whom was also August Hermann Francke. The latter had already printed Bibles in 1702 and in 1708, and he was anxious to have this work expand to a point where it would benefit the greatest possible number of people, especially those of the poorer classes. As a result of the friendship thus begun the *Canstein Bibelanstalt* (Bible institution, or society) was established. Its first edition of the Bible, based on the *Stader Bible*, the work of Johann Heinrich Grischow, who did a great deal of research work in comparing the original editions of the Luther text and who became the inspector of the printery bearing Canstein's name, was issued in 1712—13. Before the death of the founder, in 1719, the amazing number of 100,000 New Testaments and 40,000 complete Bibles had been printed, by the end of the eighteenth century almost three million Bibles and Testaments, which number had been doubled by 1875. In 1775 the orthography of the Canstein Bibles was carefully revised, and in 1794 a glossary of obscure and obsolete words was added. The text of these Bibles became the received text of the Luther version, also for the editions by the various Bible societies, especially the British and Foreign Bible Society and the American Bible Society.

Besides the form of the text as printed by the Canstein institution, there are about six others which have been in use by the various Bible societies. It is evident that this condition would be considered

very much of a nuisance, especially since it might easily lead to further corruptions of the text. On this account the matter was discussed at meetings held in 1857 and 1858, also in 1861 and 1863, in the Evangelical Church Conference held at Eisenach. The resolutions of this meeting eventually led to the so-called revision of Luther's Bible, which we shall briefly discuss in the last chapter.

#### XVI. The Revision of 1883 and Its Modern Forms.

As early as 1695 the noted pietistic theologian August Hermann Francke published his *Observationes Sacrae*, in which he suggested certain changes in the translation of Luther. He was met with such stern opposition on the part of the orthodox party, especially that of Professor Mayer of Greifswald, that he discontinued his efforts. At the beginning of the nineteenth century Claus Harms suggested that there ought to be a revision of Luther's text every hundred years, chiefly in the interest of changes in the language. Other men spoke and wrote along the same lines, and some notable contributions were made by men like Joh. Fr. von Meyer (1819), Snethlage, Grueneisen, Fresenius (1835), Rudolf Stier (1860 and 1867).

But it was chiefly due to the labors of *Moenckeberg* of Hamburg that definite steps were taken to revise the translation of Luther. Men like Nitzsch (first of Wittenberg, then of Berlin) and Dorner (1853 Goettingen, 1862 Berlin) were instrumental in bringing the matter to the official attention of the Eisenach Conference. One of the first acts of this body, in 1863, was to decide upon the latest version of the Canstein edition of Luther's text as the basis of its work, with special reference to the actual revisions and variants proposed by Luther himself. The men who chiefly urged this step were Rudolf von Raumer and Frommann. The second guiding principle of the conference was expressed in the resolution that variant readings of the German Bible in church use were to be considered according to their nearness to the original Hebrew and Greek. The third resolution of 1863 reads: "In addition to this the relatively few passages, chiefly those of the New Testament, where a change, resp. a correction in the interest of the better understanding of Scripture, might seem necessary and unobjectionable, are to be produced from the original text in a manner faithful to the meaning and as much as possible from the word-treasure of Luther's Bible."

In agreement with these principles the conference arranged to have a committee of ten theologians make the revision: from Prussia, Nitzsch (whose place was afterward taken by Koestlin), Twesten, Beyschlag, and Riehm; from Saxony, Ahlfeld and Brueckner; from Hanover, Meyer and Niemann; and from Wuerttemberg, Frohmueller and Schroeder. The Revision Board had a ten-day session in the fall of 1865 and another in the spring of 1866. The result of the labors

was published as a *Probetestament*: "*Das Neue Testament unsers Herrn und Heilandes Jesu Christi nach der deutschen Uebersetzung Dr. Martin Luthers. Revidierte Ausgabe. Halle, 1867.*" After criticisms and suggestions had been received from various sources, the board had a session about Easter, 1868, whereupon the work was approved by the Eisenach Conference about Pentecost of the same year. The text, as then accepted, was published in 1870, but unfortunately without any reference to the fact that it represented a revision, a fact which was properly censured with great severity.

In 1870, even before the beginning of the Franco-Prussian War, the Eisenach Conference decided to continue the revision of Luther's text, also in the Old Testament. The board was considerably enlarged, and the work was facilitated by the appointment of subcommittees. Between 1871 and 1880 eighteen plenary meetings were held, each one lasting from eight to ten days. In 1883, the year of the quadricentennial of Luther's birth, the so-called *Probibibel* was issued, which indicated all the changes, both from the Canstein text and from the version of Luther as differing from the original. For six years the revised text was before the German public before the Board undertook a super-revision of the New Testament text. A similar service was later rendered for the Old Testament. The revised text is now so generally accepted that, for example, the *Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt* has lately issued a magnificent edition, the *Palaestina-Biblibibel*, bearing the title: "*Die Bibel oder die ganze Heilige Schrift des Alten und Neuen Testaments nach der deutschen Uebersetzung Dr. Martin Luthers, neu durchgesehen nach dem vom Deutschen Evangelischen Kirchenausschuss genehmigten Text.*" What the friends of the undertaking thought of the work is well summarized in the following propositions concerning the *Probibibel* as accepted by the Bible Conference in 1884: "1. In the changes which she offers us the *Probibibel* presents a most welcome furtherance of our German Luther Bible and of its understanding; 2. it contains few changes that may rightfully be challenged, and these have more significance for the language than for the content; 3. as the return to the linguistic form of the Luther Bible represents a step too far, so on the other hand, it is necessary to go a step farther in the improvement of the sense; 4. since, however, we see in the revised Bible a blessing for our people and a bond of unity for the German evangelical churches, we desire that it should by all means become a reality."

We now ask: In what respect and to what extent is this a revision of Luther's text? If one includes the apocryphal books, the total number of changes made by the revisers amounts to about 4,000, with an additional 1,000 changes in the headings of the chapters based upon Luther's notes. Many of the changes were merely of a linguistic nature, the purpose being to supplant obsolescent or obsolete words and

forms with such as are in use at the present time. In about 1,700 passages the text itself has been changed, and this in spite of the concession that Luther and his coworkers cannot be charged with one rendering which would bring even one error into the German Bible.

Our second question therefore is: Were the changes, on the whole, improvements upon the text of Luther or not? In certain cases it may be conceded at once that the technical advantage is in favor of the revision. Thus Luther speaks of a *Drachen* (dragon), concerning which we now know that it was a kind of jackal; he speaks of a *Laeufer* (runner), of which we now know that it refers to a young camel. On the other hand, it is often all too evident that certain changes grew out of a different spirit from that which actuated Luther and his coworkers. This is particularly evident in the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, where the claims of a false higher criticism were accepted, to the detriment of the translation from the Hebrew. As much as possible all references to *direct* Messianic promises have been weakened or eradicated. The revisers evidently were not familiar with Luther's scholarly defense of many points of his translation. Thus in Gen. 4, 1, where Roerer wisely placed the translation advocated by Luther's company: "Ich habe den Mann, den Herrn," "I have the man, the Lord," the revisers accepted the version: "*Ich habe den Mann durch den Herrn,*" I have a man with or through the Lord, that is, with His help. The explanation offered by Wilibald Grimm is characteristic: "In Gen. 3, 15 there is no reference to an *individual* Savior. [*Sic!*] Although the translation 'den Herrn' is the first choice from the standpoint of grammar, it does not fit into the historical situation. [?] The Hebrew here can only mean *with* the Lord, that is, by His help, whence we, with Stier and others, have made the change *through the Lord*, so that Eve is presented as expressing her joy over the fact that she has born a male child and that she recognizes this as a gift of God's mercy."

In Job 19, 25—27 Luther's translation clearly refers to a belief in the resurrection of the body: "*Ich weiss, dass mein Erloeser lebt, und er wird mich hernach aus der Erde auferwecken,*" "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and He will afterwards raise me up out of the earth." The revised translation has: "*Und als der Letzte wird er ueber dem Staub sich erheben. Und nachdem diese meine Haut zerschlagen ist, werde ich ohne mein Fleisch Gott sehen,*" "and as the Last One will He raise Himself up above the dust; and after this my skin will be destroyed, I shall see God without my flesh." As Willkomm has correctly shown (*Bibel, Lutherbibel, revidierte Bibel*, 32 ff.), the linguistic situation does not require the revised rendering, but the latter expresses the false position of the critics, their denial of the doctrine of the resurrection in the Book of Job. In a similar way, in Dan. 9, 25, 26, the revisers changed Luther's reference to Christ as the Messiah

to a mere "the Anointed One," their plea being that the Messianic conception of the passage does not agree with history and that Luther had no right to express his understanding of the passage in his rendering of the prophecy.

The same spirit is evident also in the changes which have been made in the headings of many chapters. Thus the superscription of Ps. 16, which reads: "Prophecy of Christ's Suffering and Resurrection," was changed to read: "The Beautiful Heritage of the Saint and His Deliverance from Death." The heading of Ps. 47 was changed from "Of the Ascension of Christ" to "God Is King." Ps. 69 had "Messiah's Prayer in His Passion"; the revised text has "The Servant of the Lord in His Deepest Suffering." The word "Christ" was removed from all headings but two, Ps. 110 and Micah 5. Of the 66 Old Testament headings referring to Christ, as contained in the old text, only 14 have been retained in the revised text, and many of these are ambiguous. If one carefully casts up accounts, the deficiencies of the revised German version outbalance its excellencies. The new text may well be used by the trained theologian to make certain necessary comparisons, but it is not a safe text to recommend to such as are not familiar with the original languages. The longer one studies the question, the more one is bound to be impressed with the beauty and the power of Luther's work.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Weimar Edition of Luther's Works. (Luther's German version.)  
*Das Neue Testament Deutschsch (September-Bibel).* Kawerau reprint.  
*Das Neue Testament oder: Der Neue Bund.* 1710. (Contains the New Testament in parallel columns: Catholic version by Ulenbergius, 1630; Luther's translation; Reformed version by Piscator, 1602/3; a new German translation by H. Reitz, 1703; a Dutch version by a number of theologians of Holland, 1636.)

\* \* \*

Bindseil (and Niemeyer): *Dr. Martin Luthers Bibeluebersetzung, nach der letzten Originalausgabe kritisch bearbeitet.*

Bindseil: *Verzeichnis der Originalausgaben der Lutherschen Bibel.*

Ficker, J.: *Die Anfaenge reformatorischer Bibelauslegung.*

Florer: *Luther's Use of Pre-Lutheran Versions.*

Grimm: *Kurzgefasste Geschichte der lutherischen Bibeluebersetzung.*

Gruber, J. F.: *The Truth about the So-called "Luther's Testament in English."*

Hirsch: *Die deutsche Bibeluebersetzung Luthers.*

Hopf: *Wuerdigung der Lutherschen Bibeluebersetzung.*

Hopf: *Alliteration, Assonanz, Reim in der Lutherbibel.*

Kamphausen: *Die berichtigte Lutherbibel.*

Kohlschuetter: *Die Revision der Lutherschen Bibeluebersetzung.*

Kuhrs: *Das Verhaeltnis der Dezember-Bibel zur September-Bibel.*

Kurrelmeyer: *Die deutsche Bibel.*

Lagarde, de: *Die revidierte Lutherbibel des Halleschen Waisenhauses.*

Moenckeberg: *Tabellarische Uebersicht der wichtigsten Varianten der bedeutendsten gangbaren Bibelausgaben.*

Muther: *Die aeltesten deutschen Bilderbibeln.*

Panzer: *Entwurf einer vollstaendigen Geschichte der deutschen Bibeluebersetzung M. Luthers.*

Riehm: *Revision der Lutherbibel.*

Riggenbach: *Die schweizerische revidierte Uebersetzung des Neuen Testaments und der Psalmen.*

Risch: *Was jeder von seiner Lutherbibel wissen muss.*

Wahl: *Die deutsche Bibel vom 15. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert.*

Walther: *Die deutsche Bibeluebersetzung des Mittelalters.*

Walther: *Die ersten Konkurrenten der Bibeluebersetzung Luthers.*

Willkomm: *Bibel, Lutherbibel, revidierte Bibel.*

---

## Zur Lehre von der Reue.

### III.

Folgt die Buße auf den Glauben? Eine solche Frage kommt uns Lutheranern sonderbar vor. Wir lehren: „Und ist wahre, rechte Buße eigentlich Reue und Leid oder Schrecken haben über die Sünde und doch daneben glauben an das Evangelium.“ (Augsb. Konf., XII.) Und der Glaube ist „das vornehmste Stück der Buße“ (Apol., XII, 57). Nein, die Buße, deren eigentliches Wesen im Glauben besteht, kann nicht auf den Glauben folgen. Calvin aber und seine Anhänger lassen die Buße auf den Glauben folgen. Offenbar haben sie einen andern Begriff von der Buße als wir. Und dieser reformierte Sprachgebrauch hat dazu beigetragen, daß innerhalb der christlichen Kirche eine große Verwirrung in der Lehre von der Reue und der Bekehrung herrscht. Es soll im folgenden dargelegt werden, was die Reformierten meinen, wenn sie die Buße auf den Glauben folgen lassen, und wie verkehrt und schädlich diese Meinung ist.

Das dritte Kapitel des dritten Buchs von Calvins *Institutiones* handelt von der Buße. In der Übersetzung von G. Weveridge heißt es da: „Repentance being properly understood, it will better appear how a man is justified freely by faith alone, and yet that holiness of life, *real* holiness, as it is called, is inseparable from the free imputation of righteousness. That repentance not only always follows faith, but is produced by it, ought to be without controversy. . . . Repentance may not inappropriately be defined thus: A real conversion of our life unto God, proceeding from sincere and serious fear of God and consisting in the mortification of our flesh and the old man and the quickening of the spirit. . . . As repentance begins with dread and hatred of sin, the apostle sets down godly sorrow as one of its causes, 2 Cor. 7, 10. By godly sorrow he means when we not only tremble at the punishment, but hate and abhor the sin because we know that it is displeasing to God. . . . We must now show what is meant when we say that repentance consists of two parts, *viz.*, the mortification of the flesh and the quickening of the spirit. The prophets, in accommodation to a carnal people, express this in simple and homely terms,