
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

CRITICAL NOTES

LUTHER'S NEW TESTAMENT — A QUADRICENTENNIAL STUDY

BY L. FRANKLIN GRUBER, D.D., LL.D.

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

THERE are some events in the history of the race that by preëminence stand out as landmarks of human progress. And there are certain epochs that are especially rich is such outstanding events. Of such remarkable epochs was the period of the Renaissance and the Reformation; and of conspicuous individual events of that period there was perhaps none that had more far-reaching significance than Luther's translation of the Bible.

It is true that there had been translations of the Bible into the language of the people in more than one country before the time of Luther. Indeed, even in Germany, fourteen editions of the Bible (not different versions, as is often said) in High German had already appeared, not to speak of four in Low German, the first in 1466 and the fourteenth in 1518. But that old version had been made from the Latin Vulgate and not from the original Hebrew and Greek, while all these editions differed from one another, according to the fancies of editors and publishers, and were full of error. Moreover, they were practically inaccessible to the common people.

ITS TRANSLATION AND PUBLICATION

Luther had for some time been considering the matter of making a new and more accurate German translation from the original Hebrew and Greek languages, as he was more and more realizing the importance, for the great cause in which he was engaged, of having the Word become its own vindication through the medium of the language of the common people. He accordingly resolved at the opportune time to undertake the stupendous task. After championing the truth at the Diet of Worms, April

17 and 18, 1521, he was spirited away by friends, in the interests of greater safety and peace, to the Castle of the Wartburg, where his voluntary exile afforded him the necessary leisure from other duties to begin this great work. There in that historic fortress, undisturbed by foe or friend, in December of that year, he set to work upon his projected version; and within three months his first draft of the translation of the New Testament was completed. On March 6, 1522, he returned to Wittenburg, where with some assistance from Melanchthon he carefully corrected his translation and made preparations for its publication. The finished volume issued from the press after September 20, undoubtedly the 21st, the very date he had set for its appearance several weeks before. He at once sent a copy to his friend Spalatin, and on the 25th he sent one through Spalatin to his Wartburg host. It is because of its appearance in September that it has quite generally been spoken of as the "September Bible," although the term "Bible" is hardly proper for the New Testament alone. It would be more appropriate to call it the "September Testament." It bore the engraved title

DAS NEWE TESTA-
MENT DEUTZSCH

The place of printing, *Vuittemberg*, was *printed* below.

The edition supposedly consisted of five thousand copies, which the publishers sold at one and a half gulden each, or somewhat less than a dollar of our money. As the whole edition was very quickly being exhausted arrangements were almost immediately made by Luther for a second and slightly revised edition. This issued from the press of Lotther in December (1522); and has, therefore, been spoken of as the "December Bible." In size and general appearance it was almost an exact duplicate of the first edition, as also it was in text and type, although the whole had been reset. It bore the same engraved title as the first edition, the word *Vuittemberg* being, however, a little closer to the title, while it has four clover leaves with stems facing each other in the form of a cross below the name of the city. And at the end of Revelation it

has the printer's name and the date in the following colophon:

Gedruckt zu Wittenberg durch Melchior Lotther yhm tausent funffhundert zwey vnnd zwentzigsten Iar.

The translation was based chiefly upon Erasmus's Greek Testament, the second edition, 1519, which also was an important contribution to the cause of the Reformation. Luther's New Testament was therefore the first modern version based upon the original Greek, as also was his Old Testament the first made directly from the original Hebrew. Of the importance of this translation for the German language and German literature we should hardly need to speak in this connection, while space would not permit us to do justice to this point; and, indeed, numerous publications on this subject have appeared both in German and in other languages.

The Form in Which It Appeared

In outward form the book is a folio, 12½ by 8½ inches, and nearly two inches thick. The *first* edition has neither date nor printer's name, but the date was that noted above, while it was probably published by Döring and Cranach. There are evidences in the book itself that the sheets were printed by three associate presses, although the type is apparently uniform throughout. Thus, after four preliminary leaves (inclusive of title leaf) there are CVII. numbered leaves (four Gospels and Acts), the Roman numerals with but two exceptions having the period after them; then, after six unnumbered leaves of *Vorrhede* to Romans there are LXXVII numbered leaves (Romans to the end of the Epistles), the Roman numerals with but one exception (an erroneously numbered leaf XLIX. for LXXI) not being followed by the period; and, lastly, there are 26 unnumbered leaves (Revelation). That three printers were engaged is also confirmed by the fact that there are also three sets of signatures corresponding to

the above, and none goes to the end of the alphabet. The fact that the four preliminary leaves before the beginning of Matthew's Gospel and the 6 leaves of the *Vorrhede* to Romans are unnumbered and have their own signatures indicates that the copy for these was probably supplied while the rest of the book was passing through the press, as the other shorter introductions are included in the numbering.*

LUTHER'S INTRODUCTIONS AND APPRAISAL OF THE BOOKS

In the order of books, Hebrews and James are placed after III John. Indeed, in the list of the books on the verso of the fourth preliminary leaf, Hebrews, James, Jude and Revelation are not included in the numbering, and are slightly separated from the numbered books ending at 23, with III John. Immediately after the title-leaf, whose verso is blank, there is the general *Vorrhede*, covering nearly four pages. Then on the recto of the next leaf (or the fourth folio of the book) there is the celebrated appraisal of the relative value of the books of the New Testament:

wilchs die rechten vnd Edlisten
bucher des newen testa-
ments sind.

It is in this "appraisal," not in the *Vorrhede*, as has been said by Church historians, where occurs the reported supposed "fling at the rechte stroern Epistel of St. James." And this "fling" appears unaltered also in the second and later editions, although Dr. Schaff said that it was "omitted or modified" after the first edition (*History of the Christian Church*, VI, 247). It might be well to quote these words with their immediate context. After naming the books that may be considered as containing the true essence of the Gospel, namely, St. John, the First Epistle of John, Paul's Epistles, especially those to the Romans,

*For further bibliographical, as well as for historical, details, see the writer's, "The Wittenberg Originals of the Luther Bible," published by the *Bibliographical Society of America*, 1918. This also gives an account of the originals of the other parts of the Luther Bible, as well as of the whole Bible.

the Galatians and the Ephesians, and the First Epistle of Peter, Luther continues:

> Darum ist sanct
> Iacobs Epistel eyn rechte
> stroern Epistel gegen sie/. . .

It would appear, therefore, that this is rather a *comparison* of books than a rejection of James. It should, however, be stated that in the *Vorrhede* to the Epistle of James and Jude, Luther expresses it as his own opinion that the Epistle attributed to James was not from the hand of an apostle, but that, though it had been rejected by the ancients, he nevertheless loved it and regarded it as good because it does not set forth human learning while it very much stresses God's law. And therein he also sets forth somewhat at length his *reasons* for not regarding it as of apostolic origin.

In this connection it should also be stated that in the last paragraph of the above-mentioned *Vorrhede* Luther gives his estimate of the Epistle of Jude. He regards it as rather an epitome or copy of the Second Epistle of St. Peter, because of the close similarity in the phraseology. Hence, because of this, and partly because the Epistle of Jude also cites passages not found in extant Scriptures, a fact that moved the Fathers to exclude it from the chief Scriptures, Luther says that, though he prizes it, he nevertheless regards it as an unnecessary Epistle to be counted among the chief books.

As we have just given his estimate of two of the four books which he does not include in his numbered list, we shall here also give his estimate of the other two, as well as his general estimate of the four.

In his *Vorrhede* to the Epistle to the Hebrews he says that the preceding books are the real authenticated chief books of the New Testament, but that the following four books (Hebrews, James, Jude, Revelation) have for a long time been differently regarded. Then he proceeds to give his reason why he does not regard the Epistle to the Hebrews as of Pauline, or even of apostolic, origin. But

in the closing paragraph he states that, while the writer is unknown, it is nevertheless worthy of study.

Of the Revelation of St. John he writes that, while he would bind no one to his opinion, he would express himself as he feels, namely, that it is neither apostolic nor prophetic, as the apostles did not thus deal with visions. He then cites the prophecies of the Old Testament to the same effect. After stating that the book had for a long time been rejected by many of the Church Fathers, he says that, while everyone must hold as to this book what his spirit impels him to, he cannot regard the book as teaching or making Christ known.

These, then, are the reasons why the last four books are not numbered with the preceding 23, as they were regarded as not of the same high evangelical order as the rest, and as not capable of being proved to be genuine.

It should, however, be stated that Luther modified his views on these books with further study and reflection. Indeed, it may be said that, like many an advanced scholar of our own time, he became more and more conservative with more light and deeper insight into the great mysteries of God. And those modern representatives of destructive Christian scholarship, who have rashly regarded Luther as their great forerunner in the more negative criticism, have entirely too much overlooked, or perhaps not been aware of, the great change of attitude on the part of the great Reformer. Thus, for example, in his now but little known (because only several copies are extant) but textually very important and highly interesting small octavo Wittenberg edition of the New Testament of 1530 he has an entirely new *Vorrede* (spelled thus here) to Revelation, covering 12½ pages, in which he no longer says that this book does not make Christ known. But, on the contrary, he shows in summary how it teaches that our righteousness is in heaven where Christ is, and that, whatever evil may accomplish in the world, so long as the Gospel remains pure among us we shall not doubt that Christ, as in and over all, is with his saints and will finally prevail. Indeed, after speaking of the ways in which prophecies are given in Scripture and of the diffi-

culty of interpreting this book, he sets forth in chapter after chapter, somewhat at length, his interpretation, in an application of its imagery to the history of the Church and of the world. His interpretations are generally very good and suggestive. Thus he now apparently unreservedly accepts this wonderful book as an inspired prophecy of the times up to the return of our Lord as Judge and King.

The Epistle to the Romans is preceded by an introduction of eleven pages, the verso of the last of its unnumbered leaves being blank. It is an introduction in which the great Reformer is at his best, and it has been signally blessed in the history of Protestantism. It was the hearing and reading of this Epistle to which John Wesley attributed his conversion.

There are also short introductions, the longest nearly a page and the shortest about a third of a page, to the following books: 1 Corinthians, II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, I Thessalonians, II Thessalonians, I Timothy, II Timothy, Titus, Philemon, I Peter, II Peter, and one to the three Epistles of John.

The Marginal Notes, Illustrations, etc.

In the outer margins of the pages of the text, with the exception of some of the shorter Epistles, there are suggestive explanatory glosses. These are quite numerous in connection with the Gospels, and also especially so with the Epistles to the Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Galatians and Ephesians; while in connection with Revelation there is only one, with Hebrews there are only two, and even with the Acts of the Apostles there are only four. In the inner margins are well selected parallel references.

Of course, it need hardly be mentioned that there is no division of the text into verses, as the modern verse division was not introduced into the German Bible until 1568, nor into the English Bible until 1557, in the now almost unknown Whittingham Geneva New Testament, and in 1560 into the whole of the celebrated so-called Breeches Bible, of Geneva. Even its first appearance in any text was years after the first appearance of Luther's New

Testament, in Robert Stephen's Greek-Latin New Testament of 1551, also published at Geneva by Whittingham, while the first whole Bible having modern verse division was Stephens' edition of the Vulgate of 1555. Luther's early editions of the New Testament have, of course, the modern chapter division, which antedates the art of printing, and the division of these chapters into paragraphs, to which in the main correspond those found in our 1881 Revised Version of the New Testament.

With the exception of the Epistles to Philemon and II Peter, there is a wood cut initial, 2¼ by 2¾ inches (14, and in some cases 15, lines deep), at the beginning of each book. Excepting those before Acts, Hebrews, and Jude, these cuts are apparently meant to represent the writers. The same cut is used before all of the Epistles of St. Paul, representing the apostle with a sword in his right hand and a book in his left. For the three Epistles of John the same cut is used, and it represents the apostle sitting with an open book upon his knee and a pen in his hand, while for the Gospel of John a different, although very similar, cut is used; and this same cut is also used at the beginning of the Epistle of James. And, singularly, for Revelation the same cut is used as for Matthew, representing the writer, in the act of writing, seated before a book rack or an almost perpendicular desk, dictated to by an angel standing on the other side of the desk. Before I Peter the cut (initial "D") represents St. Peter with the significant key, while the initial "D" before Acts illustrates the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

Apart from these woodcut initials there are no illustrations in the book, except in connection with the Apocalypse. In illustration of the apocalyptic scenes there are twenty-one very striking full-page cuts, measuring 9 inches by 6¼ inches. These remarkable cuts have generally been attributed to Lucas Cranach, who also was apparently one of the publishers of this edition. However, some have held that these cuts were largely the work of the most gifted pupils of Cranach, and that they were simply suggested and then corrected by Cranach. Others

are of the opinion that they were suggested by Luther himself, as indicated by their controversial character. However, Luther's earlier *general* attitude toward this book, as set forth in his *Vorrhede* to it, as well as the fact that some earlier work by Dürer apparently formed a sort of model for them, would seem rather to suggest that Luther had perhaps little directly to do with them except the placing of them in connection with the proper passages in the text. It should also be said that these twenty-one full-page illustrations are the same in the second and third editions, except numbers 11, 16 and 17. In number 17 the Babylonian woman riding upon the dragon (supposedly representing Rome) has only a simple crown, instead of a triple crown as in the first edition, the crown being cut down in these and later editions, as also the highly ornamental crown on the head of the dragon itself in the first edition is cut down in figures 11 and 16. The crown in figures 11 and 17 of the first edition is surmounted by a cross, the very unfortunate place of which may have moved Luther to have it cut down in later editons. There may have been controversial reasons.

Rarity of Extant Copies

It might be stated that of the first edition about forty copies have been registered, these with several exceptions being in the various libraries of Germany. Of the second edition even less copies have come down to our time. Goetze wrote of the great rarity of the second edition in his *Samlung seltener und merkwürdiger Bibeln*, 1777, saying that neither Lorck nor Baumgarten had been able to secure a copy. Of the third Wittenberg edition, also folio, 1524, even less copies remain than of the first two editions, a few being found in the celebrated Luther collections of Europe and the copy used for this article. Although Palm had described it in his *Historie der Bibel-Uebersetzung D. Martini Lutheri*, 1772 (pp. 88-89), Goetze supposed it to be the same as his octavo edition, supposedly of that year (*Samlung*, No. 243), and therefore denied that there had been a folio edition in 1524. Thus it is evident that even Goetze had never seen a copy

of this edition. We mention the third Wittenberg edition because of its being the edition of Luther's New Testament chiefly used by Tyndale in his English translation of 1525, as the writer has definitely established* from the notes, parallel references, etc., of the only extant part of Tyndale's first edition, the famous Cologne Fragment. With the exception of an occasional correction and a few other minute differences, this edition is *textually* virtually a reprint from reset type of the preceding editions, and is almost an exact duplicate of them in appearance. The title-page, however, presents quite a different appearance, as the title is *printed* and within a highly ornamental border, consisting of an arch with eight small angels above it, one on each side holding himself by a ring fastened to the round supporting pillar, and nine below grouped around the crucified Lord. This border is the same as that on the title-page of the *Pentateuch* of 1523. The title is arranged as follows:

Das
Newe
Testa-
ment Deutzsch.
vVittemberg.

ITS INFLUENCE UPON TYNDALE'S NEW TESTAMENT

We come now to a point in our discussion that has for many years been a matter of controversy. It is the extent, if any, to which William Tyndale was dependent upon Luther in his English translation of the New Testament.

Various contemporaries of Tyndale and Luther, like Sir Thomas More and Cochlaeus, spoke of Tyndale's New Testament as "Luther's Testament in English," while George Joye, Tyndale's secretary, claimed that Tyndale was "not so exquysitely sene" in the Greek language, not to speak of his contending that certain of Tyndale's work was a translation from Luther. Some of Tyndale's enemies, as well as Joye, also refer to certain *marginal notes* in Tyndale's first edition, with which later scholars were unfamiliar. There was thus considerable perplexity

*"The Truth about Tyndale's New Testament," 1917.

as to the facts in the case until the now famous quarto Cologne Fragment of 31 leaves, now in the British Museum, containing in addition to the *prologge* (but without title-page). Matthew 1 to 22:12, was discovered by Thomas Rodd in London in 1836. In it there were seen the alleged "pestilential" marginal notes. And yet it was not till 1871, when this became better known through Edward Arber's facsimile reprint of it, that the material for a complete comparison with Luther's New Testament became available to scholars. Several direct comparisons were made by men like Brooke Foss Westcott and J. Baynes, Esq., and considerable dependence of Tyndale upon Luther was found. But these findings were minimized, and in some cases altogether ignored, by historians of the English Bible. Nor did Westcott even go as far in his acknowledgment of this dependence as his own evidence should have caused him to go. Moreover, he was more concerned about Tyndale's later editions. However, writers quite generally seemed to rely more upon the insufficient evidence of earlier scholars, and thus many authors largely simply followed their predecessors on this point. And, for that matter, even the investigations of such authorities as Westcott were by no means exhaustive, while they were apparently confined to a comparison of Tyndale's New Testament, with only the first edition of Luther's New Testament. Indeed, Westcott acknowledged his examination and collation of the Cologne Fragment to have been only partial, but said that a complete collation was desirable. By a careful detailed comparison of Tyndale's Cologne Fragment with the first three folio Wittenberg editions of Luther's New Testament, the main results of which were published in 1917, the writer found that Tyndale's dependence upon Luther in his translation was considerably greater than even Luther's most ardent admirers were willing to grant.

Luther's Vorrhede and Tyndale's Prologge*

Beginning with Tyndale's *prologge,* of which comparisons were also made by Westcott, the paragraphs of im-

*Because of its prologue, glosses, etc., we are here dealing only with the Cologne Fragment of Tyndale's New Testament.

portance, indeed two entire pages, are practically literal translations from Luther's *Vorrhede*, over half of this being thus taken over by Tyndale. This translation of Tyndale begins, after a brief introductory paragraph, at the very beginning of Luthers' *Vorrhede*, and continues practically unbroken as far as it goes; and even for certain other parts not thus directly quoted he apparently received his suggestion or inspiration from Luther.

List of the Books of the New Testament

Then in the list of the books of the New Testament he minutely follows Luther, as though it were simply a transcript of Luther's list in English. This is true of the *heading*, the *arrangement* of the books upon the page, and the *order* of the books, in which he, too, places Hebrews and James in their order after III John. He even follows Luther in such details as the name of Acts, which he calls "The Actes of the apostles written by S. Luke," after Luther's "Der Apostel geschicht beschrieben von Sanct Lucas." So, likewise, does he translate Luther's names of the other books. In the numbering of the books he, too, goes down to 23 (III John), only using Roman numerals, while Luther uses Arabic numerals. He then leaves the last four books unnumbered and slightly separated from the preceding numbered list above, which Luther did to distinguish them from the rest, as, in his opinion, not in the same class and of the same authority.

It was undoubtedly such very close resemblance, as seen by even casual observers, that caused contemporaries to speak of Tyndale's New Testament as "Luther's Testament in English."

Marginal Notes

Proceeding to the marginal glosses, 57 of the 92, or almost two-thirds of those in the Cologne Fragment of Matthew 1 to 22:12, and these the notes of importance, are virtually literal translations of Luther's notes, while at least three other notes are based upon Luther. The rest of the notes not thus taken from Luther's New Testament are generally short and comparatively unimportant. One

of these notes (with Matthew 1:26), hitherto ascribed to Tyndale himself, is indeed not found in Luther's first edition, but it is in the second and third editions. This fact proves already that Tyndale used either Luther's second or third edition. This fact does not, however, prove which of these two editions Tyndale used or whether he used both editions. But that he certainly used the *third* edition is evident from several other notes, and notably the one on the word *Sygnes* (Matthew 16:3). In Luther's first and second editions this note correctly refers to an Old Testament prophecy as *Isaie* 61. But in resetting the type for the third edition the printer reversed the 6 and 1, thus making it refer to *Isaie* 16. And Tyndale copies this mistake, even apparently following Luther's spelling, *Esaie XVI*. Of the total of 69 available outer marginal notes in the three editions of Luther's Testament, as far as the Cologne Fragment goes, Tyndale used all but 12, and even of these 12 three form the basis of three of Tyndale's notes.

It should also be stated here that another note used by Tyndale (with Matthew 13:12) is found in Luther's first edition, but not in the second and third editions. This fact is conclusive evidence that Tyndale used also Luther's *first* edition.

It would thus seem, in the light of these facts, that the assertions of George Joye as to these particulars of Tyndale's work, though no doubt somewhat exaggerated and though rather unfortunate in their vehemence, and perhaps in their motive, are probably not very far from the truth, and must have had their foundation in fact.

Parallel References

The references in the inner margin of the text afford us another point for comparison. Several writers who compared the Cologne Fragment with Luther's New Testament came to the conclusion that many, and probably most, of Tyndale's marginal references were traceable to Luther. But it was probably only the first edition of Luther's Testament—or, perhaps, even considerably later

editions—that was used in making these comparisons, as indeed the second and third Wittenberg editions are almost inaccessible, of the latter especially only a few complete copies being extant. And yet, from all the evidence, it was the *third* edition that was chiefly used by Tyndale. Thus, by checking up Tyndale's references with the references in all the first *three* editions of Luther's Testament, we find that *every one* of Tyndale's 185 references (two of them repeated) is taken from Luther. Of course, some of these references are not found in his first edition, thus again proving that Tyndale also used Luther's second or third edition. Indeed, he borrowed all but 27 of Luther's references.

Moreover, it appears that Tyndale took it for granted that the references in Luther's Testament should be more correct in the third or second edition than in the first edition, and therefore followed the later edition rather than the earlier. The fact, however, is that certain errors crept into the later edition. It appears that the printer used a copy of the preceding edition, in which Luther had apparently made his corrections and other changes, as *copy* for a new edition. Thus, in resetting the type from the first edition, the printer made some grave typographical errors; and these Tyndale, therefore, inadvertently copied. To note only one of these copied errors, in the first and second editions, in connection with Matthew 15, there is, correctly, a reference to Leviticus 20. But as the Arabic numeral 9 in the type used is quite similar to the 0, the typesetter put *Leuiti.* 29 in the third edition. And, strangely enough, even though Leviticus has only 27 chapters, Tyndale copied this error (second reference, chapter 15, *Leui. XXIX*). This error seems all the more conspicuous because of its being in Roman numerals, so that it could not likely have been a mistake on the part of Tyndale's printer. Not to mention other equally conspicuous errors, and other evidence on the same point, the above definitely establishes the fact that Tyndale used at least Luther's *third* edition, as also we have established from the *marginal glosses* that he did; and that he also

used the *first* edition, whether he used the second edition or not. In addition to taking his references from Luther, and even copying the printer's mistakes in the third edition, he also follows that edition in *misplacing* certain references, as also he does in *omitting* certain important references, of which time would here forbid me to speak. There are, of course, also certain errors in references in Tyndale's Cologne Fragment that are correct in Luther's first three editions, but at least several of these were apparently made in *copying*, whether directly from Luther's printed page or indirectly from dictation from the page by someone else.

It is interesting to note also that two incorrect references in Luther's first edition are corrected in his second and third editions; and these Tyndale has, of course, correct, thus also indicating that Tyndale followed the later edition as to *these* references. This also proves that the reprinting of the second edition was not done before Luther had again carefully checked over such details. And let it be remembered that the errors in the later editions previously referred to were of a typographical character.

The Translated Text

We have now proved from the *notes* and *parallel references* that it was chiefly the *third edition* of Luther's New Testament that Tyndale used. It is, therefore, that edition in particular with which we must compare the Cologne Fragment for a measure of the extent, if any, to which he followed also Luther's *translated text*. It should, however, be said that there are not many *essential* differences in text between the first three editions.

From an elaborate collation of the text of Tyndale's Cologne Fragment with Luther's third edition, we find that Tyndale used Luther's *translation* with almost as much freedom as that with which he made use of the *marginal notes*. However, he used it with more independence and probably with greater ability. And, of course, in connection with Erasmus's Greek Testament he un-

doubtedly used also Erasmus's Latin translation published in parallel columns with the Greek, as well as the Latin Vulgate and the manuscript English version of Wycliffe. Thus, in omitting the doxology to the Lord's Prayer he unquestionably followed the Vulgate and Wycliffe. But as Wycliffe's English was not exactly that of Tyndale's time, his use of Wycliffe's was naturally rather more to get the sense or meaning than the expression; and, therefore, insofar he said correctly in his "To the Reder," that he "nether was holpe with Englysshe of eny that had interpreted the same." Yet, in passing, we might add that Wycliffe's version nevertheless influenced even the *English* of Tyndale, its forms and combinations of words, considerably more than has generally been supposed. Even much of Tyndale's rythmic beauty is traceable to Wycliffe. But of all the texts Tyndale employed, next to Erasmus's Greek, Luther's German influenced him far the most in his first New Testament, Bishop Westcott's statement to the contrary notwithstanding (*History*, etc., p. 179). For, though he translated from the Greek text, he certainly quite generally followed Luther's version as his model both in form and in substance, as an interpretation of the true meaning of the original text. That he was familiar, however, with the grammatical forms of the Greek language is evident from many literal renderings, and these generally into chaste and exquisite English. It is rather in these that Tyndale excels, while Luther excels in his equally remarkable free renderings, which are often tersely interpretative of the mind of the Spirit in those inspired passages. But Tyndale's understanding of Greek *idioms*, and of the *Greek particles*, was apparently not on a par with his knowledge of *grammatical forms*, as it is in these that he more closely and, indeed, often literally followed Luther.

In illustration of the closeness with which Tyndale follows Luther's translation, a few expressions may be cited:

Chapter and Verse.	*Greek of Erasmus*	*Luther*	*Tyndale*
Matt. 1:1	*Biblos*	Dis ist das buch	Thys ys the boke
1:11-12	epi tēs metoikesias Babulōnos, etc.	vmb die zeyt der Babilonischen gefencknis, etc.	about the tyme of the captivite of babilon, etc.
1:25	prōtotokon	ersten son	fyrst sonne
2:18	phōnē en rhamai ēkousthē	Auff dem gepirge hat man eyn geschrey gehoret	On the hilles was a voice herde/
4:25	dekapoleōs	den zehen stedten/	the ten cetes/
6:4, 6 & 18	en tōi phanerōi	ofentlich	openly
8:9	kai legō toutōi	Ich sage zu eynem/	y saye to one/
9:13	eleon thelō kai ou thusian	Ich hab eyn wolgefallen an barmhertzigkeyt/ vnd nicht am opffer	I haue pleasure in mercy/ and nott in offerynge
9:27	huie dabid	Ach du son Dauid/	O thou sonne of dauid/
11:7-9	kalamon, etc.	woltet yhr eyn rhor sehen, etc.	wet ye out to se a rede, etc.
11:12	kai biastai harpazousin autēn	vnd die (die do, in ed. 1) gewalt thun die reyssen es zu sich	and they that make vyolence pulleth it to them
15:9	didaskalias entalmata anthrōpōn	lere die nichts denn menschen gepot sind.	doctryne which is nothynge but mens preceptes.
16:21	apo tote	Von der zeyt an/	From that tyme forth/

Moreover, the influence of Luther's New Testament upon Tyndale's is also very manifest in the *arrangement of matter* upon the printed page. This is true not only of the *lists of the books* of the New Testament, of which we have already spoken, of the *marginal notes* and of the *parallel references*, but also of the *paragraphs*, and with but few exceptions of the *divisions of the chapters* into the same, of the *headings*, which are generally literal translations from Luther, and even very strikingly of the *text itself*.

From the foregoing a fair estimate may be formed as to the extent to which Tyndale depended upon Luther, both in his translation and also in other details of his great work on the New Testament. Moreover, that dependence

indicates his unbounded confidence in the great master translator and expositor. Hence it also follows that any just valuation of Tyndale's translation, from the extent to which it still survives in our King James's Version, or even in the Revised Version of 1881, not to speak of its influence upon our language, is also inadvertently a valuation of the great importance, for those English versions, of that primary German version whose quadricentennial we have just celebrated.

Yet it is seen, also, how fortunate it was for the English Bible, and thus for the English language, that the first printed New Testament was given to the world by so noble a master of sentences as William Tyndale. But while William Tyndale thus did a truly great work for the Church and for the world, it would hardly seem proper to regard him as occupying the same exalted position in history as that occupied by his incomparable master, or to put him in the same class with him who belongs to the few uniquely great men of all time. While the translation of Tyndale, which included the New Testament and only part of the Old, was largely the one great work of his useful life, the translation of the whole Bible by Luther was but a by-product in his stupendous task of directing the epoch-making movement of the Reformation. Nor should this statement be considered as in the least minimizing Tyndale's real, and truly great and important, work in the history of the English Bible and that of the English Reformation.