Four Recent German Bible Translations

Marvin H. Folsom
The conference of bible translators in Stuttgart in April 1984 noted with some satisfaction that there were three new translations of the bible currently available to speakers of German. Since that time a fourth has appeared. Now that sufficient time has passed and the enthusiasm associated with the Luther year has subsided at least somewhat, we can take the opportunity to examine the advantages and disadvantages of each, especially with regard to the needs of LDS readers, that is, to determine which translation would be best suited for use by members of the church and missionaries in German speaking areas. Let me first describe briefly the four recent bible translations.

A. Die Bibel nach der Übersetzung Martin Luthers mit Apokryphen, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1985. The Old Testament was completed in 1964 with some recent changes in the spelling of proper names and the change of die Kinder Israel 'the children of Israel' to die Israeliten 'the Israelites.' The Apocrypha was completed in 1970. The OT and the Apocrypha are part of the same project that completed the NT in 1956. The NT (1984) is the latest revision by a different group of translators of the traditional Luther text which first appeared in 1522 and was extensively revised by Luther himself as late as the edition of 1545. This latest revision follows extended and often heated discussion of the modern revisions of the Luther NT in 1966 and 1975 and represents the currently approved text of the Council of the Evangelical Church in the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic and Austria for church services, school instruction, and private devotion. (Lu)

B. Revidierte Elberfelder Bibel, R. Brockhaus, 1985. The New Testament first appeared in 1855 and the complete Bible in 1877. It was translated by John Nelson Darby--founder of the Plymouth Brethren--who subscribed to the theological doctrine that a divine inspiration extends to every word of the Bible, consequently, it adheres very closely to the original text. This historical development accounts for its reputation of being accurate. In 1960, the work of revising the Elberfelder translation was begun. It was felt necessary to revise some of the complicated sentence constructions (present participles, un-German word order, absence of verbs), replace archaic expressions and to base the translation on a reliable version of the Greek and Hebrew according to the best manuscript information currently available. In 1975, the New Testament and Psalms were published. In November, 1985, the complete bible became available after more than 20 years of work. It claims to have retained its previous reputation of being the "most reliable German bible translation" (die genaueste und zuverlässigste deutsche Bibelübersetzung, K. Weber, Bibelübersetzungen unter der Lupe, Aßlar, 1984, p. 77). (Elb)

C. Die Bibel, Altes und Neues Testament, Einheitsübersetzung 1980 (Katholische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart), Lizenzausgabe Herder, Freiberg. This is the result of a project initiated and published by the Catholic Bishops of Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Luxemburg, Lüttich and Bozen-Brixen as a result of the impetus provided by the Second Vatican Council. The text of the psalms and the New Testament is the ecumenical text arrived at in consultation with the Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany and the Evangelical Bibel Society in the Federal Republic of Germany. The work was begun in 1962 and
soon included all the bishops of German speaking areas in Europe and received the name "Uniform Translation" because it was to produce a uniform text for use in the church schools in every diocese. The project also had consultants from the Evangelical Church in Germany from the very beginning and in 1970 it was contractually formalized. One of the first results of this ecumenical project was the list of biblical names published in 1972 (see below on spelling). The names of the ecclesiastical administrators responsible for the project are listed in the introduction. This version is quite different from the catholic translations previously available (Allioli, Karrer, etc.) for several reasons. First of all, the older versions were not the result of official church-wide policy and thus were not officially approved for use in all geographical areas of the catholic church in German speaking areas. In addition, earlier catholic translations were based on the Vulgate and did not reflect the earliest form of the original Hebrew and Greek texts. Perhaps the most important development for catholics and non-catholics alike is the absence of didactic notes supporting the interpretations of the Catholic Church that were previously required before church approval was granted (Robert Steiner, Neue Bibelübersetzungen, Neukirchen, 1975, p. 119). Controversial interpretations are avoided. The text itself is presented for the most part without interpretive theological commentary. (EU)

D. Die Bibel im heutigen Deutsch. Die Gute Nachricht des Alten und Neuen Testaments mit den Spätschriften des Alten Testaments (Deuterokanonische Schriften/Apokryphen), Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, zweite, durchge­sehenen Auflage, 1980. This is the complete German Bible patterned after the 'Good News' version of the United Bible Societies (1966-76). It is a completely different type of bible translation based on the work of Nida and Taber and their "dynamic equivalents." The work was done by an international and interconfessional team. The names of translators, editors and consultants are listed in the appendix in the back. (BhD)

Names:

EU and BhD render proper names in the form recommended by the ecumenical commission (Ökumenisches Verzeichnis der biblischen Eigennamen nach den Loccumer Richtlinien, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Katholische Bibelanstalt, 19812), e.g. Noach, Ijob, Ezechiel, Jered. In the effort to preserve the text of Martin Luther as far as possible, Lu has retained the older spellings Noah, Hiob, Ezechiel, Jared instead of using the suggested uniform spelling of names. Elb also retains traditional spellings for proper names and the names of the biblical books. All four now have the uniform spelling for Rut. With respect to the names of the books themselves, BhD bridges the gap between the traditional forms and the more modern ones based on modern biblical scholarship by listing both forms in the list of abbreviations, in the table of contents and in the heading on each page: 1. Buch Mose (Genesis). Lu and Elb have 1., 2. Buch Mose, etc. and EU has the Latin names Genesis, Exodus, Levitikus. In the table of contents and on the title page of each book (but not in the heading of each page within the book), Lu and Elb (except for the unusual Kohelet) have added in their most recent editions the modern form of the name in order to ease the problem of identification for readers who are more familiar with the traditional spellings, e.g. Lu, Das Buch Hiob (Ijob); Elb, Das zweite Buch Mose/Exodus. EU is now the only one that does not list both names for the biblical books. Since two traditional versions have acknowledged the influence of the EU, I believe it is appro-
priate to recommend that the EU reciprocate and list the traditional names.

In the case of the psalms, Lu has the older form: der Psalter, whereas EU, BhD and Elb have only die Psalmen. Lu also has the traditional name der Prediger Salomo, whereas EU and BhD have the modern, untraditional Das Buch Kohelet, from the Hebrew form of the name which has recently become popular, more in German than in English where the Greek form (Ecclesiastes) still predominates. BhD again has the older form (der Prediger) in parentheses. Elb has simply Prediger.

Order of Books:

The most significant difference in the order of books lies in the placement of the books of the apocrypha. EU intersperses them throughout the OT, whereas Lu and BhD place them in a separate section between the OT and the NT. Elb does not include them and there is no hint in the information provided by the publisher that editions with the apocrypha will be available. In Lu and H, the supplement to Daniel is in the separate section for the apocrypha between the Old Testament and the New Testament, but EU has it as chapters 13-14 of Daniel. This inclusion of the apocryphal books presents a problem for unsophisticated readers who may not be in a position to appreciate the historical and critical problems connected with the deuterocanonical books. When they appear alongside and within the other traditionally accepted books of scripture, it tends to give them the same status. New and inexperienced LDS readers may not be sufficiently aware of the statement in D&C 91 or able to take advantage of it when reading the apocryphal books. As a matter of practice, LDS leaders have never quoted very widely from the Apocrypha nor have they ever authorized for speakers of English the use of a bible that contains the Apocrypha.

2. ... There are many things contained therein that are not true, which are interpolations by the hands of men.
3. Verily, I say unto you that it is not needful that the Apocrypha should be translated.
4. Therefore, whoso readeth it, let him understand, for the Spirit manifesteth truth;
5. And whoso is enlightened by the Spirit shall obtain benefit there­from;
6. And whoso receiveth not by the spirit, cannot be benefited. There­fore it is not needful that it should be translated. Amen.

This serious difference between catholic and protestant attitudes toward the inclusion of the apocrypha in the bible was recognized by bible societies and ecumenical groups and found expression in their Guiding Principles for Translating the Bible (London, 1968) as follows:

It is recognised that on the one hand an edition of the complete Bible bearing the imprimatur of the Roman Catholic authorities will contain the deuterocanonical texts and that, upon the other hand, while many groups within Protestantism have employed the Apocrypha, a great majority find it impossible to accept an arrangement of the Old Testament which does not clearly distinguish between these texts and the traditional Hebrew canon. It is suggested that these two positions can in practice be reconciled if normally, in editions of
the Bible published by the Bible Societies and bearing the
imprimatur of the Roman Catholic authorities, the deuterocanonical
texts are included as a separate section before the New Testament.
In the case of the Book of Esther the translation of the Greek text
will be printed in the deuterocanonical section while the transla-
tion of the Hebrew text will be printed among the books of the
Hebrew canon. The deuterocanonical parts of the book of Daniel will
be presented as part of the separate section. (quoted in Siegfried
Meurer, "Ist die Zeit schon reif für eine Einheitsbibel der deutsch-
Sprachigen Christenheit?" Die neue Lutherbibel, Beiträge zum
revidierten Text 1984, Stuttgart, 1985, p. 100)

Meurer also expresses his surprise that the ÉU did not follow this recommen-
dation, especially since it intends to be an ecumenical edition. This very
serious disadvantage for LDS users as well as for many other protestants would
have been avoided, if this recommendation had been followed.

There is no chapter four of Malachi in German bibles; it is contained in the
last part of chapter three. The reference in the D&C, Section 2 should read
3:23-24. In the New Testament, there is a minor difference in order. ÉU, BhD
and Elb place Hebrews and James after Philemon. In Lu, they are placed after
3 John just as in editions of Luther appearing during his lifetime.

Pagination:

Lu numbers the pages for each section (OT, Ap, NT, other) separa-
ely. ÉU numbers all four sequentially. Elb and BhD begin numbering over again at the
beginning of the NT.

Introductions:

Elb does not have an introduction to each individual book nor did the first
edition of the 1984 revision of the NT. The most recent edition of the
complete bible has added an Inhaltsübersicht 'table of contents' of just a few
lines. BhD also has the same type of Inhaltsübersicht of just a few lines.
ÉU has an introduction to each book with an overview of the contents as well
as information and conjecture about dates of manuscripts and authorship. In
the case of Isaiah, it has separate headings placed within the text itself
(Der erste Jesaja (Protojesaja), Der zweite Jesaja (Deuterojesaja), Der dritte
Jesaja (Tritojesaja) corresponding to the division of the text mentioned in
the introduction. It is the only one of the four new translations that makes
any mention of this interpretation of the text and its author. These critical
introductions which question the integrity and prophetic/apostolic authorship
of many of the books are one of the most serious disadvantages for LDS as well
as for many other protestant readers. (For a balanced discussion of this
problem, see L. Lamar Adams and Alvin C. Rencher, "The Popular Critical View
of the Isaiah Problem in Light of Statistical Style Analysis," Computer
Studies in the Humanities and Verbal Behavior IV (1973):149-157, or the less
technical treatment by the same authors in "A Computer Analysis of the Isaiah
"conservative theories tended to be supported more than divisionist theories."
p. 157. This means that the division of Isaiah into three parts is at best
premature and at worst irresponsible and misleading.)
Besides the one just mentioned concerning Isaiah, the main authorship problems relate to the letters traditionally ascribed to Paul. Lu includes Paul's name in the title of each epistle both in the table of contents and at the beginning of the letter: Der Brief des Paulus an die ... 'the letter of Paul to ....' BhD has a general heading in the table of contents (Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus 'the letters of the Apostle Paul') and includes his name in the title at the beginning of each epistle. EU has a general heading in the table of contents (Die Paulinischen Briefe 'The Pauline Letters') but does not include his name in the title of any of the letters (Der Brief an die ... 'the letter to ....'). In addition, in the material in the introductions to each letter and in the general introduction to the Pauline letters, serious doubt is expressed as to whether or not Paul actually wrote some of the letters traditionally ascribed to him (Ephesians, Colossians, Hebrews, Timothy, Titus). Elb has nothing to indicate the author of the letters in the table of contents nor in the titles to the individual letters. The reader is left to assume the traditional attribution of authorship. A summary of the statistical studies dealing with the authorship problems in the Pauline epistles is found in an article by Kendra L. Lindsay and Thomas W. Mackay ("An Authorship Study of the Pauline Epistles," paper presented at the International Conference on Computers in the Humanities held at Brigham Young University, June 26, 1985). They conclude that the differences may indicate multiple authorship, that the differences are not explained by the theory that Hebrews was not written by Paul, that Hebrews appeared to be as Pauline as any of the other epistles, that the difference between Galatians and Ephesians was of unusual strength and that more work needs to be done before we will be able to explain all of the relationships. Once again it is premature to exclude Paul as the author of some of the letters attributed to him and such theories should not be included in the introductions in a general bible.

In the Psalms, Lu, EU and Elb have headings for the five internal divisions ("books") within the text. BhD lists the traditional division in the introduction. The numbering of the individual psalms is now uniform in all four. Lu, EU and BhD all have inserted slightly different headings at the beginning of each psalm indicating its overall content (Ps 96: Lu Der Schöpfer und Richter aller Welt 'the creator and judge of all the world,' EU Der Herr, König und Richter aller Welt 'the Lord, king and judge of all the world,' BhD Gott, der König der ganzen Erde 'God, the king of the whole earth'). Elb again has left the text as is and not introduced any additional headings. All four present the psalms in the form of poetry. The presentation in one column per page in Lu and Elb is a clearer indication of poetic form than that of EU and BhD in two columns per page, since in most cases the entire poetic line is contained within a single printed line. Lu includes the Hebrew particle in capitals (SELA). EU has it in small letters in square brackets. Elb replaces it with two slashes (///). BhD omits the word or any representation of it and explains the practice in the introduction to the psalms.

All four translations contain notes with information about readings in the manuscripts, alternative translations and cross-references in the following order of descending frequency: Elb, EU, BhD and Lu. Elb has about 50% more than EU and BhD and Lu has about 50% less than EU and BhD. In Lu, the cross-references appear (indexed with a letter and right justified) after the individual verse. Other notes on manuscripts, etc. appear (with an asterisk and left justified) after the verse. In Elb, cross-references are indexed
with a letter of the alphabet and appear in the inside margin (the outside margin has the verse number). Other references are numerically indexed and appear as footnotes at the bottom of the page. BhD has all references as footnotes at the bottom of the page, cross-references indexed with letters and others indexed by verse. EU has cross-references indexed by verse at the end of every section that has a heading or at the end of the chapter itself if there are no other divisions with headings within the chapter. Other notes are indexed by verse in the footnotes. EU also has division headings in capital letters for sections larger than chapters as listed in the introduction: DAS WIRKEN JESU IN GALILÄA (after Luke 4:13). The total effect is that the text is interrupted regularly and is very disjointed. Lu is somewhat less disjointed because it has fewer notes. The text is BhD and Elb suffers the fewest interruptions and appears more as a running text as in the original because the notes are in the margins or footnotes.

Permit me one further comment about the layout that has a bearing on the readability and integrity of the text. EU (in the complete bible, paperback edition by Herder and the small edition by the Katholisches Bibelwerk), BhD and Lu all present the text in two columns per page. EU and BhD have a small superscript numeral at the beginning of each verse with the first verse of the paragraph indented about three spaces. Lu begins each verse with a superscript numeral indented one space. It is easier to find the individual verse but the text is further segmented. Elb presents the text in a single column per page. The chapter and verse numbers are in the outside margin (cross-references are on the inside margin). This system provides the easiest method of finding a verse and at the same time presents the text as text in whole paragraphs. Small stars indicate the beginning of a verse. (Some editions of EU-NT and the preliminary editions, both published by the Katholische Bibelanstalt--present the text in a single column.) BhD is printed in a very readable new font (Biblica) created especially for this edition of the Bible by Prof. Kurt Weidemann.

EU is the most likely to question or exclude a controversial segment of the traditional text, although all four include basically the same information regarding the readings in the manuscripts. With respect to the now famous comma johanneum (1 John 5:7f), EU omits it from the text but includes the omitted portion in the footnote. Lu, Elb and BhD omit it without note or comment. The KJ version included it because Erasmus had reluctantly been forced to include it as part of what became the textus receptus. NKJ has a note to the effect that it is omitted in the NU-text (Nestle-Aland, United Bible Societies text) and the M-text (Majority text).

Elb has 70 as the number of men set apart to serve in Luke 10:1 (and 17). There is no footnote as to other manuscript readings with 72. The three others have 72 but include a note that some manuscripts have the number 70, the number in the KJ version and the one used as the basis for the Quorum of the Seventy in the LDS church.

Measures and Coins:

This is one area where the revised text of Luther (1984) has generally abandoned some of the original vocabulary used by Luther (Scheffel, Klafter) and replaced them with more modern equivalents (Zentner/ Sack, Faden 'cord,' literally 'fathom'). Luther 84 retains Scheffel in Matth 5:15 ('under a
bushel'), which I believe is motivated by the desire to retain Luther's formulation of this well known verse. All four retain Ellen (KJ 'cubit') in its symbolic use in Rev 21:17, including BhD which had a conversion into meters (70 Meter hoch) in the 1968 and 1971 editions of the NT. There is now a slight discrepancy between the OT of Luther which still has archaic Scheffel, e.g., in Isaiah 5:10 and the NT which has replaced it with modern day measurements. Lu has retained the modern German manner of referring to distance by the amount of time required to cover it introduced in the 1956 edition of the NT ((Weg)Stunden in Luke 24:13, Joh 6:19, 11:18) whereas the other two use measures of distance (EU and Elb Stadien, BhD Kilometer). (The King James Version has 'threescore furlongs' and the New King James Version has 'about seven miles.' ) The situation is similar with respect to coins. Lu retains archaic units like Heller (Luke 12:59), Scherflein (Mark 12:42 and Luke 21:2) and Groschen (Mark 12:15). Groschen is sometimes replaced by the somewhat more precise Silbergroschen (Luke 15:8-9, 20:24).

EU is more likely to use the Greek terms (Meile, Stadien). EU has the modern Liter in Joh 2:6 (ungefähr 100 Liter), yet retains the archaic Ellen in Joh 21:8 (etwa 200 Ellen, cf. BhD etwa 100 Meter). Both EU and Elb use Hebrew measures in the OT (1 Kings 5:25, 2 Chr 2:9, Isaiah 5:10): Kor, Gomer, Homer, Bat, Efa. The situation is similar with respect to coins. EU uses more of the Greek units (Denar, Drachme, Doppeldrachme, Mine). For Scherflein '(widow's) mite,' it uses the symbolic zwei kleine Münzen and letzten Pfennig 'uttermost farthing' (KJV), 'last penny' (NKJ) for older Luther letzten Heller. (The 1972 edition of EU even had das letzte Lepton with an explanatory footnote.) Elb does not use the Greek units quite as extensively as EU.

BhD makes the greatest attempt to render measures in modern terms: Liter, Kilometer, Fässer, Sack, Flasche. Instead of using the Greek word in Revelations 14:20, 21:16 (cf. E 1600 Stadien), it retained the symbolic number and used a modern circumlocution: 1600 Wegmaße 'measures of distance.' The 1968 and 1971 editions had let the attempt to modernize override the symbolic meaning and rendered it 270 Kilometers. For coins it also converts to generally understood, but imprecise equivalents: Goldstück 'gold piece' for EU 10 Minen, Millionenbetrag 'millions' for EU 10,000 Talente, Silbermünze 'piece of silver' for EU Drachme, Silberstücke 'pieces of silver' for EU Denare. All have footnotes or notes in the back about conversions.

Language:

Let me first present some of the findings of an examination of 1 Cor 13. Even though EU and BhD generally replace the subjunctive with the indicative neither felt inclined to do so in this section so well known to speakers of German in Luther's formulation. Luther uses very common subjunctive forms that are still in use today (hätte, wäre, wüste, gäbe). In addition to these, EU has besähe and BhD has spräche, nähme and even the very unusual and infrequent kennte. Elb has indicative forms in this section. Luther follows the Greek closely in his repeated use of aufhören (4 times in v. 8). Elb has three varieties: vergeht, weggetan werden, aufhören. EU varies more freely, presumably according to context: hört auf, hat ein Ende, verstummt, vergeht. BhD has vergehen, hört auf, verstummt, ein Ende nehmen. Lu, EU and Elb (with some use of the pronoun sie) follow the Greek in repeatedly using the noun form die Liebe. BhD, however, interprets this in a less abstract formulation that focuses attention on the behaviour of the person who exhibits the
attribute of love and writes *wer liebt 'he who loves.'* BhD modernizes (*Besitz* for Lu Habe, *geduldig* for Lu langmütig, *spielt sich nicht auf* for Lu bläht sich nicht auf and *in der Sprache des Geistes* for Lu Zungenreden) and occasionally interprets (*Geheimnisse Gottes* for Lu, EU and Elb *Geheimnisse* and *stehen wir Gott gegenüber* for Lu, EU and Elb *von Angesicht zu Angesicht*). In descending order from traditional/archaic to modern, we can rank the four translations in this area: Luther, Elb (Rev), EU and BhD.

A examination of the parable of the prodigal son (Luke 15) shows similar tendencies. Luther is the most archaic, traditional and "biblical." In descending order toward modern, less traditional, more prosaic language we have Elb, EU and BhD. BhD is quite distinct from the other three in its choice of vocabulary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bibel im heutigen Deutsch</th>
<th>Lu, Elb, EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gemeindenvorsteher</td>
<td>Älteste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesetzeslehrer</td>
<td>Schriftgelehrte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberster Priester</td>
<td>Hoherpriester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christusfeind(e)</td>
<td>Antichrist(en)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokurator</td>
<td>Statthalter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaritaner</td>
<td>Samariter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazarener</td>
<td>Nazorärier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zolleinnnehmer</td>
<td>Zöllner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epileptiker</td>
<td>Mondsüchtige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunkelheit</td>
<td>Finsternis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertrauen</td>
<td>Glaube</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BhD is clearly more modern and of necessity less "biblical."

More Lutheran than Luther:

In some instances, Elb has retained archaic vocabulary that is in the older (1883, and/or 1912 and/or 1956) editions of Luther that have been modernized in the (1975 and) 1984 edition(s). For instance (from Mark), *sich verwundern, Schüssel, ehebrecherisch, Becher Wassers, Kindlein, falsche Christi, verdolmetscht, feine Leinwand, ehere Gefäße* in Elb and one or more of the older editions of Luther have now been modernized as follows in Luther 1984: *sich wundern, Schale, abtrünnig, Becher Wasser, Kinder, falsche Christusse, übersetzt, Leinentuch, Kessel*. Elb thus retains more of the vocabulary and flavor of the original Luther than the present edition of Luther and in this one particular area can be said to be more Lutheran than Luther ("lutherischer als Luther").

Archaic features in Elb:

In nine verses, Elb has an awkward and archaic construction in the subjunctive, e.g., Joh 8:19 "... so würdet ihr auch meinen Vater gekannt haben." The others have either the present subjunctive *kenntet* (Lu) or the paraphrase *würdet kennen* (EU). Only a few other bibles show this feature (Zinzendorf 1744, Cartier 1770, Bahrdt 1777, Milheimer Ausgabe 1924, Bruns 1959, Neue-Welt-Übersetzung 1971 and none has more than three examples in these nine
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verses.

An examination of the 1975 edition of the Elb New Testament with the one
currently in the complete bible (1985) shows that the latest version has been
modernized somewhat in the area of vocabulary, grammatical constructions,
word order and in the use of a particular manuscript (Matth 21:29-31).
Nevertheless, the latest version still has archaic vocabulary differing from
the other three (gewehkagt, Vollendung des Zeitalters, Regenten, selhen.
Grüfte) and follows the Greek much too closely in the use of the article,
plurals, compounds words, tenses, clause and sentence construction and order,
and present and past participles. The cumulative effect of this strict
adherence to the Greek original is a style that is not smooth, colloquial
German but wooden, unusual and Hellenized.

The treatment of the name Jah(we):

Lu renders the Hebrew Jahwe (JHWH) in capitals der HERR and retains the
shorter form (Jah) in Hallelu-ja. BhD regularly uses der Herr for Jahwe and
sometimes adds the explanatory Preist den Herrn after Halleluja at the
beginning of a psalm or before it at the end of one. ED regularly uses der Herr
for the vast majority of the occurrences of the tetragrammaton JHWH, but
in a few verses whose structure accommodates a name (Ex 3:18, 6:3, 20:2, 34:6,
Deut 4:7, 35, 39, 6:4, 1 Kings 18:21, 39) it uses the Hebrew form Jahwe:

Jahwe, der Gott der Hebräer 'The LORD God of the Hebrews.' It is the only one
of the four recent translations which uses the form Jahwe extensively in the
German text. Elb takes an entire paragraph in the introduction to explain the
origin of the name Jehova, which was used in its older edition, and why it has
chosen to replace it with der HERR in the current revision since there is not
enough information to be sure about the pronunciation. In one verse (Ex
3,15), it uses Jahwe and the footnote refers the reader to the introduction.
Where the Hebrew text has Jah (in a handful of verses in Psalms), Elb also has
Jah: Ps 135:4 Jah hat sich Jakob erwählt 'The LORD has chosen Jacob for
Himself' NKJ. It also retains the formula Halleluja in the Psalms. The use
of Jehova in the older edition of the Elberfelder translation was one, perhaps
the most important reason it was esteemed so highly and used by the Jehovah's
Witnesses up until the time they produced their own translation (New World
Translation, die Neue-Welt-Übersetzung). The translation of the Jehovah's
Witnesses by the Watchtower Society even goes so far as to introduce without
any textual justification the name Jehova 237 times into the text of the New
Testament and 72 times into the footnotes (S. Kubo and W. Specht, So Many Ver-

As far as I am able to tell by examining the verses listed in Wigram, (The
Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament, Nashville,
1980), the German paraphrases of the Old Testament by Martin Buber (Die fünf
Bücher der Weisung), which, by the way, generally have a very Hebrew flavor in
vocabulary and word order, do not use the name Jahwe, Instead, Buber uses
ICH BIN or simple ER. The translation of the Hebrew canon by the Jewish
Publication Society of America (The Torah, Philadelphia, 1962) uses Hebrew
forms (Ehyeh-Asher-Ehyeh) only in Exodus 3:14, the same verse in which Elb has
Jahwe. I believe this is way modern translations should handle this problem,
i.e., give the flavor of the original Hebrew if it is felt necessary to do so
only in Exodus 3:14 and then use some other formulation. The treatment in ED
is too scholarly and confusing for most bible readers.
Word order:

Two elements of word order in bible translations (the so-called "Saxon" genitive and the position of the verb) have already been examined extensively and can give us some insight into some syntactical differences. Luther's earlier translations had numerous Saxon (= preposed) genitives: in meines Vaters Haus 'in my father's house' (John 14:2). Of fifteen such examples in the Luther text of 1956, the following numbers were retained in the four translations under review here (M. Folsom, "Lutherische Sprachmuster in der deutschen Bibelsprache," Linguistische Studien, Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Zentralinstitut für Sprach-wissenschaften, Reihe A, Luthers Sprachschaffen 119/3 (1984):65-80):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luther 1984</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revidierte Elberfelder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einheitsübersetzung</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibel im heutigen Deutsch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information allows us to make some general statements about the conservative nature of the language in the translations. Even though the intent of the recent revision of the Luther text was to restore the language of Luther as much as possible, this is one area where they felt there were compelling reasons not to revert to an archaic word order and thus only two-thirds of the archaic preposed genitives were retained. BhD and EU have done away with them almost entirely. Elb stands between the two poles; it is somewhat more modern than Luther but more archaic than BhD or EU.

The second study deals with elements of word order peculiar to Luther that are retained in modern translations (M. Folsom, "Die Stellung des Verbs in der deutschen Bibelsprache von Luther bis heute." Germanistische Linguistik 2 (1985):144-154). Of 99 items in twelve different word order categories, the translations discussed here retained the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luther 1984</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revidierte Elberfelder</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einheitsübersetzung</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibel im heutigen Deutsch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neither of the translations undertaken in the 20th century exhibits any of the archaic word order features of the original Luther examined in the study. The Luther 84 revision retains about the same level of archaic language in this section as in the one just discussed (slightly over half). The revised Elberfelder translation once again occupies a position between the more archaic Luther 84 and the other two modern translations and shows just slightly more archaic features than in the previous study.

In the matter of following the text of the Greek original, let me mention the matter of translating the Greek future passive into German. Forty-six Greek future passives (\textit{wird gerettet werden} 'shall/will be saved' \textit{wird gegeben werden} 'will be given') in the New Testament were examined in the four translations. The number translated with the future passive into German are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luther 1984</td>
<td>15 (4)</td>
<td>32.6% (41.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revidierte Elberfelder</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einheitsübersetzung</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibel im heutigen Deutsch</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In ascending order of closeness to the Greek original, we have BhD, Lu, EÜ and Elb. We should note further that this adherence even to the forms of the Greek text is the reason Elb is called "the most exact and the most reliable" translation. It does not necessarily represent the most "German" way. The future passive is not a frequent tense in modern spoken German and this fact is reflected in the very few examples in H. Lu and EÜ occupy the middle ground.

Inspired Text:

In a letter of January 1981, the Quorum of the Twelve approved the use of EÜ in all official contexts (instructional material, glossaries, concordances, footnotes, etc.) and continues: "You will certainly be glad to know that of all those previously translated, the new German Bible comes closest to the King James version and that it will be a wonderful help and blessing for our German-speaking Saints" (quoted in M. Snow, "The Challenge of Theological Translation: New German Versions of the Standard Works," \textit{Dialog} 17 (Summer 1984), p. 134). This appeal to the authority of the King James Version seems to indicate that we have become victims of the inspired translation trap, that is, we esteem the translation of the text higher than we do the original text. Since we deal almost solely with the biblical text in its translation into English, we come to think that the wording, the rhythm, and interpretation are somehow sacred in themselves without regard for the text in the original Hebrew or Greek. This is an understandable misconception and has happened many times in the past with the biblical text. Eugene Nida (\textit{Toward a Science of Translation}, Leiden, 1964, p. 27) describes the process.
The Greek of the LXX became the "inspired" text over the original Hebrew. The Latin of the Vulgate became the authoritative text and language of the church over the original Hebrew and Greek. For us, the English of the King James version has become the language of the church and the bible over the original Greek and Hebrew. People ask the Bible Societies if they publish the King James Version in Japanese ... implying that they regard the King James version as in a special sense divinely inspired.

In addition to the fact that the translation can never be better than its source without the same kind of inspiration as the original source, it is in fact not true that the EU is the closest of the modern translations to the King James version. Listed below are a few categories for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closest</th>
<th>Farthest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) text(us receptus)</td>
<td>Lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) introductory notes</td>
<td>Lu and Elb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) apocrypha (omit)</td>
<td>Elb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) coins/measures</td>
<td>Lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Isaiah</td>
<td>Lu, Elb and BhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) names</td>
<td>Lu and Elb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) 70 x 7</td>
<td>Lu, Elb and BhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) sacral markers</td>
<td>Lu and Elb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) archaic style</td>
<td>Lu and Elb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the categories listed here, EÜ is the farthest from the King James version, and Luther the closest. I would very much like to know what categories were examined in the previous study.

As a personal note, I would like to described what I believe are the best features of these four new bibles that I would like to see in my own personal "ideal" bible. I like the visually pleasing biblical font Biblica in BhD. The verse and chapters numbers in Elb allow the fastest possible finding of a verse. This layout is far superior to the others. Likewise, the presentation of the text in continuous, uninterrupted paragraphs in one column to a page in Elb with the footnotes in the margins or at the bottom of the page give a much a more realistic view of the original documents and allow me to focus on the text itself without interference from so many outside elements. To be consistent, I suppose I should want to do away with the section headings and relegate them to the footnotes, but that is one tradition no publisher seems willing to abandon. Quotations from the Old Testament in italics (EÜ) allow me to see at a glance which portions of the text are direct quotations and help me to realize the intimate connection between the Old Testament and the New Testament texts. The chiastic structure of portions of the text in the concordant version of Isaiah could be indicted by equal indentation of related lines as in the Concordant Version of Isaiah. In a few places (e.g., Amos), BhD indicates chiastic structure by letters in parentheses. Readers of the bible who are not aquainted with Hebrew literary fugures would appreciate one of these or some other help in understanding Old Testament texts. With respect to style, I much prefer the consistent, christological style of a
strong, committed Christian reformer (Lu) to a wooden, Hellenized style or the prosaically modern style of scholarly experts and critics of the texts.

Summary:

A. Because of the history of German bible translations, Lu is most traditional with respect to names, text and language. It is somewhat archaic linguistically, is written in a "sacred" style, is faithful to the spirit of the original documents and is the closest to the LDS tradition associated with the King James version.

B. Elb is most likely to present the text as in the original manuscripts and has the most cross-references to aid understanding of the text from within the texts themselves. It retains some of the archaic features of older editions of Luther and is faithful to the spirit of the original texts. It reflects details of the original text most accurately even to such details as the use of the future passive, plurals, articles, etc. It is compatible with the LDS tradition associated with the King James version.

C. EÜ is most critical of traditional views on authorship and casts doubt on the authenticity of some texts. It is most innovative textually and includes texts that are not accepted as inspired by the LDS and many other protestants. It is closest to the catholic tradition (apocrypha, names from the Vulgate). It is middle of the road in linguistic matters except for the radically innovative Umkehr for 'repentence.' It is least compatible with the LDS tradition associated with the King James version.

D. BhD stands between traditional and modern views on the matter of text, names of books and the apocrypha and attempts to accommodate both. It is innovative and modern linguistically which accounts for its lack of sacred style. It is in too liberal a tradition to be compatible with the LDS tradition associated with the King James version.

We have in essence four different types of translations: 1) one based on the theory of the inspired text which is very literal (Elb), 2) one based on the theory of dynamic equivalents in the modern language (H), 3) one which incorporates modern scientific criticism and catholic tradition (EÜ), and 4) one which preserves the work of a reformer who infused the translation with a unifying theological concept measured "against the Rock of Christ" (Quoted in M. Reu, Luther's German Bible, Columbus, Ohio, 1934, p. 133)

In my opinion, neither BhD nor EÜ can be recommended for LDS readers. The approval of EÜ was premature in light of the problem with the critical introductions and the interspersing of the apocrypha. We should follow the example of the Luthern Church in Germany which withdrew the unduly innovative 1975 translation of the New Testament which followed the EÜ in its use of Umkehr, etc. and returned to a more traditional text of Luther with Buße. I believe, the choice for LDS readers really comes down to the choice between Lu and Elb. Elb reflects the original texts in greater detail but that is also the reason it sometime sounds rather stiff and it retains some archaic features. Lu retains much of the powerful style of the reformer familiar to most speakers of German over the centuries. The scales are tipped in the direction of Lu when we take into consideration the role of the Luther bible in the LDS church. From the beginning of the church in German speaking areas,
the Luther translation was used by its members. Up until 1980, all transla-
tions of the LDS scriptures into German were based in the language of the
Luther translation (basic theological concepts and the passages of Isaiah and
Matthew in the Book of Mormon). The decision to abandon the Luther transla-
tion in favor of a highly critical, apocryphal, catholic translation was
precipitous and ill-advised. We should reinstitute the long established
tradition and return to the language and spirit of Martin Luther.

Some may think this recommendation too conservative, too traditional, but we
can come to no other conclusion if we start with the position of the church in
English speaking areas. We have resisted any recommendation to use any
translation other than the Authorised (King James) Version. We have invested
large amounts of time and money in producing an annotated edition of it which
preserves a very archaic form of English. We seem too timid to want to
produce a translation of our own, either because of the immensity of the task
or perhaps because of the lack of qualified and trusted experts within the
church. We are thus forced to rely on the work of others to provide a usable
bible. Now that others have completed the task of removing some of the
archaic and misunderstood elements from the King James version and published
the New King James version, we remain as one of the few groups that cling to a
venerable but archaic text. The 1984 edition of the Luther text is at the
very least somewhat less archaic and somewhat less dated than our present King
James version. If we continue to use the King James version in English
speaking areas, we can certainly continue to use the slightly modernized
edition of Luther in German speaking areas.

My personal recommendation is to choose any modern bible which does the
following:

1) Renders proper names as close to the original as possible but not radically
different from traditional spellings. If there is a choice between the
protestant and catholic traditions, preference should be given to the
protestant tradition for historical reasons.

2) Places the deuterocanonical books in a separate section before the New
Testament. In the case of the Book of Esther, the translation of the Greek
text will be printed in the deuterocanonical section while the translation of
the Hebrew text will be printed among the books of the Hebrew canon. The
deuterocanonical parts of the book of Daniel will be presented as part of the
separate section.

3) Does not include interpretive headings and unsubstantiated theories about
authorship and chronology.

4) Presents the text as much as possible as a single column text. Headings,
chapter and verse numbers, references and footnotes should be as unobtrusive
as possible.

5) Provides enough manuscript information in the footnotes so that the reader
can understand the extent of textual evidence. No doctrine is altered in any
substantive way by the variant readings.

6) Uses names for coins and measures that have meaning for the reader.
Archaic names (farthing, furlong, mite) should be replaced by general terms (a
small amount, a short distance) or by the original Hebrew or Greek term with an explanation in a footnote.

7) Modernizes archaic words and language, if possible, without doing violence to the traditional text.

8) Renders the tetragrammaton (JHWH) as a title (LORD, HERR) and not as a transliteration (Yahweh, Jahwe). If a transliteration is used at all, then only in a verse or two in the OT (e.g., Ex 3:14).

9) Gives precedence to the original Hebrew and Greek texts over translations, yes, even English translations (even the King James Version, The Living Bible, and the New World Translation).

10) Gives precedence to the biblical literary tradition of the target language (in this case German) over translations (especially literal ones) of English translations of the original Hebrew and Greek.