Bo Giertz’s The Hammer of God in English
by Rune Imberg

One of the most important theological books in Swedish during the twentieth century is also one of the most widely circulated. Bo Giertz’s *The Hammer of God: A novel about the cure of souls* was written in just six weeks, at a rate of nearly ten pages per day. Four months after Giertz began writing the book, it was published in May of 1941. In rapid succession tens of thousands of copies were printed in Sweden alone. Today, over seventy years later, it continues its victory march across the globe. The book has been translated into at least ten other languages; some years ago it came out in Faroese, in Russian, and in a third revised American edition. The exact number of copies in print is difficult to determine, but a conservative estimate would be in the range of 210,000.

In Swedish, the book is easily accessible and its printing history is uncomplicated. One edition followed the other along the same lines, the content remaining the same without any real changes. In other words, unlike several of Giertz’s other books, it has not been subject to any comprehensive revision. However, when one begins to study the book’s international distribution the situation becomes more complicated. Editions of *The Hammer of God* in other languages deviate radically from Giertz’s original Swedish text. Remarkably, while the textual discrepancies in translation have been noted previously, they have never been properly analyzed. In order to appreciate the extent of this problem, one needs to consider not only Giertz’s writings in general and the publication of his books internationally, but also the actual content of *The Hammer of God*, using detailed textual analysis.

The Content of The Hammer of God

*The Hammer of God*, which according to its subtitle is “*A novel about the cure of souls,*” contains three parts, each consisting of three chapters; the titles of the three novellas are based on Bible passages. In the first
part, the three chapters have even been named after three spiritual stages: “The Call,” “Awakened by the Law,” and “Poverty of Spirit and the Light of the Gospel.” In the second part, each chapter takes its title after the time of the year when the respective events unfold. Part three has a somewhat different character. The action is still driven forward by situations of pastoral care, but in this part of the story women play a more important role than in the previous parts and the parsonage provides the main setting. For the first time a pastor’s wife is in the picture (both Savonius and Fridfeldt were single; Dean Faltin was a widower and Fridfeldt’s supervising rector was single, possibly a widower). Inger Selander maintains that the middle chapter in this part plays a central role in the book, as “is demonstrated by the fact that the chapter title includes the book’s title.” Yet I maintain that the book reaches its climax and finds its culminating balance with the final chapter. This chapter is set in the “present day” of real time. Giertz completed the novel in February 1941. The last chapter reports “fictional” events, as well as actual events, that transpire in March 1940.

The action takes place in the fictional parish of Ödesjö, in the southern part of the Diocese of Linköping. It is well known, especially through the author’s own comments and Anders Jarlert’s research, that Giertz drew much of his literary and historical inspiration from reading the novel, Lennackers, although the theological and church-historical inspiration came from completely different sources.

Regarding this unusual achievement [writing The Hammer of God in six weeks] he himself said that “God put everything in my head during the trips [as the traveling secretary of the Church’s High School Association (KGF), 1932-1935], except for how the Cathedral Chapter treated a young pastor.” Therefore, he read about Mårten Landahl in Arvid Norberg’s book about the church revival in the Diocese of Skara during the first half of the 1800s, which is still evidenced in the extant underlinings and notes . . . Giertz chose historical matter from the oral tradition he encountered during his early years as pastor in the Diocese of Linköping, from Norberg’s book about the revival in the Skara Diocese, and from the Finnish revival pastor Jonas Lagus’ partly autobiographical essay, “A young teacher reflects on his early years as pastor.”

Historical periods, well known to many readers, structure the novel. According to Hans O. Andræ’s thorough analysis, the relevant time periods are:
1. First novella: Summer 1808–Summer 1810.
3. Third novella: Chapter 1 (chapter 7 of the entire book) can be dated to Tuesday, 6 April 1937 (a week after Easter), chapter 2/8 to 16 March 1939 (during Lent, just before the Annunciation), and chapter 3/9 to the period between 17 December 1939 (Third Sunday of Advent) and 17 March 1940 (Palm Sunday). Thus, the closing chapter coincides to a great extent with the Winter War, that is, the war between Finland and the Soviet Union, 30 November 1939–12 March 1940.15

A careful reading of The Hammer of God shows that Giertz frequently included significant chronological details from the world in real time. To begin with, there is the book’s setting, namely, the framework of its introduction and conclusion in which he alludes to the various battles in the Swedish-Russian War of 1808–09, as well as to the 1939–40 Finnish-Soviet Winter War. Further details include the case against Savonius delayed by the coup d’état against King Gustav IV Adolf (February–March 1809), and a change of bishops in Linköping (Carl von Rosenstein, appointed bishop of Linköping, 30 March 1809; later archbishop). It will also be apparent to the careful reader that current theological trends and developments are reflected in Giertz’s story as well. As a new pastor in Ödesjö, Fridfeldt, three days before Christmas 1879, gently raised “the question of the new mission covenant, which lecturer [P.P.] Waldenström and curate [Jakob] Ekman had formed the previous year.”16 Fridfeldt’s rendition of Henric Schartau’s (1757–1825) sermon on Transfiguration Sunday the following summer is described as though “the city curate of Lund preached in Ödesjö church on this Sunday fifty-five years after his death.”17 The most surprising detail in the entire book is perhaps the pastor’s report on historical military uniforms, which in fact reflects Giertz’s own hobby. This astounds not only Fridfeldt, but also many of the book’s readers.18

Text-critical Problems with the American Editions
of The Hammer of God

Both the German and American editions of the book 19 omit the final chapter. It may be understandable that in post-World War II
Germany this chapter containing a scathing criticism of communist Soviet Union should be omitted. After all, Stalin was still living. But why was the final chapter omitted from the 1960 American translation? It is difficult to explain. Only after forty-five years, in the third edition (2005), was the final chapter restored. One might guess that the American translator of the 1960 edition, Clifford Ansgar Nelson, worked from the German edition, but this assumption cannot be supported. Purely in terms of translation, there are absolutely no similarities between the German and the American translations, except on one single point: both translations lack chapter nine. Perhaps the American editors deemed the book to be somewhat long, and therefore under the influence of the German edition omitted the final chapter. Since Nelson, who translated several of Giertz’s books into English, was in close contact with him, it is hard to believe that the deletion would have occurred without the author’s permission. Moreover, the phenomenon of abridging important Swedish theological works in English translation is not uncommon.

From a scholarly point of view, particularly given the international importance of the book, Nelson’s translation is problematic in a number of respects. Allow me to give some examples. To begin with, there are a number of direct mistranslations of certain words and expressions. The Dean’s daughter Eva-Lotta comes with a ladybug (“nyckelpiga”) on her finger, not a bunch of keys (“nykelknippa”) (S 106/92, Hammer 85); the war against the Russians took place across the sea, in other words, on the other side of the Gulf of Bothnia, not beyond the Baltic (S 56/50, Hammer 40); Schenstedt’s father had died at age thirty, not thirty years ago (S 279/238, Hammer 229). Of course, all translators make mistakes, but the American edition of The Hammer of God is remarkably flawed, even linguistically. An incomprehensible mistranslation is made in the section where Fridfeldt’s senior pastor compares his curates with Egypt’s ten plagues: the list of paddor, mygg, flugsvärmar and det stora Mörkret is rendered by Nelson as “turtles,” “grasshoppers,” “swarm of flies,” and “the great Darkness” (S 141f./121, Hammer 115); Nelson has thus confused toads with turtles, and the mosquitoes in Exodus 8 with the
locusts (grasshoppers) in Exodus 10. One mistranslation, involving essentially a single word, has dramatic consequences both pastorally and theologically. Dying Johannes in Börsebo has been gripped by despair and says in the hearing of the irresolute young pastor Savonius:

“For thirty years, as Thou knowest, Lord, I have confessed my sins. And Thou didst forgive everything—the salt I stole, the grouse I snared, adultery and profanity—all was forgiven. It was like the singing of larks that day in the church, and it was Thy voice, O Lord, that I heard when the pastor read the absolution. That day I knelt in prayer at the gates of Börsebo, and blessedness and peace lay like sunshine on the grass, Lord, all this Thou didst for me. I believed then that I was Thine. But the heart of stone remained. The uncircumcised, adulterous heart continued to be just as evil. I wept and confessed, and Thou didst forgive me afresh. I came with new confessions. Thy grace was great, Lord. Twenty times, fifty times, I came; but I was still no better. Then the door of grace was shut. He who repents and believes will be received into the kingdom. But I did not repent.”

Savonius’ brain worked desperately. The man was certainly out of his head; his hand was very hot. Still, one could sense a certain logic in his wanderings of mind . . . [T]his man had long ago experienced sorrow for his sins, which for that matter did not seem to be so great. Why in the world did he, then, doubt the grace of God?25

Nelson’s translation of this part is mostly excellent and is linked to a traditional liturgical English (“Lord, all this Thou didst for me”). However, Johannes’s final sentence, which I have italicized in the quotation above, should not read “But I did not repent,” but rather, “But I cannot repent [Men jag kan icke bättra mig].” This mistranslation undermines the whole of Giertz’s theological reasoning.26 The title of chapter 8 is also problematic in Nelson’s translation. He translates, Stengrunden och forsoningsklippan, A Heart of Stone and a Rock of Salvation. Particularly given concepts developed in the chapter,27 a more fitting translation would have been, The Stone Foundation and the Rock of Atonement.”28

Nelson has also deleted many passages from Giertz’s Swedish text. I have not made a precise count but a good guesstimate would
number several dozen. For example, Nelson’s translation omits seven pages of the heated political discussion in opening scene of the original Swedish edition (S 10–17/9–16, Hammer 6). From a theological point of view one of the most shocking deletions occurs in the report of Fridfeldt’s Transfiguration Day sermon, which he “borrowed” from Schartau. Nelson has eliminated half the text; no less than eight sections of the sermon that have been removed. In three cases, it is approximately a whole page in the original edition; in two further instances, about ten lines each. As such, this section, which in the original edition amounts to seven pages, is just half that in the American edition. There are many of us who feel that Fridfeldt’s (= Giertz’s) representation of Schartau’s sermon is one of the highlights of The Hammer of God. However, Nelson is so freely selective in relation to the original that translation has been eclipsed by ellipsis. Among other things, the entire section is missing where the exordium (ending with the Our Father, prayed silently) transitions into the text’s exposition; this includes the announcement of the “meditation theme,” namely, the sermon theme and its parts. Thus, for example, the following moving section is missing entirely in the American translation:

He took a deep breath and inhaled the warm air, which was mingled with the scent of the farmyards and church spices and the lavender twigs that the ladies had placed in their hymnals. He continued: “The subject for our meditation is thus Jesus only. We will speak about Jesus only, first: within the awakening, as its goal; second: within justification and the new birth, as its foundation; and third: within sanctification, as its strength.” At the word strength he noticed that he struck down hard on the pulpit’s edge. He felt something behind him that gave him boldness.

It is also noteworthy that the entire closing application, one of the most characteristic parts of the proclamation in the tradition of Schartau and his disciples, is eliminated. Once the extent of Nelson’s deletions has been registered, we can see a recurring pattern. The following original traits tend to be missing or at least severely minimized: historical references—particularly the debate regarding the Swedish-Russian war of 1808–09, but also the coup in 1809 (deposition of Gustav IV Adolf), and
allusions to Napoleon; church history references—allusions to neology; the bishop’s appointment in Linköping in 1809 (immediately after the coup!); Bishops Tengström and Lehnberg; botanical details regarding vegetation; architectural details—the church in Ödesjö, the parsonage; and a number of cultural references, including in the linguistic sphere (in the first part, the educated class speaks a Swedish which is strongly mixed with French expressions).

A serious consequence of this is, of course, that the English translation of *The Hammer of God* (regardless of edition) gives a somewhat different picture and tone when compared with the original *Stengrunden*. The Swedish original intersperses a remarkable amount of cultural material that is largely missing in English. This makes the English version of *The Hammer of God* in some ways more narrowly “theological” than the original *Stengrunden*. For example, Giertz manifests a willingness to allow a type of “creation-perspective” of world and landscape to break through in the plot; in the English translation, however, this often disappears completely.33 For example in the quotation above, Giertz weaves a central theological presentation of “Jesus only”34 with a description of scents (barnyard, church spices, lavender) and cultural phenomena (that the women had placed lavender twigs in their hymn books). As such, Nelson’s translation is that much more impoverished and plainer than the original, as well as in comparison to other translations that I have examined.

But there is yet one more problem with the omissions, and it is more explicitly theological. A number of theologically significant details, which in a way function as interpretative keys, are also missing. The omissions are significant because Giertz was not primarily a creative and innovative theological thinker. He was a theological eclectic. In a unique and inspiring way he integrated ideas from the different theological influences that shaped his thinking over the course of his life: the Young Church Movement [*ungkyrkorörelsen*], the Oxford Group movement / MRA, Churchly Renewal [*Kyrklig förnyelse*] and Father Gunnar Rosendal, Rosenianism (for example, in Östra Husby), the Schartauuesque revival on the West Coast, and so forth.35 In other words, the references Giertz put into his text reveal the sources that influenced
him theologically. When such references are removed, it complicates not only the interpretation of his theology, but also often a detailed understanding of his positions. Consider, for example:

- In the course of a conversation between Savonius and neighboring pastor Lindér, the latter cites Schartau’s presentation of the heart’s sinful depravity; Nelson has deleted five lines of this (S 122/106, Hammer 99), including the following: “Then the sledgehammer strikes the heart’s sinful depravity, and there it may strike a long time before one notices that it is sheer bedrock, sheer gray, hard stone, which is of no value for anything good . . .”

- A bit further on Lindér refers to a (fictitious?) letter by Schartau dealing with the saving faith. There, Nelson condensed nine lines of text down to four. Thus, for example, the following statement has disappeared: “When man no longer rejects, due to his unworthiness, this consolation—that is, that Jesus has paid for all his sins, however many they are—then faith is already present . . .” (S 125/108 f., Hammer 101).

- In another important passage Lindér refers to their predecessors; thus Giertz gives a hint of the spiritual “fathers” who (in his opinion) contributed to the Church of Sweden’s character:36 “On the West Coast, [Lars] Linderot has gone forth as a storm and roused the dead leaves; in Svenljunga, the boozing Hoofen [Jacob Otto Hoof] has been converted and now is hard at work clearing the stones in the vineyard, so that even way up in the Skara Diocese folks are apparently taking notice. And then we have this blessed little chaplain, [Henric Schartau] in Lund.” This passage, too, is missing in the English translation (S 129/112, Hammer 105).

Some of these omissions could possibly be explained by the argument that they make the text more accessible to an American audience; at least this could apply to the last of the three examples given.

But then there are also a large number of deletions that, considering the American readership, are all the more remarkable and inexplicable.
In the book's second part, where Fridfeldt is the protagonist, there are often references to the Swedish Mission Covenant [Svenska Missionsförbundet (SMF)] and P. P. Waldenström. Given that their activities produced a branch in the Swedish Evangelical Mission Covenant of America—now the Evangelical Covenant Church—these deletions are difficult to understand. Other missing material includes two passages on perfectionism: First, Giertz’s allusions to Waldenström’s “simplified and non-dogmatic gospel,” advocated by Jon Nilsson of Linderyd, who had escaped to America. Fridfeldt hopes that this gospel “would unite the believers again” (S 160/137, Hammer 131). Second, a little later in the narrative, there is a discussion between two cousins, where different pet phrases from the Mission Covenant and Rosenianism clash (S 165 f / f 141, Hammer 136):

Erik Svensson looked angrily at his cousin.

“Surely it is due to the fact that for far too long there has been a preaching about the atonement in such a way that it kills sanctification. Come as you are! The world is justified in Christ. No judgment for those who believe. The snare is broken and the bird set free . . .”

The church warden responded rather heatedly: “The misery comes from the new teaching! God is love, love, love! Jesus never had to pay for your sin and never suffered any punishment in your place. Well, it can’t be so dangerous with your petty sins then, can it?—When God is so pious!”

It is clearly evident that Nelson attempted to minimize Giertz’s confessional polemics, something that is especially obvious in the book’s third section. The eighth chapter begins with an old woman from Sörbygden admonishing Pastor Torvik. Her niece Margit, who had been a servant in the pastor’s home for a year, has just been re-baptized. The following formulations can be found across three pages in the novel: the portions italicized and in brackets can be found in original but have been either omitted or significantly altered in the translation:

It was to let the pastor know that Margit, who had been a servant at his home for an entire year, had now, scarcely two months later, [become a Baptist and] allowed herself to be re-baptized.

. . . And now she had become convinced [Now the Baptists had come and told her] that she could never be saved unless she were baptized again. Those who
counseled this had also spoken to her about the precious atonement. Was it strange, then, that she had joined their ranks?

“If Margit had understood . . . that a poor, tortured soul, seeing the whole ugly tangle of his sins, dares to look at Jesus instead of at himself . . . she would never have strayed from the Church [gone over to the Baptists].”

“Yes, Pastor, there was something else that I believe caused Margit to leave us [become Baptist]. It is that you deny baptism.”

In a very intentional way, Nelson has edited Giertz’s text. The criticism of Margit for being re-baptized remains, but all references to Baptists have been removed. Another passage that has been condensed for incomprehensible reasons concerns the conversation between Gösta Torvik, his wife Britta, and his ministerial colleague, the neighboring senior pastor, Olle Bengtsson. Generally, Torvik is the person in the novel who usually reflects Giertz’s own development and positions, but in this case it is actually Torvik’s wife Britta and colleague Bengtsson representing his theological trajectory. Their discussion includes, among other points, the following very central issues: the old Lutheran heritage; the Spirit in the church; the historicity of the virgin birth; the resurrection of Jesus; the virgin birth (again); the historical view of the Bible and its authority; love as an overarching dogmatic principle. In a programmatic way, the young Giertz identifies what appear to be some of the fundamental ideas in his theology at the time. This section, which in the Swedish consists of approximately seven pages, corresponds in the latest American edition to a page and a half.

Theological Implications

In Sweden, Giertz currently stands out as one of the most important theologians during the twentieth century. This is evident in numerous ways: for example, the concluding volume of Sweden’s Church History features only three people, Giertz and two others, in separate and extensive articles. Undoubtedly, his best known book is The Hammer of God, one of the most widespread theological books in Sweden and internationally. Considering the role that the novel The Hammer of God has played in Swedish theology, it is regrettable
that it exists in at least three different versions: first, the Swedish original, with several Nordic translations (such as Danish, Norwegian, and Finnish) that seem to be close to the original; second, a well-done German translation, although the concluding ninth chapter is missing; and third, a defective American translation, in which also for forty-five years the concluding ninth chapter was missing.

In conclusion, I would like to concretize the problem by relating these results to recent research on The Hammer of God. Of course, for such interpretation, it will be of great significance to note well which version the scholars in question have cited. Psychology of Religion scholar Hans O. Åkerberg, docent in Lund and professor in Stavanger, published Teologin i Stengrunden in connection with Bo Giertz’s eightieth birthday in 1985. Among many themes, Åkerberg analyzed how Giertz describes different situations regarding the cure of souls (Seelsorge) and how this concretizes important concepts within the psychology of religion, such as decision and conversion. Naturally, Åkerberg utilized the original version, in Swedish, which also includes the concluding ninth chapter. Considering his handling of the subject, it is extremely important to note which version of the text he was using. One aspect that Åkerberg himself does not address, but which is in line with his reasoning, is that The Hammer of God concludes with Torvik receiving a (posthumous) letter from Gunnar Schenstedt, in which he apologizes for his former libertine lifestyle. Repudiation of that kind of antinomianism played an important role in Giertz’s own personal development and not the least in parts of his early writings.

Other Nordic scholars can, in most cases, alternate between the Swedish original text and various translations of The Hammer of God. For scholars who completely or for the greater part depend on German and English translations, the problems become greater. This is true not least for American scholars; this needs to be considered, since interest in Giertz’s works has increased in the U.S. during the last several years. Three Americans, who in very interesting and creative ways have been working with The Hammer of God, may serve to illustrate the problems that many international Giertz scholars face. Robert Kolb, professor in St. Louis, Missouri, has been especially interested in the use of history in The Hammer of God. He has in an inspiring way placed the book in its historical context. However, American scholars with a similar interest,
who do not operate with Kolb’s knowledge of German and Swedish, would be at the mercy of Nelson’s omissions, as noted previously.51

Another very creative reading of The Hammer of God has been provided by the Japanese-American scholar, Naomichi Masaki, professor in Ft. Wayne, Indiana, who in his doctoral dissertation addressed the history of the Swedish liturgy. In a recent essay, he studied the celebrations of Holy Communion in The Hammer of God, which he then applied to the historical development of the liturgy in Sweden.52 Even if he himself does not emphasize the problems, it is evident both from his own notes and also the editor’s comments in the footnotes, that he (along with the editor, Eric R. Andræ) is forced to diverge from the American edition that he himself quotes. Especially in one case he makes a clear statement about such a divergence.53 On the other hand, he does not point out that in one extended quotation from the book there are at least ten textual differences from the original. Words are missing or changed. American liturgical formulations have been substituted for the Swedish originals. There are even outright mistakes of fact in Nelson’s translation.54 Masaki’s insightful and fascinating analysis would have no doubt benefited from a more reliable translation.55

A third scholar, Eric R. Andræ, a native of Sweden and a campus pastor in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, has more than anyone advocated for the publishing of Giertz’s books in English. In his S.T.M. thesis, later published as an extended essay, he has addressed Giertz’s use of the Order of Grace. Working with both the original text and the English translation, he establishes that Giertz’s use of one of the fundamental elements in the Schartausque cure of souls (Seelsorge), namely, the threefold application in the conclusion of the sermon that is addressed to different kinds of hearers, is only partially included even in the most recent American edition.56 As a consequence, in the English versions the conclusion of the sermon is less gospel-centered and the theme of election disappears.57

Conclusion

My comparison of the original Swedish version with the English translations leads me to three conclusions. One, research ought to prefer the original Swedish version of the text.59 When research
relies on other language editions it ought to be cognizant of their relationship to the original. Two, the German edition ought to be revised and expanded to include the original ninth chapter. Three, the American edition should be revised to reflect more faithfully the original Swedish text.

Research on Giertz’s life and theology is likely to continue among scholars not fluent in Swedish. Such scholarly inquiry to be consequential demands reliable translation in which the voice of Giertz may be heard. It is important that Giertz himself is allowed to speak, rather than a “theologized” and censored Giertz. In this context, Anders Jarlert’s comparison with Umberto Eco and Dostoevsky is noteworthy.

Unlike sermons and speeches in, for example, Eco’s *The Name of the Rose*, the sermons and pastoral conversations in Giertz—occasionally criticized for their sometimes considerable length—drive the plot forward. Another similarity with Dostoevsky is the meticulous care taken in the actual details, even when they do not play any active role in the plot. This is a prerequisite for what I have here called the novel’s incarnational function.59

Bo Giertz, one of Sweden’s foremost theologians and churchmen during the twentieth century, deserves to be judged—and criticized—on his own merits, not in a “filtered” form.60 Given that his writing is so straight, clear, and sometimes provocative, the analysis of his theology should rest on a stable, firm textual foundation.61

Abridged, this essay was annotated and translated by Eric R. Andræ, from Rune Imberg, “Fast mark eller textmässigt gungfly? Några synpunkter på Bo Giertz’ tidiga författarskap, särskilt översättningar av Stengrunden,” Kyrkohistorisk årsskrift 2012 (Publications of the Swedish Society of Church History 1:112), 166-181, with permission.

NOTES

1. Bo Giertz wrote *The Hammer of God [Stengrunden]* in six weeks while serving full-time as associate pastor in the Torpa congregation; see Anders Jarlert, “Genom tron talar han alltjämt. Aspekter på Bo Giertz författarskap,” in Rune Imberg (ed.), *Talet om korset–Guds kraft. Till hundraårsminnet av Bo Giertz födelse* (Gothenburg: Församlingsförlaget, 2005), 201-02 (also found in *Svensk Pastoraltidskrift [SPT]* 1998, 484-85); and Eric R. Andræ,

2. Some of Bo Giertz’s motivation for writing The Hammer of God came from his reading Ina Seidel’s Lennackers, a novel that he received as a Christmas present in 1940. When he finished the book on Epiphany 1941, he himself immediately started to write. The draft-manuscript for The Hammer of God was finished in mid-February, his typing was done on March 10, on Easter Eve (April 12) the first proof-sheets were ready, and the book printed on May 14. See Algot Mattsson, Bo Giertz: Ateisten som blev biskop (Gothenburg: Tre Böcker, 1994), 194ff.; and Eric R. Andræ, “‘The best treatment of Law and Gospel in the history of Lutheran theology.’ A Historical and Systematic Overview,” especially 8.


7. Both Inger Selander and Anders Jarlert have noted and commented on this phenomenon (see note 12 below for Selander). Jarlert, Kontinuitet, 8. I, however, will in this article draw somewhat different conclusions than they do.

8. My interest in methodical criticism of various editions and related forms of text analysis was aroused during my PhD studies and is reflected in my doctoral dissertation, In Quest of Authority, and its complementary volume, Tracts for the Times. A Complete Survey of All the Editions (both 1987). What I learned from this I have applied to other areas of research. Among other things, I could see that such criticism would yield interesting results.
from an analysis of key texts by C. O. Rosenius, especially his Dagbetraktelser; see Rune Imberg, “Pionjären C. O. Rosenius–publicist, själavårdare och predikant,” in Sändebudet, April 2009 (Sändebudets Bilaga Nr 38, 8–12; Finland).

9. Translator’s note: It is “En själavårdsbok”—that is, as literally subtitled, “a cure of souls book”—but the cure and care of souls is not just for the characters, but also for us, the readers. Not just “about the cure of souls,” as the English subtitle has it, but “for” the cure of souls as it helps the reader to recognize and know self, God’s work, and, ultimately, Jesus only. See Anders Jarlert, bonus material in the DVD, Stengrunden: Herrens Hammare (Helsingborg, Sweden: Insamlingsstiftelsen långfilmen Stengrunden, 2007), motion picture picture; Jarlert, “Can romaner ge själavård? Pastorala tankar kring Bo Giertz författarskap,” in Jarlert (ed.), Bo Giertz–präst, biskop, författare.


12. According to Selander, it was no shortcoming that the American edition of the novel (at that time) ended with the eighth chapter; according to her, it gave “a more coherent shape to the novel” (Selander, “En prästgårdsroman om själavård: Bo Giertz Stengrunden,” 138).

13. As the traveling secretary of the Church’s High School Association (KGF) 1932–1935, Giertz had for some years been visiting many parts of churchly Sweden. The various (fictional) parishes mentioned in the novel may therefore have borrowed features from many different places. But “Ödesjö” is assumed to be relatively close to Eksjö, and in that parish there are the “Northeasterners” (persons associated with Östra Smålands Missionsförening). Translator’s note: The “Eastern Småland Mission Society” is depicted in The Hammer of God, 201, 245–247, 260–272. Geographically “Ödesjö” is close to the actual Torpa, where Giertz wrote his novel. See also Markus Klefbäck, “Bo Giertz i Torpa,” in: Rune Imberg (ed.), Tålet om korset–Guds kraft, 42 ff.


16. Translator’s note: Giertz, Stengrunden (Stockholm: SKDB, 1941), 145. It should be noted that this reference is from the beginning of the initial dialogue between Fridfeldt and the old rector; the reference, as well as the opening of the conversation, is not found in the English translation; indeed, the 56 lines of text from this conversation in the Swedish


20. Given the Cold War, it is particularly noteworthy that the closing chapter was lacking in the 1960 American edition, a chapter the U.S. audience could have interpreted in prophetic terms.

21. I assume that Giertz sanctioned the deletion of the final chapter in both the German and English translations. Bishop Giertz’s correspondence with, among others, Clifford Ansagar Nelson and Christa–Maria Lyckhage, archived in the Lund University Library Department of Manuscripts, does not shed any light on this issue. However, general questions about the translation of *The Hammer of God* are addressed by Giertz in a letter dated 8/28/1956 to “Dear Brother Cliff:” “The question of the translation of *The Hammer of God*–which I touched on in my letter of 18 June–still seems to be undecided. I hope that there will be an agreement between Augsburg Publishing House and Augustana B. C. [Book Concern].” The book was published in 1960 by Augustana Press.


23. As such, I cannot share Hans O. Andræ’s assessment of Nelson’s translation as an “excellent translation.” Hans O. Andræ, “Preface,” x, Bo Giertz, *The Hammer of God*, rev. ed. (2005). Andræ’s translation of chapter 9 is much better than Nelson’s in chapters 1–8, although it also has some flaws (some omitted words, formulations that could have been translated more literally, etc.). *Translator’s note:* Hans O. Andræ, though still impressed by Nelson’s often fine effort in translating so much of Giertz, now agrees that Nelson’s translation of *The Hammer of God*—though in large part accurate—is seriously flawed in some respects. (Telephone interview with this translator, 20 November 2013).

24. Parenthetical references are given as follows: *Stengrunden* (1st printing, 1941) / *Stengrunden* (24th printing, 2009), *The Hammer of God* (2005); for example, S 100/50, Hammer 100.
25. S 29f./26f., Hammer 16f.; emphasis added.

26. Translator’s note: “Confessing sins” and “repenting” are generally understood as almost identical in the English language and within American Lutheranism. The challenging translation issue here is that the Swedish word for “repentance” [bättring] and its forms can also mean “improvement” or “becoming better.” Moreover, another Swedish word appears in this exchange which also can mean “repentance:” ånger and its forms can also indicate “remorse,” “regret.” Nelson translates this with two different terms in the same passage. In other words, Johannes says: “I came with new confessions. Thy grace was great, Lord. Twenty times, fifty times, I came; but I was still no better [men jag blev inte bättre]. Then the door of grace was shut. He who repents and believes [Den som bättrar sig och tror] will be received into the kingdom. But I cannot repent [men jag kan icke bättra mig—(or, ‘I cannot become better/improve’ or even ‘I cannot amend my ways’)] Savonius’ brain worked desperately. The man was certainly out of his head; his hand was very hot. Still, one could sense a certain logic in his wanderings of mind. The curate knew that sinners could repent [ängra] and be absolved. . . . But it was evident that this man had long ago experienced sorrow [ängra] for his sins, which for that matter did not seem to be so great. Why in the world did he, then, doubt the grace of God?” (S 29f./26f., Hammer 17). That is to say, Johannes had confessed his sins, he regretted them, but he felt that this had not resulted in any noticeable outward amendment of his life; he still found himself lacking in external works of love; there had been no, or at least not enough, improvement, no real reversal. Note what Norwegian professor Carl Fr. Wisloff writes in the Swedish theological journal Nya Våktaren, referencing the Danish church historian, J. Oskar Andersen: “Bättring är detsamma som bot, sinnesändring, omvändelse. . . .en botsfromhet, en allvarlig, självansakande fromhet, som ville att kristendomen skall yttra sig i livet, inte bara i ord” (“Repentance is the same as penance, change of heart and mind, conversion [literally, in Swedish, “the act of turning around,” or “reversal”]. . . . a penance-piety, a serious, self-examining piety, which wanted Christianity to manifest itself in one’s life, not just in words’”) (XIV: 2006, 2, emphasis added; original: Ur Fast Grunn 1987:4.).


29. In an e-mail to this author, Hans O. Andræ has given a compilation of deleted portions (e-mail from Hans O. Andræ to Rune Imberg, August 6, 2012). In his comparison of Stengnunden (4th edition) with The Hammer of God (3rd edition), Andræ has identified seven major deletions, each comprising 1-7 pages, which together account for 23½ pages. In addition, there are 17 minor deletions totaling 6½ pages. These omitted portions, totaling approximately 30 pages, mean that about 9.4% of the total original text in the first eight chapters is missing in the American editions. In addition, there are also a large number of shorter deletions: single words or sentences.

30. Translator’s note: One of the most distinctive features of Schartauanism is the style and structure of its sermons. After the Trinitarian invocation, the introduction (exordium) begins with a verse of Scripture, followed by its interpretation or brief exegesis, and then the Lord’s Prayer (prayed silently, not aloud). The proposition or theme is then stated along with its subdivisions or parts. The main body of the sermon consists of expounding the theme while addressing the hearer in the third person. The closing application has three sections, applied in the second person: one part addressed to the self-righteous “confident sinner,” another to the awakened stricken sinner or “mournful soul,” and finally one to the forgiven reclaimed sinner who knows and believes the “assurance of grace.” For fifteen

31. S 208/178, see Hammer 172. “Church spices” = “kyrkkryddor.” This means that the women—many of whom definitely would never use something so “worldly” as perfume—achieved the same effect by using spices, perhaps carried in some sort of pouch. This demonstrates how very careful Giertz was with even the smallest detail.


34. This topic for Schartau’s sermon (“Jesus only”) has given the name to the whole of the second novella. It will also return in the third one.


36. That this is the way one should understand Giertz is demonstrated by comparison with a similar reference (S 60/52, Hammer 44), where he (through Dean Faltin) partly distances himself from the theology of Peter Murbeck [1708–1766, pastor in Skåne and Blekinge, represented one form of Halle Pietism in Sweden]. See Anders Jarlert’s interesting argument along these lines in *Kontinuitet och förnyelse i Bo Giertz kyrkohistoriska romaner*, 15.

37. S 287ff./244ff, Hammer 237ff.

38. *Translator’s note*: Yet one more similar example is found in chapter 4. In response to Fridfeldt’s championing of the new Mission Federation and its aversion to “all conflicts about doctrine and even the issue of baptism,” the rector says in the Swedish original: “You have to
at least have some wineskins to pour the wine in. The forms and the requirements will prob-
ably come back. Just wait—after all these free missionary unions get enough hair pulling with
the Leites [Ephraim’s Messengers] and Methodists and Irvingites and Baptists and whatever they are
called, then they will indeed establish both statutes and common funds, and some sort of
bishops and pastoral education. Either it will all come to nothing and wind up in the other
sects, or else they will have to gather it together into some sort of church body” (Giertz,
_Stengunden_, 145–146, emphasis added). In the condensed version of the conversation found in
_The Hammer of God_ (118–119), this is completely left out. See note 16 above.

39. Regarding Torvik as a representative of Giertz himself, see Hans O. Andræ,
“Introductory Notes,” in Bo Giertz, _The Hammer of God_ , xxx. See also Markus Klefåck,
“Bo Giertz i Torpa,” in Rune Imberg (ed.): _Talet om korset—Guds kraft_ , 42 ff, especially 53.


41. Oloph Bexell, “Bo Giertz och Svenska kyrkan,” in Ingmar Brohed, _Sveriges kyr-
kohistoria, 8. Religionsfrihetens och ekumenikens tid_ , 386 ff.

42. The first part has even been made into a film. See www.LutheranVisuals.com.

43. According to information from Daniel and Inese Johansson, Gothenburg (the
latter a native of Latvia), it seems that even the Latvian translation suffers from major short-
comings.

44. However, I cannot understand why the Finnish translation, _Kallio pllja_ (at least
in the first edition), consistently calls _Savonius_ instead _Sevenius_. Another peculiarity, that the
Finnish pronouns in the third person singular are gender–neutral, has forced the translator
to insert the names (e.g., Gösta, Torvik, Britta) in innumerable places where Giertz used
pronouns (he, she). However, this is a general translation problem, not a fault.

45. Hans O. Åkerberg, _Teologin i Stengunden. Själavård och homiletik_.

46. If one adopts the approach of Åkerberg, then it is difficult to agree with Inger
Selander on her assessment (see note 12 above) that the novel could just as easily have
concluded with the eighth chapter. The ninth chapter makes the connection to Schenstedt’s
great-grandfather in chapter 1, as well as to another war against the Russians. In Gunnar
Schenstedt, Gösta Torvik is confronted with a sexual libertinism that Giertz often criticized
in his writing. In the final chapter there are also a pair of communion episodes that relate
to similar situations in the previous parts.

47. The interesting analysis which Åkerberg makes of the development of Fridfeldt
on Transfiguration Day 1880, for example, could not possibly have been done on the basis
of any of the three American editions; Hans O. Äkerberg, _Teologin i Stengunden. Själavård
och homiletik_ , 48 ff.

48. See, among others, Algot Mattsson, _Bo Gietz: ateisten som blev biskop_ , 50 ff., as
well as Folke T. Olofsson, “Bo Gietz’ teologiska väg fram till Torpa” and “Att leva med
Kristus. Om nåmedelskristendom, kyrkomdr och vardagskyrkighet,” in Rune Imber-
berg (ed.): _Talet om korset—Guds kraft_ , 123 ff. and 184 ff.

49. In a master’s thesis (NLA University College, Norway, 2009), Yagaantsetseg
Olsen has worked with themes that are similar to Åkerberg’s: “En analyse av utvalgte
sjelesorgssituasjoner i romanen Steingrunnen og anvendelsen av lov og evangelium;” see
http://brage.bibsys.no/nla/bitstream/URN:NBN:no-bibsys_brage_9403/1/Master_
Olsen,Y_v09.pdf (120221).

50. Robert Kolb, “Bishop Gietz’s Use of History in _Stengunden_” in Eric R. Andræ
i _Stengunden_ ,” in Rune Imberg (ed.): _Talet om korset—Guds kraft_ , 261 ff.
51. The availability of a better American translation of The Hammer of God hardly would have altered Kollb’s reasoning in his essay; on the other hand, the historical perspectives could have been further widened.


53. Masaki notes that page 80 of the 2005 American translation differs from the Swedish original; Masaki, 147, note 62; see also the editor’s comments in notes 55 and 56.

54. Giertz writes, “whereupon the thanksgiving was sung” (S 105/92). Anyone who wants to make a liturgical analysis of this formulation is led astray by the American translation: “after which the Thanksgiving and Benedicamus were read” (Hammer 85). That is, according to the original, there are one, not two parts; and the liturgy here is sung, not read.

55. The absence of the ninth chapter in the first two American editions may therefore explain the following statement by Masaki: “The third novella does not quote liturgy even though the story is full of sacramental piety.” Naomichi Masaki, “Johannes’ Heavenly Vision...,” in Eric R. Andræ (ed.), A Hammer for God, 143. In fact, the ninth chapter contains two dramatic communion scenes, one with Gunnar Schenstedt as communicant and one without him, with the latter quoting directly from the communion liturgy (S 349ff., 390ff./298ff., 334ff.); they are found in the most recent American edition (Hammer [2005], 290 ff., 326 ff.). Translator’s note: Furthermore, though Masaki is likely referring specifically to the communion liturgy, other quotations from and references to the Lutheran liturgy are also found: for example, the very first lines of the third part/novella in the American edition quotes the Benedictus from Lauds (Giertz, The Hammer of God, 195-196; see also 213, 231, 281-282, 307).


57. See the online Logia article by Eric R. Andræ, “Walther and Giertz: Law and Gospel Properly Distinguished / But to How Many Applied?,” http://xa.yimg.com/kq/groups/4936533/200453829/name/Andræ-Blogia-pdf-FINAL.pdf, 2f., especially note 23. Translator’s note: I am grateful to my father, Hans O. Andræ, for some translation assistance, especially with this section, as well as to Christopher Barnekov for suggestions.

58. As for references to other books by Giertz in Swedish, such as Grundet, it is additionally very important to do a proper analysis of what edition you are working with and how it reflects his personal development.


60. The “filtering” of Giertz can appear in different ways. Among the more remarkable ways belong the latest editions of Steingrunnen (The Hammer of God in Norwegian). Therein the publisher (since 1983?) has included a study guide that tries to “contextualize” the book to the Norwegian milieu. The book’s intended readers must then apply the novel to various possible situations: a conflict in a missionary society in Agder in Norway, a dying Israeli soldier who ends up at a field hospital in Lebanon next to a Christian Arab (Palestinian), Dutch priests who do not want to distribute Holy Communion to people that support U.S. government deployment of nuclear weapons in Europe, etc. “The point of the study guide is to draw lines from the contents of the novel to current problems which people of faith deal with today.” Tor Wennesland, “Studieplan,” in: Bo Giertz, Steingrunnen
(1996), 351. Translator’s Note: For a list of published writings by Giertz available in English, see the compilation “Writings by Giertz Previously Published in English,” Eric R. Andræ and Matthew Erickson in *A Hammer for God*, Eric R. Andræ (ed.), 329ff. This list is also continually updated online by the International Giertz Society at [http://www.lsfpgh.com/writings-of-bo-giertz](http://www.lsfpgh.com/writings-of-bo-giertz). [note to typesetter: close up this space and remove this note to typesetter]

61. Translator’s Note: As many are aware, the first printing of the revised and complete edition of *The Hammer of God* in English (2005) contained an inordinate amount of editorial and typographical errors; it is very significant to note that the newest printing has essentially corrected these mistakes.