Luther's Translation of the Bible

by   Birgit Stolt

I. Introduction

The original title for this article—"… 'And Feel It in the Heart …': Luther's Translation of the Bible from the Perspective of the Modern Science of Linguistics and Translating"[1]—needs some explanation. We must begin with a few words about the "Modern Science of Linguistics and Translating." Regarding developments in the field of linguistics during the last few decades, one thing above all must be highlighted: since the 1970s a "communicative-pragmatic transformation" has taken place. A new view of language as chiefly communication replaced the reigning, largely historical philology with its limitation to a study of sentences, phonetics, lexicography, grammar and—to a lesser extent—syntax. Modern linguistics is more interested in the hearer (the receiving pole), the process of understanding and reception, as well as the context in which the communication occurs. Coupled with this was a shift in interest from the sentence to the text, from the history of a language to its use in the present. Tape recordings made possible a precise study of oral speech. A series of new subfields has also surfaced: speech-act theory, analysis of conversation, social linguistics, pragmatic linguistics, text linguistics, reception, ethnomethodology—the list goes on and on. They all concerned themselves with different aspects of the functioning of linguistic understanding within the communicative situation. For example, in text linguistics great weight is attached to the beginnings and ends of texts; researchers find "signals for understanding" and "emotive meanings" provided to the reader/listener. Style is not merely regarded as an aesthetically pleasing means of ornamenting a text, which one can take or leave; rather, style is a bearer of meaning that powerfully shapes the reception of what is read.[2]

Ancient rhetoric, which had been dismissed as cold calculation and cynical manipulation of the masses, also underwent a re-evaluation

parallel to changes in linguistics. Given that such rhetoric had always been a pragmatic communicative art, instructing orators how to gain success in a given situation (today called the "situation context"), one can see how classical rhetorical concepts crop up now in different terminological dress.[3] The perspective has expanded from the intellectual to the emotive and sociological power of language. Thereby new light also has shone on Martin Luther's creative writing. The rhetorical tradition in which he stood, the natural talent with which he mastered it and adapted it to German usage, the timeless validity and the archaic resonance of his style can all be more clearly recognized within this frame of reference.

II. The Heart

It is also necessary to explain the quotation from Luther, "And feel it in the heart." It presents a tremendous difficulty that in Luther's day words could have a slightly different meaning than today. Now we understand the word "heart" frequently as a metaphor for "feeling." The human personality is divided into the "cool" understanding of the head on the one hand and the "warm" feeling in the heart on the other. Since the Enlightenment, in order to unravel the mystery of the world and existence, we have tended to give pride of place to intelligence. Feeling rather interfered with thinking, for which one needed a "cool" head. "Emotional thinking" is dismissed, rejected as sentimentality, and reserved chiefly for women. And because Luther in his preaching repeatedly stressed just how important it was that the simple folk *understand* the biblical word, one imagines today—for the most part inadvertently—that Luther, Lutheranism, preaching and faith had only to do with the head.

Luther, however, lived in an era before the Enlightenment; he shared, along with Augustine, the anthropology of the Bible, according to which the mind's organ for knowing is the heart, as the innermost center of human personality, separated from external influence and visible only to God. Heart and mind are inseparably joined to one another. Thinking is "filled and controlled by the power of the heart."[4] The free movement toward or away from God

takes place in the heart, not the head (see Mark 16:14, in the translation of Luther and King James). When it says in the Bible that a person "thinks in his [or her] heart," then what is implied is by no means a kind of emotional thinking. Today we are in danger of sentimentalizing or poeticizing the biblical expression "heart." Both tendencies are miles away from Luther's conceptual world. For him the heart was wise and the understanding warm. I can only hint at the richness of the concept of "heart" and its significance for Luther's theology and language. I do want, however, to emphasize that it was of central importance. A single reference from Luther's *Preface to the Psalms* must suffice to demonstrate the intertwining of thinking, feeling and willing in the term "heart." There he insists that the Psalter shows what the state of the saints' hearts is and what kind of thoughts they have, so that we "look into the basis and source of their words and work, that is, into their hearts, to see what kind of thoughts they had . . ."[5]

The importance of this approach derives from the central Bible passage for Luther's doctrine of justification, Romans 10:10: "Whoever believes from the heart will be justified." In a "House Sermon on the Articles of Faith" from 1537, we discover in concentrated form Luther's view of the heart as the seat of faith.[6] "To believe from the heart" means to take up with understanding what is heard, but that is not enough. The hearers must also feel that they are affected; they must "take what is heard to heart." The Holy Spirit is the one who "speaks into the heart," so that knowledge and feeling fuse in the heart into the unity of faith:

> Therefore, a human being is doubtless redeemed, but as long as he does not believe it he does not feel it, it is still not in his heart. Here comes now this third part, that God pours the Holy Spirit into the hearts, who speaks it so into the hearts that we know [= feel] that what He says is truly so and not otherwise.[7]

Luther often designates the Holy Spirit as "Orator" [Latin: *rhetor*], especially when he "speaks into our hearts" in such a way that the individual feels, understands and believes.[8] When in the following we refer to the heart, the close connection between thinking and feeling must be kept in view (*intellectus et affectus*, as Luther at one

point defines "heart").⁹ All of Luther's activities with language, both as a translator and as a preacher, aim at "speaking into the heart."

The "heart" is also responsible for understanding the Bible. To feel one's way into a text is for Luther a precondition for correct understanding. In his sermons on Genesis from 1523 he explains that the affective grasp of a text's content is just as necessary as an intellectual grasp of the meaning of the words. Indeed, he specifies the former as the *sine qua non* for proper reading of the Bible, which occurs in three steps: "that one understands the words properly, and the affective side, and feels it in the heart. Those who cannot do this are forbidden to read the text at all."¹⁰

The close connection between thought, feeling, word, and faith explains why Luther in his *Open Letter on Translating* lists first as *the* necessary precondition for a good translator of the Bible not knowledge of languages, erudition, or fluency in one's own tongue but instead "an accurate, upright, true, diligent, reverent, Christian, learned, experienced and practiced heart."¹¹ That the heart is to be "practiced" (German: *geübt*) is aimed at the lived experience in faith that touches upon the depths of one's actual existence. This brings us at last to the theme of Luther as translator of the Bible. In what follows Luther himself should be allowed to speak as much as possible.

III. The Translation of the Bible

A. Traditional Theory and Praxis of Translation

In Luther's day, a traditional praxis for translating existed along with an almost completely formulaic, fixed theory. The central problem in translating is faithfulness to the original text. How true to the original must one remain; how freely may one formulate things? The free, adaptive method, oriented toward the language of translation, stands over against the "alienating" method, oriented toward the original language, with its emphasis on remaining true to the words. The translators of the "early new High German" era quoted in their introductions what had become a stereotypical

criterion: A faithful translator should translate "not word for word but meaning for meaning."

Friedrich Schleiermacher's reflections from 1813 became the classic formulation. He described these two opposing methods as follows: "Either the translator leaves the author alone as much as possible and moves the reader toward the author, or the translator leaves the reader alone as much as possible and moves the author toward the reader." Schleiermacher assumed that one must decide between these two paths and hold to one's choice throughout the entire work. Mix translation and "replication," and the readers would become like balls thrown back and forth between their world and the foreign world of the author. As we will see, however, the truly remarkable part of Luther's method of translating lies precisely in going back and forth between both strategies, without readers feeling "like balls."

B. Luther's Comments on the Theory of Translating

In two more extensive writings, *An Open Letter on Translating* (1530) and the *Summaries of the Psalms and the Causes of Translating* (1531-1533), Luther himself explained his principles of translation and took exception to critical remarks by others concerning his individual decisions. Whoever wants to study Luther as a Bible translator must concentrate on these comments most of all. Studying them makes one thing clear above everything else: as a Bible translator, Luther is always in the first instance a responsible theologian. This approach, which Luther justifies in the above-mentioned writings on the basis of his theory of language, shapes his individual translating decisions. Scholars have often designated Luther's language as "the language of the pulpit." He also experienced the Bible as a spoken word, read from the pulpit and quoted in sermons. The preacher could perceive directly from the reaction of his listeners whether or not they followed what he was saying. From his time as an Augustinian friar, Luther was already accustomed to read from the pulpit the Latin biblical text before translating it into German with explanations and expansions.

In this situation of oral transmission, such a thoroughly adaptive method of translation, with its goal of keeping the audience in mind,

had been standard for a long time. In the context of oral transference, this method of translating, with its accommodation or far-reaching adaptation to its audience, had been in use for quite a while and was even expressly prescribed in the rules for preachers, the so-called *Artes praedicandi*. The tradition and practice of preaching provided fertile ground for Luther's translation of the Bible. From it he gleaned the criteria for good and bad translations and for good and bad German. The congregation gathered around his pulpit is the target audience that he envisions. What they understand, how they express themselves provides him the material. In an oft-quoted text, we read:

> For one must not inquire of the literal Latin language for how one should speak German . . . instead one must ask the mother in the house, the children in the street, the common man in the market about this, and listen very closely how they speak and then translate accordingly so that they understand it and realize that one is speaking German to them.[12]

Behind these words one can sense the successful preacher, who is accustomed to pay attention to his listeners. The decisive role that Luther here accords to the linguistic competence of the common speaker of the mother tongue was first recognized within the field of linguistics by Noam Chomsky, whose questioning and studying of "native informants" comes close to what Luther designates with the phrase "watch the [common native speaker's] mouth," namely, listen carefully how everyday people express themselves.

For the most part people have connected this greatly-overused quotation to vocabulary, which is then characterized as "simple" or "colloquial." Doing this overlooks what is particularly characteristic of this group of people: its members express themselves not abstractly or intellectually but concretely and colorfully, in ways filled with feelings and powerful expressions. Luther was concerned not simply for cognitive comprehension but also for power and pithiness in order to address emotions. Indirectly, this proceeds from the example or adage that he adds: "*Ex abundantia cordis os loquitur*" ("The mouth speaks from the abundance of the heart," Matthew 12:34), which is the equivalent of the German saying, "Whatever the heart is full of spills over into the mouth." The choice of this particular adage says a lot.

In the *Open Letter*, as also in the *Summaries*, Luther picked out a variety of problems from translation theory which still concern the science of translating today, on which a rich literature exists and which even today have by no means been solved. He had to defend himself against accusations of having distorted and falsely translated certain passages. For "literal" or "free" translation, Luther for the most part used phrases like "bound to the letter" or "let the letter go." He comes near to the principle of "meaning for meaning" translation in a passage from the *Summaries*.

> Where the words may have permitted and offered a better understanding, there we did not let ourselves be forced by the grammar of the rabbis to a lesser or different understanding. As all schoolmasters teach, the sense should not serve and follow the words but the words the sense.[13]

Regarding the word "schoolmaster," Luther is referring to *the basic rule of rhetoric*: *Rem tene, verba sequentur* ("Hold fast to the matter at hand and the words will follow from themselves"), a rule that Luther could assume was well known. For orators, a fundamental knowledge of the topic on which they were to speak was necessary. In this context the above-mentioned quotation fits, that to Bible translating belongs "a . . . Christian, learned, experienced, practiced heart."

Luther adheres to neither a literal nor a free method of translation. Instead, he combines both, depending on the text. He writes in the *Summaries* ". . . we have prided ourselves on the rule that sometimes we stick strictly to the words and sometimes we have only given the sense."[14] In the *Open Letter* he introduces these two opposing, technical means of proceeding in the following way: ". . . where at one place it is important, I have held to the literal and have not proceeded freely" and, contrariwise, "thus, here I depart from the literal and examine how a German speaker says this." It is Luther the theologian, based upon his Christological understanding, who determines "what is important."

Verba sequentur. The words are to "serve and follow" the sense. This is how Luther understands the "schoolmaster's" saying. But that the fitting word follows spontaneously on the heels of "the matter at hand" is more beautiful theory than reality:

> In translating, I have devoted myself to producing a pure and clear German. And it often happened that we searched for and inquired about a single word for two, three, or four weeks and even after that time still did not come up with one.[15]

What Luther means by "pure and clear German" he explains in what follows. At that time linguistics did not know about today's distinction, in use since the time of Ferdinand de Saussure, between *langue* (a system of language) and *parole* (speech). Nevertheless, in his explanations in the *Open Letter* we find both aspects of "language" remarkably taken account of in the following.

> This, however, is characteristic of our German language. . . . Although the Latin and Greek languages do not do this, German does. It is its characteristic to add the word "alone."[16]

Luther judges bad translating by the criterion that a German would not speak this way (*parole*) : "But what is this for German? What German would speak this way?" "No German could say it this way" lest it not be understood: "Is that speaking German? What German would understand this?" As already mentioned, in the twentieth century Noam Chomsky first raised the "native speaker," on whom Luther bestows such a central role, to the same normative rank and worth.

In his *Summaries*, Luther gives an illustration of how he approaches finding "pure and clear German."

> Who wants to speak German must not follow the Hebrew manner of expression. Instead, when he understands the Hebrew person, then he must see that he grasps the meaning and thinks, "My dear, how does a German person speak in this situation?"[17]

Here Luther describes with remarkable precision the three phases of the process of translating, as one also finds them in modern handbooks: first, a linguistic understanding of the text, which moves from a lexical understanding of the words to comprehension of the meaning of the sentences and text, that is, of the intention. Current science of translation speaks of "deverbalization." Only after this can

a new formulation in the receiving language ensue. Worth noting is the pragmatic component found in Luther: How does a German express himself or herself *in this situation?* This means paying proper regard to the "situational context," as it is called and taught today, by placing oneself into the speech situation and from that perspective finding the idiomatically correct expression.

This advice of Luther is completely modern. One can find exact parallels to Luther's comments in today's institutes for translating. In a lecture delivered in 1977, Danica Seleskovitch, the professor and director of the research division of the École Supérieure d'Interprètes et de Traducteurs at the Sorbonne, described how long she searched in vain for a good translation of a particular expression until she imagined a concrete situation in daily life. Then the words came of their own accord. As the caption for her lecture she used the words of Lewis Carroll, "Take care of the sense, and the sounds will take will take care of themselves," cited without giving any hint of its ancient source.[18] Luther gave precisely the same advice 450 years earlier.

This discussion can give the impression that Luther placed philological points of view ahead of exegetical ones. This would, however, be a mistaken conclusion. One should not forget that Luther places the *res*, the matter itself, ahead of everything else. The stress on the "sense" assumes that Luther interprets the text above all from a theological perspective. Only theological bases dictate his decision when to remain true to the text and when to translate more freely. "Besides the manner of speaking, the matter itself demands this," he states regarding the "alone," and he summarizes his conclusions this way. "Because this matter basically demands from itself that one says that faith alone justifies, and because our German way of speaking also teaches us to express it this way."[19] Clearly the "matter" (*res*) stands ahead of language.

In the *Open Letter* Luther defends two texts in his Bible translation: Romans 3:28 ("by faith alone") and Luke 1:28 ("Greetings, Mary, you beloved one" [German: "*Gegrüßet seist du, Maria, du holdselige*"]). We have to examine the latter translation more closely, not only because it gave rise to strong objections—given that the Ave Maria was prayed daily—but also because it instructively elucidates the

collision of two methods of interpretation and translation current in Luther's day.

1. "Only Give the Sense"

When fifteenth-century humanists declared that only those versed in Hebrew and Greek had the right to interpret the Holy Scripture, this amounted to declaring invalid a majority of traditional, ecclesiastically-sanctioned interpretations of the Bible, since these proceeded from the Vulgate. In the greeting of the archangel Gabriel (Latin: *Ave Maria gratia plena*), the phrase *gratia plena* was traditionally translated as "full of grace." Luther, contrariwise, translated it with "you beloved one," and he declared in his *Open Letter* that no German would say let alone understand "full of grace," but would instead think of a keg full of beer or a purse full of money.[20] This elicited strong protests across the board. His opponent Jerome Emser wrote:

> . . . Certainly the angel here was not speaking about human affection [*huld*] but about the grace of God. And Mary did not possess the honor and worthiness that she would become the mother of God from human affection but from God's grace. For this reason, we should not at this place read and pray "You beloved one" but "You full of grace." For the grace that Eve forfeited, Mary regained for us, and the curse of Eve has been transformed into the blessing of Mary.[21]

The church had established once and for all how this passage was to be interpreted, namely, in harmony with dogma and typology, and any questioning of this reading came close to blasphemy.

Luther proceeds in a completely different way, the humanistic way *ad fontes* (back to the sources). He does not stick with the Greek of Luke but instead tries to go still further back in the past. In his discussion, the archangel is such a concrete figure that one can imagine him to be similar to a flesh-and-blood person. Luther asks how he normally speaks when, under orders from God, he greets a person. For Luther it is a matter of course that when the angel addressed Mary, he employed the language of paradise, namely, Hebrew, and that Luke translated this greeting into Greek. In order to get back to the Hebraic

original, Luther employs the method of concordance. He searches the Old Testament for a parallel text and finds it in the book of the prophet Daniel. The archangel greets the prophet three times (Daniel 9:23, 10:11 and 10:19), every time with the same expression, which Luther transcribes as "*Hamudoth*" and "*Isch Hamudoth.*" This, Luther thinks, Luke wanted to render with the Greek *kecharitomeni* [sic!].

> And I believe that the angel Gabriel spoke with Mary the way he spoke with Daniel, and calls him "*Hamudoth*" and "*Isch Hamudoth*" (*vir desideriorum*), that is, you dear Daniel. For that is the way Gabriel talks, as we see in Daniel.[22]

Luther is convinced that one is dealing with an oral ritual of greeting and that languages and cultures differ from one another in this, so that one must proceed from the pragmatic situation and not translate the literal text. Today ethnomethodology and linguistic sociology concern themselves with "greeting rituals" and "rituals of address" as part of a "sociology of daily life." And pragmatic linguistics studies a greeting's symbolism in the framework of so-called "communicative patterns of interaction."[23] In what follows, Luther continues with no little irony about how mistaken it would be were he to translate the Latin *vir desideriorum* literally into German: "You man of desires" or "You man of lusts." Thus, here he had to "let the letter go" and ask how German speakers would express themselves in this situation.

> Thus, I find that a German would speak this way, "You dear [*lieber*] Daniel," "You dear [*liebe*] Mary" or "You beloved [*holdselige*] maid" . . . For whoever wants to translate must have a great variety of words from which to choose, where one would not fit in every situation.[24]

He would have preferred to have written "You dear Mary," he continues, for that would be what the angel intended and what he would have said had he wanted to greet her in German. But then his opponents would probably have hung themselves out of adoration for Mary, because he would have so obliterated the angel's greeting. He then inserted reflections on the German word "*liebe*" (English: dear; lovely), to which we will return below.

   In the discussion of translation in the *Open Letter on Translating*, Luther reveals the entire range of his thoughts: at the same time

bound to tradition, and yet a humanist and modern. In the concreteness of his understanding of the angel, he mirrors the thought patterns of the late Middle Ages, and in the way he proceeds hermeneutically, he mirrors humanist textual science. In his pragmatic method of translating, with its concern for the contextual situation, personal idiom (the archangel "Gabriel's way of speaking") and speech rituals, as well as his taking into account "language" as "address" or system and the distinction between meaning, signifier and sense, he stands at the very pinnacle of linguistics and the field of translation of our own day.

The discussion in the *Summaries of the Psalms* deals in part with somewhat different problems that are based on the peculiarities of the Hebrew language. In translating the Psalms Luther also combines both methods, which he describes this way: "sometimes we hold to the words strictly; at other times we have only given the sense."[25] Again, theological reasons were decisive for his decisions. The metaphorical language in Hebrew caused particular difficulties, something that still constitutes a *crux interpretum* for modern translators as well, given that so many of the images are either no longer or even falsely understood by people of Western culture. Above all, in Psalm 68 Luther often translated freely, what he himself characterized as "hazarding" a guess. "Again, we have hazarded [a guess] regarding many things in Psalm 68 and often gave the sense while abandoning the literal text."[26] In Luther's translation work, one can observe a growing preference for a more strongly adaptive method. This paralleled his linguistic advances, in that he developed deeper familiarity with the Hebrew language on the one hand and a more and more masterful command of German on the other. As an example of the difficulty presented by pictorial language, Luther provided a quotation from Psalm 63:6 [KJV], "My soul shall be satisfied as with marrow and fatness; and my mouth shall praise with joyful lips." Luther explains that with the phrase "marrow and fatness" the Hebrews meant joy. However, because no German would understand the literal text, he had "to abandon" it and instead provide a clear German rendering: "That would be the joy and delight of my heart."[27] This approach is still par for the course today. Neither in theory nor in praxis has anyone advanced beyond Luther in solving this problem.

2. "Holding strictly to the words."

For the other approach, namely, holding fast to what was to a German a foreign-sounding expression or picture, Luther gives two reasons.

a. A passage that is obscure in the original language could be interpreted in a variety of ways, as in Psalm 91:5. "So that you do not fear the terror by night nor the arrows that fly in the day; nor the pestilence that walks in the darkness; nor the plague that wastes at noonday." He left it this way to avoid forcing the individual Bible reader to a particular, preordained interpretation.[28]

b. Luther perceives the Hebrew language to be more expressive and evocative. In this instance, Luther consciously employs a Hebraism as his speech pattern and, interestingly enough, thereby refuses to follow his principle of "the manner of the German language," that is, "this is what a German would say." It has to do with Psalm 68:19: "You ascended to the heights and have captured captivity." Here, Luther opines, it would have been much better German to write, "You have freed the captives."

> But this is too weak and does not give the fine, rich meaning that is in the Hebrew text . . . which not only makes clear that Christ has freed the captives but also that the prison itself has been led away captive so that it neither can nor should ever again take us captive and is as much as an eternal freeing . . . Therefore, in order to honor such a teaching and to comfort our consciences we must hold fast and accustom ourselves to these words and thereby give the Hebrew language a certain latitude, where it can do it better than we can in German.[29]

With this Luther is also putting demands on the reader of the Bible. True, he had "watched the mouth of the man in the market," as he put it, but he did not speak down to him. Luther's Bible did not speak the undemanding vernacular of the masses. Here he "translated strictly according to the letter," which meant that he attached special importance to the text in question. His entire argument, which need not be extensively covered here, revolved exclusively around the sense of this passage. That Luther stayed true to the Hebrew text is an example of how he "allows the words to serve and follow the sense," in that the Hebrew expression communicates the intended

meaning more strongly and richly, that is, more strikingly, than the idiomatic German one. Here we encounter an "alienation effect," as it is called today, that forces the reader to reflect more deeply on the passage.

3. "Grasping the Words Correctly"

"Those who cannot grasp the words correctly along with the affective qualities and feel the meaning in the heart are forbidden to read [the text]." Let us recall this passage cited above from the lectures on Genesis concerning the presupposition for an appropriate, comprehending reading of the Bible, this time linking it to the concept of "heart" as combining "intellect and affect." In this section we will concentrate on the intellectual side of "grasping the words correctly" in the process of translation.

That Luther's approach to translating the Bible corresponds to a large degree with modern scientific methods is also true for the practical work: the interdisciplinary cooperation with other experts, which we call "teamwork" in today's parlance. In sessions with other scholars, Luther managed to overcome countless problems. Not only has Luther's own well-worn copy of the Bible with all of his notes and corrections been preserved for us, but even the minutes of the sessions, recorded by the reliable stenographer, Georg Rörer, are still available.[30] In reading them, one is overcome with the feeling of taking part, at the very highest level, in a modern university seminar. We also possess the description by a contemporary, Johannes Mathesius, who although probably not himself present was well-informed about what went on. We need to quote this in modernized form in order to illustrate with what great circumspection and intellectual energy the "*sensus*" of the text was ascertained and communicated.

We are talking here about the sessions from 1539 until 1541. The participants were dealing with the revision of the first complete Bible and were laboring over the Hebrew in the Old Testament. Mathesius lists the scholars whom Luther gathered around himself once a week "for several hours before supper." His designation for Luther is "doctor."

When the Doctor had in preparation studied the printed Bible and in addition had investigated the work of Jewish scholars and other experts in language—for example, one time he had a German butcher slaughter several sheep in order to learn the names of the various parts—he would come into the "consistory" with his old Latin Bible [the Vulgate] and the new German Bible. He also always had a Hebrew text at hand. Mr. Philip [Melanchthon] brought the Greek text [the Septuagint], Doctor [Caspar] Cruciger [Sr.] brought, alongside the Hebrew text, the Chaldean [Aramaic] Bible. The professors had their Rabbis with them [i.e., commentaries on the text by Jewish scholars]. Dr. Pommer [i.e., "the Pomeranian" Johannes Bugenhagen] also had a Latin text in front of him, which he had truly mastered. Each had previously prepared himself well for the text that was up for discussion and had studied the Greek, Latin and Jewish commentaries on the passage. Then the presider [Luther] would bring up a text for discussion and let the participants, one after the other, have their say concerning the characteristics of the language or the exposition of the ancient teachers. Wonderful and instructive speeches were made during this work . . .[31]

This depiction provides insight not only into the scholarly collaboration at the highest intellectual level but also into the effort connected to finding just the right word. The anecdote about the butcher, who had to instruct Luther in the terms for parts of the sheep (referred to in passages about sacrifices in the Old Testament), is only one example among many. There are also letters in which Luther asks for particular words, names for species, and so on. For example, on 12 December 1522 he wrote to Spalatin and asked him about the descriptions and names of various animals, especially birds of prey like vultures, goshawks or sparrow-hawks and nocturnal birds like screech owls, long-eared owls and night herons, which he could not accurately distinguish from one another. While working on the text that dealt with the building of Solomon's temple, he visited artisans in their workshop and gleaned from them their tools' names and functions. With the translation of Revelation, the jewels in the New Jerusalem gave him trouble. Here Luther was not satisfied simply with knowing their names, so he wrote to the court and asked to obtain examples from the Elector's treasure-vault via courier. He wanted to see for himself their colors and luminosity in order to be able to connect the word to a concrete concept.

Res and *verba* [reality and words] are inextricably bound to each other, and the precedence of *res* follows unequivocally from the

above-mentioned depictions of Luther's work. That Luther's language is so concrete and vivid derives directly from his effort to bind a concrete concept to the words that he used.

4. ". . . Along with the Affective Qualities"

Although Luther's translation of the Bible was, on the one hand, "modern," nevertheless, on the other hand, it differed in one important way from today's scientific translators, namely, in the matter of critical distance from the text, which today stands as an absolutely necessary demand for philologists and theologians working with the biblical text. There is no trace of such a distance to be found in Luther. He had a completely personal or, better still, an intimate relationship to many books of the Bible; he had his favorite texts, which he called verselets, textlets, psalmlets [German: "*Versichen*," "*textichen*," "*pselmichen*"], and others that he did not hold in such high esteem. This intimate relation to a text emerges with particular clarity from a comment in a *Table Talk*. There Luther says of Galatians, "The Epistle to the Galatians is my little epistle that I have entrusted myself to. It is my Katie von Bora."[32] These brief words shine a spotlight both on Luther's relation to Galatians and on his relation to his wife Katie. Warmth, security, trust and high esteem sound throughout this comparison. His relation to this Pauline epistle is in equal measure intellectual and emotional.

With this basic attitude toward the Bible, it is no wonder that Luther dedicated great care to the emotional side of the text. As far as feelings went, he was richly endowed and possessed a genial capacity to give expression to his emotions. When he wrote in the *Open Letter on Translating* that he would have much preferred to translate "*gratia plena* " in the angel's greeting as: "You dear Mary," he was not simply sticking to philological constructs regarding greeting rituals but immediately added reflections about the German word "*liebe*" (dear or love):

> And I do not know whether one can express the word "*liebe*" in such a full and heartfelt manner in Latin or other languages so that it might thus penetrate into the heart and ring and reverberate through all the senses, as it does in our language.[33]

"So that it might thus penetrate into the heart and ring and reverberate through all the senses" is Luther's masterful formulation for what today in modern linguistics is called "the emotive effect of the language." How much intellectual effort Luther also spent on the emotional side of the biblical text, with this "feeling oneself into the text" as a first presupposition, also comes out in his commentaries on the Bible.

Only during the last few decades have people noticed in textual linguistics what Luther was already adhering to in the above-quoted remark, namely, that words and their affective qualities be correctly understood and felt in the heart. For the proper understanding of a text both the mental (that is, intellectual and cognitive) content *and* the emotional content are necessary. In this the emotional component is often decisive. It does not simply concern what is said but rather how it is intended and wishes to be understood. How often have we ourselves understood every single word of another person and still have to ask: "How do you mean that?" "Why are you telling me this?" "Are you serious?" "Are you teasing me?" "What's that supposed to mean?" "What are you trying to say?" And how often haven't we ourselves become irritated with the hearer and blurted out: "But that isn't what I was trying to say at all!" (In 1986 the best-selling book on this problem by the American linguist, Deborah Tannen, bore the title, *That's Not What I Meant!*) This uncertainty—whether an expression is meant to be a request or a reproach, praise or irony, pure information, a warning, or even a threat—can completely endanger the entire process of communication. In oral language this information is expressed mainly through tone of voice.

If one studies Luther's commentaries on the Bible, it is striking how often he sticks to the emotive basic tone of a passage, how he immerses himself in the text's feelings and seeks to plumb the depths of its emotions and recreate them for his hearers, "so that it penetrates and rings in the heart." This can be demonstrated in a single passage from Luther's translation of the Psalms, which addresses the issue of human beings' love for God, Psalm 18:2. Luther cites the beginning of the Psalm in Latin: *diligam* ("I love"). Modern translations render this plainly and simply: "I love you." But do not imagine that Luther would also simply write down: "I love you!" In the protocols for this

Psalm he attempts to encapsulate and explore the depth of feelings here. It reads as follows:

> *Diligam: paternabo, maternabo, filiabo te* [I love you paternally, maternally, filially]. I dearly love you, as in the phrase "I am so deeply in love with you." He is talking about *viscera*, the heart of a mother. I have a heart for this person! Oh how I take you into my heart [or: caress you]![34]

At first glance, the passage seems unproblematic. Luther's comments do not relate to the cited Latin word but to the Hebrew original. One sees clearly how Luther takes great pains to feel his way into the text and to exhaust every avenue for capturing the relationship to its inner meaning in both Latin and German. The reference to "a mother's heart" points to the comparative material that Luther draws upon in his efforts regarding love for God: the experiences in his own family life. Further constructs center on and circle around the term "heart," reaching their high point with the ardent "Oh how I take you into my heart." The revised translation that he then comes up with reads: "Heartily I hold you dear, Lord, my strength." [35] The passage speaks for itself.

5. *"Joyfully"*

Thinking about God's grace results in joy. "God becomes so dearly loved that the heart overflows with happiness, skips and jumps for joy," as Luther explains in his commentary on the Magnificat.[36] Hence Luther also took to heart how to express joy. It must be stressed how often Luther emphasized the words joy and cheerfulness. God desires a joyful heart, but the devil on the contrary is the enemy of joy, the *Spiritus tristitiae*, the evil spirit of sorrow, melancholy, and depression. A Christian even has "a command of joy."

As Luther set out to translate and interpret the Magnificat, he first measured the basic feelings of the text and thus emphasized Mary's joy as the fundamental tone of her praise. Mary, "the tender mother of Christ," "extols God here with a cheerful, dancing spirit and praises him for having regarded her."[37] Here we see an historical change in the language, in that "cheerful" (*fröhlich*) denoted a

stronger form of joy (*Freude*) in Luther's day than in our own. The definition of *fröhlich* in Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm's famous *Deutsches Wörterbuch* as ". . . the one who is cheerful is, as it were, half joyful and begins to be glad" does not match up with this reference to a "dancing" cheerfulness.[38] On the contrary, the tradition of translating the Psalms before Luther's day included *fröhlich* among the designations for joy—one that showed itself outwardly with jumping, skipping, dancing, handclapping, jubilation, and so on. It corresponded to the Latin word *exultare* [to exult], while "to rejoice inwardly" was denoted with the word *laetari* [to rejoice].

Today it is normally only children who express their joy by jumping around. Among adults this is legitimate and typical only in exceptional circumstances, especially in sports activities, as when a goal is scored, one's own team wins, or the like. In biblical times and even in Luther's day, people including adults apparently behaved in this way as a matter of course when something joyous occurred. *Exultare* most often corresponds for Luther with *fröhlich sein* [to be joyful]. When in this way Luther describes the state of Mary's soul in the Magnificat as a spirit jumping for joy, he probably heard in his inner ear the initial words of her song of praise in the Vulgate, which he knew by heart: "*Exultavit spiritus meus in Deo,*" my spirit exults in God.

Today's German reader hears "*fröhlich sein*" as weaker in comparison to "*sich freuen.*" But in Luther's day it was reversed. The alliterative doubled phrase he often used, *sich freuen und fröhlich sein*, signified an intensification from "inward joy" to an external expression of it. Ignorance of the strong intensity of feeling in Luther's use of *fröhlich* easily awakens in today's reader a false impression. Particularly when in Luke there is talk of a *Freudenfest* [joyous feast] in honor of the returned Prodigal Son, the music and dance of which was heard from afar (Luke 15:24f.), it sounds particularly weak to our [German] ears to hear "*Und fiengen an frölich zu sein*" [and they began to be cheerful; KJV: "to make merry"]. The field of meaning for words of joyful feelings in Luther deserves its own study.

In Luther's commentaries on the Bible it is striking how often he emphasizes the emotive side of a text, and attempts to experience the same feelings, exhausts their possibilities, paraphrases and

explains. Sometimes he also elaborates on emotions in his commentary that are not explicitly present in the text of the actual Psalm. For example, David promises in Psalm 54 to present an offering to the Lord. Today in the Zürich Bible it reads: "Thus I want to bring you willingly a sacrifice," and in the *Good News Bible*: "Voluntarily I present to you a sacrifice." Luther writes, "Thus I will make a sacrifice of joy [*Freudenopfer*] to you." In his commentary on the Psalms, he explains this further.

> To make a laughing or joyful sacrifice [*Freudenopfer*], for the Lord God delights in this, that a person rejoices [*sich freuen*] that God is so good, comforting and rich in joy [*freudenreich*] and makes a person joyful [*frölich*].[39]

It is a remarkably bright picture of God that shines through these words.

For most of passages cited above, where Luther used "*fröhlich*," modern translations employ in the Psalter the term "*jubeln*" [exult] and in the New Testament "celebrate (*fröhliche* [joyous]) feasts." Whoever reads Luther today should consider that the word *fröhlich* denotes "an exultant [*jubelnde*] joy, often about help from God. This takes a central place in Luther's theology and language.

6. ". . . and feel it in the heart": Empathetic Translation

Luther also handles other, painful feelings with great care. A single example must suffice to illumine how Luther goes about shaping an emotive translation in these cases. It comes from a section of the Old Testament, where Joseph puts his brothers to the test. Benjamin is (falsely) accused of theft, and Judah makes a speech before Joseph and declares that he is prepared to remain behind as a slave in Benjamin's place in order to atone for the crime, if only Benjamin might be allowed to return to his aged father, for whom the loss of Benjamin would mean certain death. The modern "Common Translation" ["*Einheitsübersetzung*"] renders the anticipated feelings of the father with grief [*Gram*] and misfortune [*Unglück*]. Contrariwise, Luther translates it as "heartache" [*Herzeleid*] and "woe" [*Jammer*] (Genesis 44:31 & 34). In comparing the two, the difference between Luther's emotive approach and the scientific, technical method

becomes clear. "Misfortune" [*Unglück*] is the objective, technical term for the event. "Woe" [*Jammer*] is the experienced catastrophe, which becomes visible and audible in loud cries and gestures. People in the Bible tear out their hair and rend their garments. This sympathy colors the entire tone of Luther's text. Through this emotional language the reader is also pulled along into the text's feelings.

C. The Style of the Luther Bible

This last facet of Luther's translation of the Bible describes a substantial part of his Bible's style as well. The long-time director of the United Bible Societies, Eugen Nida, has found that the study of emotive meanings is closely related to the nature of so-called "religious language" and that here lurks a constant problem for translation commissions. It was also his experience that the reaction to a new translation depends far more on its stylistic quality than on its scientific precision.[40]

In the mid-1970s, linguists working on the revision of the German New Testament—which was later rejected and itself underwent significant revisions—designated the style of Luther's Bible as "a generally understandable and conventional, colloquial language of midrange difficulty, neither an ecclesially nor a personally exclusive language." On this basis, the revisers then set their own criterion as "a dialect-free, colloquial German of midrange difficulty." With this they thought that they were most closely approaching Luther's own intentions.[41] Since that time, people have realized that because of its one-sidedness this was a mistake and have taken this into consideration in the subsequent revisions. The people responsible for the revised Luther text of 1984, by contrast, have worked successfully with the concept of a "Luther Bible Kind of Text" [*Textsorte Lutherbibel*].

1. Sacred Style

Contrary to earlier opinions, recent linguistic research has made it clear that Luther strove for a sacred style in particular important passages, as will be sketched out in the following. "Behold [*siehe*], I bring you [*euch*] tidings of great joy," the angel proclaims to the

shepherds in the Christmas gospel (Luke 2:10).[42] Why does the angel not use the plural [*sehet*]? In the same way, actually grammatically speaking incorrectly, another angel says to the women who seek the resurrected Jesus, "And behold [*siehe*], he will go before you [*euch*] into Galilee. Behold [*siehe*], I have told you [*euch*] this" (Matthew 28:7). The gospel of Matthew ends with Jesus' command to spread the gospel to all nations, "And behold [*siehe*], I am with you [*euch*] always, even to the end of the world" (Matthew 28:11).

Were Luther translating "according to manner of the German language," he would have had to use the plural *sehet*. And initially he actually did translate, "Behold" [*sehet*], exactly as the Bible translations before him. As long as the German translation was based upon the Vulgate, there was no other possibility, since the corresponding Latin word, *ecce*, was the same in the singular and plural. That starting in 1533 Luther introduced, over against the tradition and the idiomatically correct German, a grammatical mistake, that is, that he "followed the literal [Greek] text" rather than the "manner of the German language," means that for him it had to do with a passage of exceptional importance, "where at one place it is necessary" [to hold to the literal text]. If we examine the context more closely, one discovers that this is indeed the case. There are few Bible passages more central than the narratives of Jesus' birth and resurrection.

We saw above how intensively Luther concerned himself, in translating the "Ave Maria," with the archangel Gabriel's manner of speaking. In that case, he put himself in the place of the evangelist Luke and tried to imagine how Luke had translated the original greeting of the angel from Hebrew into Greek. Similarly, in the Christmas gospel it is an angel who is speaking. Once again, Luther goes back to the Greek original and also finds there the singular (*idou* and *kai idou*, respectively). And, again, he goes back one step further, back to the Hebrew, and finds that a Hebrew interjection (transcribed by him as "*hinneh*") underlies the Greek. The intensive study of such particles, ongoing since the 1970s,[43] has sharpened the view of linguists for this class of words, which earlier were ignored as "empty," having no lexical meaning. Since then researchers have learned that enclitics, called today "modal particles," fulfill important functions in the process of communication. For example, they

establish contact between the author and reader, guide the reception of a text, influence the cadence of a sentence and affect the speech act itself.

The particle "*Siehe*" [behold] is marked as an important stylistic means through its departure from the norm. The Hebrew, "*hinneh*," has value as a signal to the hearer to pay acute and reverent attention to the following words. Although common and in daily use, it functions in particular contexts, because of its frequency and distribution and unusual grammar, as a means of communicating a particular style. This function will be explored more closely in what follows.

2. The Appearances of Angels

We begin with the angelic appearances. Had Luther searched in the Old Testament for a corresponding situation, he could easily have found it in Jacob's dream (Genesis 28:12ff.) beginning with "And he dreamed, and behold, a ladder stood on earth . . . and, behold, the angels of God were climbing up and down it," and continuing right down to God's promise: "And, behold, I am with you and I will watch over you, wherever you go." The frequency and distribution of "behold" mark the breaking in of the supernatural into the sequence of narration and are limited to the dream episode, so that afterwards they once again disappear from the text. Here we have (to use the terminology of the linguist, Harald Weinrich) a "recurrent" signal, which shows that it has to do with a passage of higher mythological density.[44] In the New Testament the particle "behold" occurs above all in Matthew and Luke. Within this tradition, Matthew obviously shaped his account of the angel's appearance to Joseph in a dream according to the Greek Septuagint. ". . . Behold, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream" (Matthew 1:20 and 2:13); "But after Herod had died, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream in Egypt." The echo from the Old Testament may clearly be heard here. Thus, it has to do with a hermeneutical relation, in text studies called "intertextuality."[45]

As has already been mentioned, it is striking how often Matthew uses the word "Behold!" above all else in the Resurrection story

(Matthew 28). Besides the passages already cited, the word echoes in the voice of the narrator (as already in Jacob's dream): "And, behold, a great earthquake came to pass…", and: "And, behold, Jesus met them."

3. The Style of Visions

Beyond this, "behold" belongs to the style of visions and demarcates prophetic speech and promises. In Daniel 7 almost every vision is introduced with the phrase: "And behold." "I, Daniel, saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven churned up the great sea . . . and behold, another animal, the second . . ." Of particular importance for the New Testament was Daniel 7:13, "I saw in my vision by night, and behold, one came with the clouds of heaven as the Son of Man." The Revelation of John follows this style of vision. "And I looked, and behold, a white horse . . . and I looked, and behold, a black horse" (Revelation 6: 5, 8); "And I looked, and behold, a white cloud" (14:14), and so on. By echoing the Old Testament, the character of the vision is strengthened.

The particle also denotes visionary prophecy. When Mary says in the Magnificat, "And, behold, from now on all generations will call me blessed," the "behold" raises the statement from a sober, realistic account to an ecstatic vision of the future. (Thus, it marks the speech act itself.)

Divine promises acquire through the "behold" an unconditional, sacred believability. The closing words of the command to go into all nations (Matthew 28:20: "And behold, I am with you always, even to the end of the age") echo the divine promise to Jacob (Genesis 28:15: "And behold, I am with you and will watch over you wherever you go"), whereby the dignity of Jesus' words is underscored. Bound with this is a feeling of the sacral dimension, the numinous benediction, and an emotional depth.

This unequivocal proof that Luther consciously introduced celebrative, biblical elements of style into the German translation is not a one-of-a-kind example of his stylistically "following the letter." Upon closer examination, it is clear that in several cases Luther follows the original text even more closely than the German

translators before him. Particularly striking and one of the most important hallmarks for this is the monotonous, paratactic succession of "and." This is not—as was long misunderstood—a popular element of colloquial speech but rather a stylistic element that already before the evangelists—from the Septuagint on—was a Hebraism and thereby a hallmark of sacral language that determined the "Biblical tone" of a speech. It would have been an easy thing for Luther to eliminate some "ands" in order to accommodate the sentence structure to the standard of Early New High German, had he wanted stylistically to follow the "manner of the German language." Nor would he have been the first: the Old High German translation of Tatian had already done it.[46] That Luther did not undertake this process of accommodation shows that he was sensitive to the historically developed, stylistic genre of the biblical way of narration, a biblical narrative tone.

The same thing happened to the normal Greek conjunction *dé*, which was rendered in the Vulgate with *autem* or *enim* and in Luther's translation as "*aber*" [but], appearing in second place in a sentence. "Mary, however, remembered all of these words . . ."; "When, however, the Sabbath was over . . ."; and the like.[47] This particle denotes the progress within the narrative and thereby also often a change in characters.

To these recurrent biblicisms is joined yet another macro-syntactic introductory signal: "And it came to pass" (*Es begab sich [aber]*).[48] In Greek this corresponds to an epic formula, *Egeneto de*, repeated stereotypically at important beginning points—an introductory signal indicating that in what follows an event in salvation history is being recounted. The reader or listener is oriented toward specific relations to the truth and dimensions of the text that clearly separate the consequent sequence of events from the "once upon a time" of fairy tales.

There are a whole series of further biblical stylistic hallmarks that cannot be mentioned here. It must be stressed emphatically that we are not dealing with colloquial, day-to-day German that Luther picked up from the "mother in the home, children in the street and the common man in the market." We are dealing throughout with biblicisms, predominantly from the Greek original but also from

ones Luther copied from the tradition of his beloved Vulgate, which can consistently be traced back to the Hebrew. Luther stood in an ancient tradition of sacral narrative.

Compared with the oft-praised freedom of Luther's translation, this faithfulness over against the original is truly remarkable. It can only be explained in this way: that Luther was conscious of the effect of such an approach, although in his day terms like "text signals" or "reception aesthetic" did not yet exist. The function of this style is to suggest to the hearer an appropriate attitude of receptivity which requires special attention. One can compare this attitude to the words addressed to Moses, as he, filled with curiosity, approached the burning bush. "Do not come near; take your shoes off, for the place on which you are standing is holy ground" (Exodus 3:5). Only after Moses through this gesture had accommodated himself inwardly to the sacral dimension of a situation not fitted for banal curiosity, and had demonstrated his reverence and ready receptiveness—Luther would say that he had opened his heart— does the actual communication take place.

Thus, Luther's translation of the Bible demonstrates on all levels that it was molded with an eye toward the text's deepest emotional dimensions, which he himself described so fittingly: "so that it penetrates into the heart and rings and reverberates through all the senses."

NOTES

1.   A speech for the celebration of the Reformation at the Evangelical Theological Faculty of the University of Tübingen on 31 October 2000, first published in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 98:2 (2001), 186-208, and now reprinted in Birgit Stolt, *"Laßt uns fröhlich springen!": Gefühlswelt und Gefühlsnavigierung in Luthers Reformationsarbeit* (Berlin: Weidler, 2012), 251-73. Here slightly altered by the author and translated by Timothy J. Wengert. For additional bibliographic references, see Birgit Stolt, *Martin Luthers Rhetorik des Herzens* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), chapter 4, pp. 84-126. Abbreviations: LW: *LUTHER'S WORKS*, American Edition, 76 vols., eds. Jaroslav Pelikan, Helmut T. Lehman, and Christopher Boyd Brown (St. Louis: Concordia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1955ff.); WA: *LUTHERS WERKE: SCHRIFTEN*, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, 65 vols., eds. J.F.K. Knaake, et al. (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1883-1993); WA DB: *LUTHERS WERKE: BIBEL*, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, 12 vols. (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1906-61); WA TR: *LUTHERS WERKE: TISCHREDEN*, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, 6 vols. (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1912-21). Where possible, the American Edition of Luther's Works will be cited alongside the Weimar.

2.   For just one example among many, see Wolfgang Heinemann and Dieter Viehweger, *Textlinguistik: Eine Einführung* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1991).

3.   See Heinrich F. Plett, *Textwissenschaft und Textanalyse; Semiotik, Linguistik, Rhetorik*, 2d ed. (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1979).

4.   Anton Maxsein, *Philosophia cordis: Das Wesen der Personalität bei Augustin* (Salzburg: Müller, 1966), 40; Stolt, *Rhetorik des Herzens*.

5.   WA DB 10/1:101.23.

6.   WA 45:22-24.

7.   WA 45:22.12-16.

8.   See, for example, WA 40/3:59f.; 472.7, 22; 270.2-4; WA 5:329f.

9.   WA 4: 282.8-9. For more on this topic, see Stolt, *Rhetorik des Herzens*, 49-55.

10.   WA 12:444.7-8 "und fühl's im Herzen."

11.   WA 30/2:640.25-28; LW 35:194.

12.   WA 30/2:637.17-22: LW 35:189. The expression "auf's Maul schauen" is literally "watch their mouths."

13.   WA 38:11.13-17; LW 35:213.

14.   WA 38:17.6f.; LW 35:222.

15.   WA 30/2:636.15-18; LW 35:188.

16.   WA 30/2:637.4-5, 11-13; LW 35:189.

17.   WA 38:11.27-30; LW 35:213.

18.   D. Seleskovitch, "Why Interpreting Is Not Tantamount to Translating Languages," *The Incorporated Linguist*, 16/2 (1977): 27-33.

19.   WA 30/2:641.12f., 643.1f.; LW 35:195, 197.

20.   WA 30/2:638.13-20; LW 35:190f. Translator: In English, the preposition "of" must be added to make sense of the German genitive case that lies behind the phrases that could be rendered literally "full grace" (*vol gnaden*), "full beer," or "full money." It is perhaps captured best with a phrase like a "mouthful." On this point, see also Birgit Stolt, "On Translating Ave Maria as 'Hello there, Mary,'" *Lutheran Quarterly* 12 (1998): 105-07.

21.   Jerome Emser, *Auß was gründ und ursach Luthers dolmatschung / über das nawe testament / dem gemeinen man billich vorbotten worden sey…* (Leipzig: Wolfgang Stockel, 1523), here cited according to Karl Bischoff, ed. *Martin Luther: Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen*, 2d ed. (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1965), 38.

22.   WA 30/2:639.4-9; LW 35:192.

23.   See D. Hartmann, "Begrüßungen und Begrüßungsrituale: Überlegungen zu Verwendungsweisen sprachlicher Symbolik in kommunikativen Handlungsmustern," *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik*, 1/2 (1973): 133-62. Elmar Weingarten et al., eds., *Ethnomethodologie: Beiträge zu einer Soziologie des Alltagshandelns* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1979).

24.   WA 30/2:639.10-23; LW 35:192f.

25.   See the discussion above.

26.   WA 38:11.23; LW 35:213.

27.   WA 38:10.21-28; LW 35:212. To this problem see, among others, M. B. Dagut, "Can 'Metaphor' Be Translated?" *Babel* 22 (1976): 21-33, and J. De Waard, "Biblical Metaphors and Their Translations," *The Bible Translator* 25 (1974):107-16.

28.   WA 38:13.22-30; LW 35:216f.

29.   WA 38:13.5-12, 18-21; LW 35:216.

30.   WA DB 3 and 4.

31.   J. Mathesius, *Ausgewählte Werke*, vol. 3: *Luthers Leben in Predigten*, ed. Georg Loe-sche (Prague: Calve, 1906), 315-16.

32.   WA TR 1:69 (no. 146); LW 54:20. Regarding the use of the diminutive endings, see WA DB 3: XL.24; 24.6-7; 58.11, passim; 59.25, 30.

33.   WA 30/2:638-39; LW 35:190-93. – Luther's "dass es also dringe und klinge ins Herz, durch alle Sinne," with its "in-" assonances is not possible to translate without loss in poetry.

34.   WA DB 3:XLI.20-24 (see also 6.1-3). These protocols are from 1531 and reflect discussions about the revised translation of the Psalter.

35.   Translator's note: WA DB 10/1:146-47. The 1524 translation read: "Ich byn dyr hold HERR, meyne stercke" [I am so in love with you], but in 1531: Hertzlich lieb habe ich dich HERR, meine stercke."

36.   *Das Magnificat verdeutscht und ausgelegt* (1522), WA 7:548.8-10; LW 25:300.

37.   WA 7:548.29ff.; LW 25:301.

38.   *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, ed. by Wilhelm Grimm, et al., 4, 1/1:226.

39.   WA DB 3:56.31-33.

40.   E. A. Nida, "Report on the United Bible Societies Consultation in Bible Trans-lation," held in the Bernhäuser Forest in Stuttgart, 10-14 September 1972 (Mimeographed), 13 and 11, respectively.

41.   This discussion is summarized in Birgit Stolt, "Bibelübersetzung: Ihre philologische Genauigkeit und Verständlichkeit," in: *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen einer Revision des Luthertextes*, vol. 1 of Veröffentlichungen der Luther-Akademie e.V. Ratzeburg (Erfurt, 1980), 113-132, now in: Birgit Stolt, *"Laßt uns fröhlich springen!"*, 175-92. See also, with additional bibliography, Stolt, *Rhetorik*, 120ff.

42.   In German, the distinction in verbs and pronouns between the singular [*siehe, dir*] and plural [*sehet, euch*] can still be made.

43.   See Harald Weydt, ed., *Die Partikeln der deutschen Sprache* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1979); and *Aspekte der Modalpartikeln: Studien zur deutschen Abtönung* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1977).

44.   Harald Weinrich, "Erzählstrukturen des Mythos," in *Literatur für Leser: Essays und Aufsätze zur Literaturwissenschaft* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1971), 137-49, here 140.

45.   Josef Klein and Ulla Fix, eds., *Textbeziehungen: Linguistische und literaturwissen-schaftliche Beiträge zur Intertextualität* (Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1997).

46.   See the synopsis by Fritz Tschirch, *1200 Jahre deutsche Sprache in synoptischen Bi-beltexten*, 2d ed. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969), 26-27. The Old High German "Tatian" text eliminated or replaced with *tho, thar*, etc. Anne Betten, *Lancelot-Roman, Luther-Bibel, Lessing-Dramen: Beispiele neuer sprach-historischer Arbeitsweisen*, Eichstätter Hochschulreden, 64 (Munich: Minerva, 1988), 15-18; and "Textkritische Methoden in der historischen Syntaxforschung," *Energeia* (1991): 22-35, here, 26-31.

47.   Translator's note: In all English translations, the enclitic in question always ends up in first place ("But Mary"; etc.), since it is impossible grammatically to put that word anywhere else. To render the German word order, the equivalent "however" was used here.

48.   Here also, the English must put the conjunction first.