Gergely Juhász, *The Printed Bible and Its Reformation*

**Abstract**: This article presents a short overview of the printing history of the Bible in German and English at the down of the Protestant Reformation. By contrasting the situation in the Holy German Roman Empire with that in England at the beginning of the sixteenth century, I argue that although their texts are quite close to each other on a linguistic level, the English Bible and its German counterpart functioned very differently in the Early Reformation Period for historical, political and personal issues.

On Monday 29th of September 1466, the feast of St Michael at the *Leipziger Messe*, Leipzig’s famous fair, that had recently received imperial privileges from Frederick III (1415-1493) for exemption from paying toll,[[1]](#footnote-1) potential customers of a certain Johannes Fust (d. 1466) were deeply troubled.[[2]](#footnote-2) Their puzzlement came from the fact that Fust was selling several bibles far below the normal asking price for such works. Their astonishment was even greater when they started to compare the copies Fust was selling: these were all identical, whereas every schoolboy knew that no human copyist can keep the copies so exactly the same: with the same number of pages, with words placed at exactly the same position, and all written in such a uniform hand. But there could be no doubt: all of Fust’s bibles were indistinguishable copies. These customers came to the logical conclusion that the scribe was no human being and Fust must be a magician who used some devilish trickery to produce these bibles. Johannes Fust’s reputation and his diabolical magic confounded with Johan Georg Faust (d. ca. 1541)[[3]](#footnote-3), became the literary figure of Doctor Faustus, the diabolical magician, and was eternalized by many later artists from Christopher Marlowe (1564-1593) through Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) to Hector Berlioz (1803-1869) and Charles Gounod (1818-18932) and beyond.

Or so the story goes. Its historical reliability can be questioned (the story exists also with a version situated in Paris in 1455)[[4]](#footnote-4) and the confusion of Johannes Fust with Doctor Faustus is dubitable. Nonetheless there is just enough ring of truth in it to entertain the idea of the plausibility of some of its elements.

For us, modern readers, the solution to the puzzling mystery of identical copies, of course, lies not in any black magic but in the mechanical reproduction by a printing press with movable types, an invention that was first put to use in the West by Johannes Guttenberg a decade earlier or so, a project in which Fust himself had played the role of the financer of the project and one in which he ended up in court with Guttenberg for requesting payment of 2026 guldens as the repayment of his two loans of each 800 guldens with a considerable interest in 1456.[[5]](#footnote-5)

It is worth noting that the people at the Leipzig fair (or that in Paris) were struck by the fact that several copies of the same book were identical in their wording, spelling, layout and page numbers but not by the fact that the books in question were bibles and, for that matter, completely in German. This may come to just as much of a surprise to some of my readers as was the alleged surprise of the fifteenth-century Leipzigers. Yes, in 1466, even before Martin Luther was born, there was a complete German bible available in print that people could buy at book fairs.

In fact the 1466 German Bible was not printed by Fust but by Johann Mentelin (ca. 1410-1478) in Strasbourg sometimes before 27th June 1466, as the buyer’s note at the end of the Book of Revelation in the copy preserved in Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München attests.[[6]](#footnote-6) The inscription also records that the book was bought unbound for the price of 12 guilders.[[7]](#footnote-7) Depending on the exact currency, this could have a purchasing value between 1,300 and 6,500 euros in modern money.[[8]](#footnote-8) At the end of the Book of Jeremiah, another annotation, made by the rubricator records the date for supplying the red capital letters, decorations and running titles by hand in the book: 1467, during the papacy of Paul II (1464-1471) and the reign of Emperor Frederick III (1452-1493).[[9]](#footnote-9) When the book was bound, it was usually done so in two volumes. The *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, the German catalogue for incunable books (i.e. works printed before Christmas 1501) lists 42 known copies of it still available in public libraries and collections to which the *Incunabula Short Title Catalogue* adds yet a other copy (GW 04295, ISTC ib00624000) bringing it to 43 known surviving exemplars still accessible.[[10]](#footnote-10) Its text is based on an earlier High German translation of the Vulgate.

Within the next four years after printing of the first German bible, Heinrich Eggestein (d. 1488), a business associate of Mentelin, and perhaps a former apprentice of Guttenberg, printed the second complete German Bible in Strasbourg (GW 04296, ISTC ib00625000).[[11]](#footnote-11) Eggestein’s edition updated Mentelin’s text by replacing some of the unidiomatic or archaic phraseology. There are still 67 known copies or fragments listed in public libraries. The copy in the Gotha *Forschungsbibliothek* documented its first owner: “Steffan Losniczer Zum Stege Ist dicz puech Amen etc. 1470.”[[12]](#footnote-12)

Another five years went by when the Augsburg printer Jodokus Pflanzmann (fl. 1465-1494) printed the third German Bible (GW 04297), before 20th June 1477. Pflanzmann was trained as a lawyer and worked as a notary besides his printing business.[[13]](#footnote-13) Just as Fust, Mentelin and Guttenberg, he, too, profited from printing indulgences on a large scale.[[14]](#footnote-14) The ISTC lists 36 public collections to contain copies of Pflanzmann’s edition of the German Bible, which was the first illustrated bible in the history of printing containing no less than 73 illustrations.[[15]](#footnote-15) Pflanzmann also proudly advertised on the title page that his book was better than any earlier editions because it was corrected with great diligence according to the original text (in his case the Latin), a claim that would flaunt on many later Protestant translation’s title page.[[16]](#footnote-16)

His business partner, Augsburg’s first printer, Günther Zainer (d. 1478) was keen to republish Pflanzmann’s successful bible.[[17]](#footnote-17) This latter edition dating from around the same time (GW 04298, ib00627000) has survived in 101 full or partial copies around the world. Zainer had earlier used some the illustrations among other publications in his German translation of Jacobus de Voragine’s *Golden Legend* (*Legenda aurea*), an immensely popular medieval account of the lives and legends of biblical figures and saints which supplied most mediaeval readers (and hearers) with a basic biblical literacy but was heavily embellished with legend. His woodcuts were very popular because they contained textured areas alongside with solid black, giving the page a greater tonal range. Zainer initially met some opposition from the local woodcutters’ guild but eventually he agreed to commission illustrations only from guild members.[[18]](#footnote-18) It is thus no surprise that Zainer capitalized in his bible edition, too, on the marketing power of the woodcut illustrations, as will all subsequent editions of the Bible.

The fifth German bible was printed in Nürnberg by Johann Sensenschmidt (d. 1491) and Andreas Frisner (d. 1540),[[19]](#footnote-19) between 1476 and 1478 (GW 04299, ISTC ib00628000). Sensenschimdt seems to have had a difficult character: his relationship with his various business partners (including Andreas Frisner and Heinrich Keffer (d. after 1473), a former apprentice of Guttenberg) mostly ended up in the court. It is thus not surprising that among his books on the whole mainly in Latin, we find not only the works of the Church Fathers, books on theology and homiletics, two Latin Bibles but also several legal publications, including the Codex Justinianus.[[20]](#footnote-20) 68 copies of his German Bible are known to have survived.

The sixth German bible was a reprint by Zainer in 1477 in Augsburg of his earlier edition (ISTC ib00629000, GW 4300). 66 public institutions have holdings of it.

It was followed by yet another Augsburg publication, namely that by Anton Sorg’s in 1477, and was reprinted three years later. Sorg had learned the art of printing in the Benedictine Monastery of St. Ulrich and St. Afra,[[21]](#footnote-21) where the abbot, Melchior von Stainhaim (d. 1474), who was keen to reform his own monastery for a stricter observance of their Rule, had strongly promoted the new technology and set up the monastery’s own press issuing religious works both in German and Latin.[[22]](#footnote-22) For his edition Sorg obtained the popular woodcuts after the Zainer’s death. Sorg is remarkable as he dates all his publications exactly: the first edition of his German bible saw the light of day on the 20th June 1477 and survives in 54 copies and the second one on the 3rd January 1480 and exists in 36 exemplars. Most of Sorg’s output was in the vernacular: from classical popular works such Aesopus’s fables through Bernhard von Breydenbach’s (d. 1497) account of his journey to the Holy Land and Bocaccio’s Decameron to theological and spiritual literature both in Latin and in German.

The bibles discussed until now were all published in High German and, besides the woodcuts, their paratextual material consisted mainly of introductions and prologues attributed to St Jerome. Between the publications of Sorg’s two High German editions, however, two Low-German Bibles came out around 1478 (ISTC ib00636000; GW 4307, and ib00637000; GW 4308 respectively), both printed in Cologne, in the office of Heinrich Quentell (d. 1546) who having moved there from Strasbourg acquired citizenship in that year and set up his own, highly productive printing press.[[23]](#footnote-23) The two editions differed in the exact lect they used: one was in Lower-Rhine or West-Westphalian lect the other in the Lower-Saxon or East-Westphalian lect.[[24]](#footnote-24) These editions contained also annotations in the vernacular, based on Nicholas of Lyra’s (d. 1349) Latin *Postillae*, a set of commentary on the entire bible, which the Franciscan author based on the literal interpretation of the text and included contemporary Jewish scholarship. The GW lists 47 and 58 extant copies of these two Low German editions respectively in public libraries.

The best known, and perhaps most influential incunable German Bible is Anton Koberger’s High German Bible, printed in Nürnberg on 17th February 1483 (ISTC ib00632000; GW 4303). Koberger, a business associate of Heinrich Quentell, was certainly one of the most important players on the international book business both as printer and publisher with branches or partners in Basel (Johann Amerbach d. 1513, and Johann Petri d. 1511), Strasbourg (Adolf Rusch d. 1489 and Johann Grüninger d 1533), Lyon (Hans Koberger, Jacques Sacon d. 1530 and Johann Klein), Paris (Johann von der Brück, d. 1476), Heidelberg (Johannes Blumenstock), Leipzig (Peter Clement, d. 1535), Frankfurt am Main (Hans Breuer), Passau, Regensburg, Wrocław, Krakow and Buda.[[25]](#footnote-25) Around 220 works bear his name (among which 14 complete editions of the Latin Bible), mostly folio works with print runs of up to 1,600 copies. According to a later report by Johann Neudörffer (1497-1563) dating from 1547, Koberger allegedly had worked with 24 presses and possibly employed 100 assistants including bookbinders, correctors and illustrators.[[26]](#footnote-26) For his German Bible Koberger acquired Quentell’s woodcuts and had 109 coloured in his printing office and revised the biblical text yet again.[[27]](#footnote-27) In total, there are 271 known fragments or full copies listed in the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*.

The year Koberger published his magnificent vernacular bible is also the year in which Martin Luther was born. Indeed, all these bibles that have been enumerated were printed before Luther’s birth: eleven full editions of the German bible saw the light of day before Luther was born and there were seven more predating Luther’s first translation of the New Testament in 1522: Johann Grüninger’s Strassburg edition on the 2nd May 1485 with 74 surviving copies (ISTC ib00633000; GW043), Johann Schönsperger’s Augsburg print of 25th May 1487 (ISTC ib00634000 ; GW 04305) and its reprint on 9th November 1490 (ISTC ib00635000; GW 04306) with 38 and 56 listed extant copies respectively in public libraries and Steffen Arndes’s Lübeck editon, printed on the 19th November 1494 (ISTC ib00638000; GW 04309) with 75 extant exemplars, Johann Otmar and Johann Rynmann’s Augsburg edition from 1507 with 13 known copies (USTC 616420) and its reprint by Johan’s son, Silvan Otmar with Johann Rynmann still available in 16 copies from 1518, and finally Lorenz Stuchs’s print in Halberstadt (USTC 616608) in 1522 preserved in 18 existing copies according the USTC. In addition, a Dutch bible is printed by Jakob van der Meer and Mauritius Yemantszoen in Delft on the 10th January 1477 (GW M45710) with 59 known copies.[[28]](#footnote-28) All together 9 High German editions were printed in Augsburg, 2 Low German editions in Cologne, 1 Low German edition in Lübeck, 2 High German editions in Nürnberg, 3 in Strasbourg and 1 Dutch edition in Delft of the full bible, of which there are almost 1200 known full or fragmentary copies available in public collections. This is in addition to the hundreds of editions the Bible in Latin throughout Europe, the ninety different German editions of the Gospels and Sunday readings, and some fourteen German Psalters, all of which predated Luther’s first New Testament translation. That is why that I wrote in another publication in 2002: “There was probably no other country in Europe where the Bible was more easily accessible to the people than in Germany at the dawn of the Reformation.”[[29]](#footnote-29)

And so we arrive at the Protestant Reformation and the Reformation of the Bible.[[30]](#footnote-30) In 1522, while being kept in incognito in the Castle of Wartburg for his own safekeeping from the Imperial Ban, issued at the Diet of Worms a year earlier, Martin Luther translated the entire New Testament into German in the space of eleven weeks. As we can deduct from what has been observed, the publication of a partial bible translation would have hardly made any sensation in Germany at the time, were it not for the reputation of its translator and the reformation of the New Testament. By September 1522, when Melchior Lotter published Luther’s New Testament in Wittenberg (USTC 627910 – 11 surviving copies), Luther was something of an international celebrity, the *enfant terrible* of German theology, condemned by his peers at the universities of Leuven and Paris, an excommunicated heretic by Pope Leo X (n.b. a protector of humanist scholars such as Erasmus), and a fugitive of the state from the Imperial Ban of Charles V.[[31]](#footnote-31) Luther was also a prolific writer targeting both an international readership and the German public on an unprecedented scale: during those barely five years since the beginning of the affair around the indulgences, he had published around 160 works, with approximately twice as many in German than in Latin. [[32]](#footnote-32) Of these, his vernacular writings went through 828 editions, or in other words with a new edition coming out nearly every other day on an average.[[33]](#footnote-33) By 1530 the number of editions of his works in German would exceed well over 2000 editions in an estimated total print-run of some two million volumes.[[34]](#footnote-34) Simply the sheer volume of his publications served as a self-propagating and self-promoting marketing tool.

Luther’s New Testament translation was also distinctive in the fact that it reaped the fruits of Catholic humanist scholarship as opposed to earlier biblical editions, which were the products of mediaeval translators. For during the early days of printing, humanist scholarship awakened by the Renaissance, had both called into question the reliability of the Vulgate as an authentic text and source for theology and produced all the necessary tools for creating fresh translations from Hebrew and Greek. The first two Hebrew Bibles (1517-19, 1524-25) were printed in Venice by the Flemish émigré Daniel Bomberg († ca. 1549) of which the second became the golden standard for the *Biblia Rabbinica*, containing not only the biblical text in Hebrew but its Aramaic targums and some of Rabbinical commentators, too.[[35]](#footnote-35) The first Greek New Testament saw the day of light in Alcalá by Cardinal Francisco Ximénez de Cisernos (1514-1517), Great Inquisitor of Spain, as part of a polyglot edition of the complete bible in Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and Latin, an inconceivably difficult scholarly and technical enterprise.[[36]](#footnote-36) Ximénez’s edition of the highest quality however was not sold until 1522 and thus Erasmus’s Greek New Testament, first printed by Johannes Froben in Basel (1516) was the first available New Testament in the original language.[[37]](#footnote-37) Its text formed the source text for Luther’s and Tyndale’s translations and remained the basis for all Protestant translations until the end of the nineteenth century. Catholic humanist scholars had produced Hebrew and Greek dictionaries and grammars, bilingual editions, new Latin translations, maps of the biblical lands, chronologies, names lists, etymologies, editions of contemporary non-biblical authors such as Flavius Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* and the *Jewish War*,[[38]](#footnote-38) a critical edition of Jerome’s writings, and a myriad other aids for anyone who wished to study or translate the Scriptures.[[39]](#footnote-39) All this was at the disposal of Luther when he set out to translate the Bible afresh. His choice to translate the New Testament from a Greek text and the Old Testament from the Hebrew carried the air of authenticity vis-à-vis the reputedly corrupt Latin text of the Vulgate.

Luther’s biblical translations were no doubt largely successful due to Luther’s translation strategy which involved (1) an intentionally broadly defined target audience and emphasis on adhering to the rules of the target text for a natural flow for the translation: Luther advocated a sense for sense rather than a word for word translation; (2) a differentiated approach, determined on a case by case basis rather than using Procrustes’ bed, and (3) the preference to domesticate and naturalize many of the *realia* and linguistic specificities of his source texts. These three interrelated aspects can be seen at work in the example of Matthew 17:24, where Luther chose to render the Greek δίδραχμα (*didrachma*, or two drachms, a currency used frequently by the Septuagint for translating the Hebrew *shekel*, half of which was the value of the Temple Tax) with the German *Zinsgroschen*, a coin in which tolls and taxes were collected in Luther’s time, and had the value of 12 *Pfennig* (pence).[[40]](#footnote-40) Similarly, in Luke 1:28, the opening words of the Archangel Gabriel are rendered by Luther as “Gegruͤsset seystu holdselige”(Hail, gracious [lady]) rather than the usual “Gegruͤsset seistu/ Maria vol gnade” (Hail Mary, full of grace) because to be “full of something” creates the image of a barrel full bier, as Luther would later explain, and this, in Luther’s eye, was not the meaning of the Greek κεχαριτωμένη.[[41]](#footnote-41)

Finally, Luther’s translations achieved their popularity thanks to their paratexts. Comparing these to the Pre-Reformation German Bibles’ paratexts shows a two-fold tendency. On the one hand, Luther’s 1534 complete Bible translation shows remarkable closeness on a visual level to its predecessors. For example Lucas Cranach’s beautiful illustration at the opening of Genesis 1 creates a clear visual link to the woodcuts of the pre-Lutheran German bibles of Zainer, Quentell and Koberger. The circular arrangement of the world at creation is not just the result of a shared world-view but is intentionally piggybacking on the commercial success of its antecedents, as can be easily seen from a comparison with a strikingly different and innovative arrangement of the last of the Pre-Reformation bibles, the abovementioned Low-German *Halberstäder Bibel* that was published in the same year as Luther’s September Testament (1522). Nonetheless there is also radical discontinuity with the past in Luther’s biblical publications. Although the Low-German bibles did continue some annotations, as has been observed, based on Nicholas of Lyra’s *Postillae*, Luther’s extensive annotations to the texts, his prologues and explanations to the biblical books were very different in nature and tone. These (just as some of the accompanying woodcut illustrations by Cranach) were namely openly polemical and highly offensive to a conservative Catholic readership. In other words Luther used his biblical translations along with their paratexts to attack the papists, the Antichrist (i.e. the Pope), and in general against who disagreed with Luther. These features have found a resonance with many who would feel resentment against the papacy and the Old Church. Luther continued to revise his translation until his death. His last translation came out in 1545 and remained authoritative for Lutherans not only in Germany but also in related in Germanic speaking Lutheran areas where derivative translations were established.[[42]](#footnote-42)

Having shortly viewed the Reformation of the Bible in Germany, where the Bible was so easily available, let us turn to the opposite end of the scale in contemporary Europe, namely the Reformation of the Bible in England.

The situation in England was incomparable to any other European country for historical reasons. Namely, at the end of the fourteenth century in short succession after each other (ca. 1382 and 1395) two translations of the Vulgate into English were produced by a circle of Oxford divines who were followers of John Wycliffe (d. 1384).[[43]](#footnote-43) During his life Wycliffe raised questions around a number of issues, such as transubstantiation, veneration of the saints, monastic vows, the authority of the pope, etc. but he was never formally condemned of heresy.[[44]](#footnote-44) His official censure happened only decades after his death, at the same council of Constance which also condemned and burned the Czech Jan Hus, who was influenced by Wycliffe’s writings.[[45]](#footnote-45) Subsequently Wycliffe's bones were exhumed, reduced to ashes and then dumped in the River Swift. A few years prior to the council, however, namely in 1407 the Provincial Council of Oxford approved the Constitutions of Archbishop Thomas Arundel (1353-1414).[[46]](#footnote-46) These stipulated that all new translations of the Scripture into the vernacular need to be approved by the local ordinary, i.e. the diocesan bishop or equivalent ecclesiastical authority. The Constitutions also prohibited the reading and the possession of any *unlicensed* recent translations of the Bible (explicitly mentioning those associated with John Wycliffe). The Arundel Constitutions were promulgated at the London Council of St Paul’s two years later (1409).

Although the Constitutions did not forbid explicitly the production of new translations or the possession of the Bible in English *tout court*, certainly in regard with the former matter, effectively it did halt any such activity and no new translation was produced prior the Protestant Reformation.[[47]](#footnote-47) Such a strict control on Bible translations in England was exceptional and, as has been observed, stood in stark contrast with practices on Continental Europe, especially with the situation in Germany. Besides the heretical teachings of Wycliffe, the reason behind such stringency was the fact that the Wycliffite translations were used by the Lollards, a populist movement during the fourteenth century, which was seen as a threat to the social order and peace of the society itself.[[48]](#footnote-48) Consequently, the use of vernacular bible translations in debates came to be perceived by the English authorities as a weapon to advance one’s own political agenda.[[49]](#footnote-49)

It comes therefore as no surprise that in 1524 William Tyndale (d. 1536), an Oxford-educated Catholic priest, who had already acquired the reputation of a theological trouble maker, found the bishop of London, the humanist Cuthbert Tunstall less then supportive for Tyndale’s request to prepare a fresh English translation of the New Testament from Erasmus’s Greek edition.[[50]](#footnote-50) Tyndale spent a year in London courting the Bishop in vain to convince him to supply financial support for the project but he did manage to secure the backing of some of the rich members of the Merchants Adventurer. Therefore Tyndale decided to pursue his goal and publish his New Testament translation without an official licence. Besides the necessary investors who were to fund the costs of publication itself he also needed a printer who would be willing to print the obviously illicit material. Tyndale realised that this was not possible in England, due to the primitive state of the printing business in his country. To illustrate the situation, during the fifteenth century there were more than fifty presses set up in Germany, more than seventy in Italy, almost forty in France, more than twenty in the Netherlands, two dozen in Spain, but only three in England (counting London and Westminster as one). [[51]](#footnote-51) And while London and Westminster produced 330 books in the era; Oxford and St. Albans only brought out a mere twenty-five volumes. [[52]](#footnote-52) During the entire sixteenth century, Germany counted 92 printing centres, Italy 60, France 53, the Low Countries 27, Spain 20, Poland 13, The Swiss Confederation 10, Hungary 9, Bohemia 8, and finally England only 6.[[53]](#footnote-53)

Given that 97% of all publications printed during the sixteenth century in England were printed in London (and London printers were concentrated in the Flete street) the authorities had little trouble to control the output. No sensible English printer (and there were only a handful working in England at the time) would have wanted to risk his business for such an undertaking. Furthermore printing was more expensive in England and less qualitative than on the continent. England had no paper mills and thus every single sheet of paper had to be imported from abroad.

And thus, abandoning his priestly duties William Tyndale left England illegally and lived the rest of his life on the Continent running from the English authorities. He probably first went to Hamburg and to Wittenberg, where the University’s matriculation list from 1525 contains a coded name which quite possibly hides Tyndale. But in the same year we find him in Cologne where he started to print his own unlicensed New Testament translation. Cologne seemed to be an obvious choice, due to its convenient proximity to the Frankfurt book fair, on account of being situated on the Rhine and because it was the most important printing centre in Germany, with the largest output both in number of titles and in copies. The printing took place probably in the premises of Peter Quentell, the son of the abovementioned Heinrich Quentell, who printed the two Low-German bibles of 1478.

But when the printing was advanced almost as far as the end of the Gospel of Mark, the business was discovered, because Tyndale’s coworker, the run-away Franciscan friar William Roye became too talkative under the influence of the good German bier and started to boast in the alehouse that their New Testament translation was going to turn the whole of England into Lutheran.[[54]](#footnote-54) That he was not talking loosely can be seen in the marginal notes of the Cologne fragments. These were explicitly and combatively Lutheran and it was this underlying Lutheran agenda that raised the red flag rather than being a translation of the bible.

Tyndale and Roye who were tipped off, left Cologne, taking the already printed sheets with them to Worms, which, being only a few miles from Mainz, the home to Guttenberg’s press, was a very early printing centre. The most important was the business of Peter Schoeffer, the second son of Gutenberg’s successor (also called Peter Schoeffer) and the grandson of Johann Fust (Gutenberg’s erstwhile business associate and Peter Schoeffer the elder’s father-in-law whose books allegedly caused the consternation at the Leipzig Fair).[[55]](#footnote-55) The Schoeffers were true innovators, they were the first to use woodcuts to illustrate their books, to use black and red coloured prints, or to print music.[[56]](#footnote-56) More importantly, Schoeffer had also printed a Lutheran German New Testament (USTC 627804), and was to print the translation of the prophetic books directly from Hebrew (USTC 610825, 610826) as well as a full German bible (USTC 616843) in the coming years. In Worms, it was at his press where a new, octavo edition was issued, the first printed complete New Testament in English, during the summer of 1526.[[57]](#footnote-57)

Tyndale’s New Testament was at the same time also printed in Antwerp, as I have argued in an earlier study, commissioned by the same publisher, Frans Birckman.[[58]](#footnote-58) The latter edition went through several reprints in Antwerp, which was much closer situated to England and could also boast of an English House for the Merchants Adventurer.[[59]](#footnote-59) Accordingly sometimes around 1527 Tyndale moved to Antwerp, where he continued on his bible translations, issuing the Pentateuch in 1530[[60]](#footnote-60) and the Book of Jonah in 1531.[[61]](#footnote-61) In an attempt to stem the flood of clandestine English publications from the Continent (including Tyndale’s biblical translations), King Henry VIII (1491-1547) forbad the import of English books into the country but the injunctions remained ineffective.[[62]](#footnote-62) In 1534 Tyndale’s revised edition of the New Testament came out of the press of the French printer Marten Lempereur (d. 1536) working in Antwerp.[[63]](#footnote-63) The following year however Tyndale was betrayed by a secret English agent, was arrested under Charles V’s authority for Lutheran heresy and after more than a year imprisonment defrocked and executed in September 1536.[[64]](#footnote-64) While in prison, he petitioned for his Hebrew bible, dictionary and grammar in order to continue his translation work, which he was permitted to do.[[65]](#footnote-65) In the meantime Myles Coverdale (d. 1569), an associate of Tyndale brought out the first complete English bible (1535), which incorporated Tyndale’s already published translations but cleansed it from Tyndale’s Lutheran paratexts. Coverdale also published a diglott New Testament in 1538 containing Tyndale’s English version alongside with the Vulgate’s Latin to accommodate for a more traditional readership.[[66]](#footnote-66)

Tyndale’s translations of the historical books which he executed in prison were added by John Rogers in the so-called Matthew’s Bible in 1537.[[67]](#footnote-67) In 1538 Henry VIII prescribed that Coverdale’s recent revision, the Great Bible should be purchased and publicly displayed in all churches. During the following years Coverdale’s Bible, Matthew’s and the Great Bible were repeatedly reprinted, independently of each other. When Mary ascended to the throne, many Protestant scholars fled to the Continent. A group of them published a new revision of the English bible in Geneva (1560) which shows direct influence from its French counterparts published a few years earlier. This edition was the first that was fully based on texts in the original languages even if the driving principle was clearly one of revision rather than creating a completely new translation.[[68]](#footnote-68) It was also first to contain verse numbers and to indicate words that were added in English but are not contained in the source texts. Elizabeth I despised the Geneva Bible for its anti-monarchical annotations (which were advertised as ‘most profitable annotations’ on its title page), and therefore she commissioned a competing version in 1568 to be supervised by her bishops (hence Bishops’ Bible). It underwent several revisions and its 1604 edition came to form the basis of the Authorized Version on the command of King James I, which appeared in 1611 and became *the* English Bible.

*Concluding remarks*

Exactly hundred years after the alleged astonishment of the potential buyers of Johan Fust, one of his compatriots would record posthumously a saying by Luther that regarded the printing press not as a diabolical but as a divine invention: Luther called it ‘summum et postremum donum Dei’ (God’s ultimate and latest gift) through which God advances the cause of the Gospel.[[69]](#footnote-69) In this expression Luther certainly summarized what the general opinion was throughout the century: rather than an instrument of the evil, it was God’s grant to humanity in an apocalyptic world, where God’s Word about His Incarnated Word had to be spread by all means. In that regard Catholics and Lutherans concurred.

I have presented in great details that at least in Germany, the vernacular Bible was widely available prior to the Protestant Reformation. I wanted to stress this point to such a degree and in such great details, because most accounts of the Reformation depict the Late Mediaeval Church not only as ignorant of the Scriptures but as wilfully hiding it from the people. By now it has become clear that this position is no longer teneble.

Its origins go back to the accusations of some of the Protestant Reformers themselves, which are often taken out of their original polemic contexts and are taken at face value by modern readers.[[70]](#footnote-70) So can we read for example Luther’s reminiscences recorded in the *Table Talks*, that he had not seen a bible before the age of twenty and that he had thought that there were no Gospels and Epistles except those which were written in the Sunday postils.[[71]](#footnote-71) He also claimed that he only came across a copy of the Scriptures by accident in the monastery’s library and that his confessor and superior Dr [Johann] Staupitz was greatly astonished seeing him reading and re-reading his bible, an account which certainly has to be taken with a pinch of salt. Later biographers embellished this account with legendary elements, that the bible Luther chanced upon was chained up, hidden away, enveloped in dust, and altogether forgotten. In reality, when Luther was admitted to the noviciate, he received his personal copy of the Vulgate with the admonition “industriously to read, thoughtfully to hear, and carefully to study” God’s holy Word. Augustinian friars were bound by their Rule to meditate daily on the Scriptures, and a scrupulous monk such as Luther was in the stricter, observant branch of his order could hardly have overlooked such an instruction. In fact, the rapid and huge success of Luther’s vernacular works would be impossible to explain without presupposing a very high level of biblical knowledge among its readers. Similarly, Luther’s remark about people noticing the difference between his translation of New Testament and the traditional one betrays the presupposed knowledge of the traditional translation on behalf of his readership.

Secondly, although Tyndale’s wording and paratexts in his New Testament are so close on a linguistic and theological level to that of Luther’s that there have been questions raised about Tyndale’s originality from the earliest times, the wide availability of the German bible before Luther creates a significantly different position for Luther’s Version vis-à-vis Tyndale’s New Testament.[[72]](#footnote-72) Tyndale’s New Testament broke new grounds and had the potential to introduce an English readership to a closer familiarity with the biblical texts. In Luther’s case Luther’s success was built precisely on such a familiarity with earlier bible translations.

Thirdly, the lack of a supporting monarch behind Tyndale such as the Elector of Saxony was behind Luther, has rendered Tyndale’s translation unpalatable for the English readership initially. That is why, quite differently to the German bible, the death of the translator did not conserve the translation in its final form but through a series of revisions along both sides of the ideological division lines, the English bible underwent a similar transformation as the Church of England itself until it reached its *via media* in the King James Bible, a compromise solution that has both the potential to dissatisfy and to unify.

1. See André Thiem, *Herzog Albrecht der Beherzte (1443-1500): ein sächsischer Fürst im Reich und in Europa*, Köln, Böhlau, 2002, p. 229-230. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A version of this story is recorded in manuscript on the verso of a flyleaf in a copy Heinrich Eggestein’s German Bible (see below) in *The Newberry Library* (Chicago), shelf number: VAULT folio Inc. 286. The actual date is supplied by conjecture based on the fact that markets were held in Leipzig at Easter and at St Michael’s. Fust died later that year (30th October 1466). On Johan Fust see: Lotte Hellinga, “Johann Fust, Peter Schoeffer and Nicolas Jenson” in *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 78 (2003), p.16-21; and Aloys, Ruppel, art. “Fust, Johannes” in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 5 (1961), p. 743-744. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Alfred Zastrau, art. “Faust, Johannes” in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 5 (1961), p. 34-35. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Joseph Schafer, “Treasures in Print and Script”, in *The Wisconsin Magazine of History* 10, 1 (1926), 95-96. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Eberhard König, “Für Johannes Fust”, in Hans Limburg, Hartwig Lohse, and Wolfgang Schmitz (eds.), *Ars impressoria: Entstehung und Entwicklung des Buchdrucks : eine internationale Festgabe für Severin Corsten zum 65. Geburtstag*, Saur, München, 1986, p. 286. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Biblia [Johann Mentelin, Strasbourg, before 27 June 1466]. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München Shelfmark: BSB-Ink: B-482. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. “1466 27 Junio ward ditz buch gekaft vneingepunden vm[b] 12 guld[en]” (fol. 400v). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. See online tools to calculate purchasing value of historical currencies at http://www.iisg.nl/hpw/calculate2.php and https://www.measuringworth.com. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. “1467 sub papa paulo secundo Et sub imperatore frederico tertio.” (fol. 261r). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. For more information see: Karl Stackmann, “Die Bedeutung des Beiwerks für die Bestimmung der Gebrauchssituation vorlutherischer deutscher Bibeln”, *De captu lectoris. Wirkungen des Buches im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert dargestellt an ausgewählten Handschriften und Drucken*, *Festschrift Wieland Schmidt*, ed. Wolfgang Milde and Werner Schuder, Berlin and New York, 1988, 273-88. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. See Carsten Kottmann, “Die erste deutsche gedruckte Bibel? Zu einem historischen Irrtum um die Inkunabel ‘Bb deutsch 147002’ der Württembergischen Landesbibliothek Stuttgart”, in *Zeitschrift für Württembergische Landesgeschichte* 75(2016), p. 347–361. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. ISTC note (http://data.cerl.org/istc/ib00625000). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Helmut Presser, “Briefe des Frühdruckers Jodokus Pflanzmann”, in *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 58 (1983), p. 172-176. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. His correspondence records the printing of more than 20,000 indulgences in 1480 (Peter Stallybrass, “Broadsides and the Printing Revolution” in *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies After Elizabeth L. Eisenstein*, ed. by Sabrina Alcorn Baron, Eric N. Lindquist, Eleanor F. Shevlin, University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, 2007, p. 316; Falk Eiserman, “Fifty Thousand Veronicas. Print Runs of Broadsheets in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Century”, in *Broadsheets: Single-Sheet Publishing in the First Age of Print* ed. by Andrew Pettegree, Brill, Leiden, 2017, p. 86. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. S. H. Steinberg, *Five Hundred Years of Printing*, Dover Publications, Mineola, NY, 2017 (first published by Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1955), p. 45. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. *Das Buch der Teutschen Bibel mit figuren mit grösstem fleiß corrigiert und gerechtgemacht. Also daz alle frembde teutsch und unverstendtliche wort, so in den erstgedruckten klainen bybeln gewesen, gantz ausgethan und nach dem latein gesetzt und gemacht seind.* [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. On Zainer see Akihiko Fujii, *Günther Zainers druckersprachliche Leistung: Untersuchungen zur Augsburger Druckersprache im 15. Jahrhundert* (Studia Augustana), Max Niemeyer, Tübingen, 2007. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Philip B. Meggs, and Alston W. Purvis, *Meggs’ History of Graphic Design*, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, 2016, p. 278. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Severin Corsten, and Reimar Walter Fuchs (eds.), *Der Buchdruk im 15. Jahrhundert: Eine Bibliographie*, Hiersemann, Stuttgart, 1988, p. 400-401; 532-533. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Randall Herz, art. “Sensenschmid, Johannes”, in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 24 (2010), p. 264-265. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Norbert H. Ott, art. “Sorg, Anton”, in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 24 (2010), p. 598-599. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Wilhelm Vogt, art. “Melchior von Stainhaim”, in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 21 (1885), p. 285-286. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. The traditional attribution to Quentell has been recently called into question. Severin Corsten suggests Johann Helman as the printer. See Severin Corsten, art. “Quentell, Heinrich”, in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 21 (2003), p. 40-41. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Gergely Juhász, in *Tyndale's Testament*, ed. by Paul Arblaster, Gergely Juhász and Guido Latré, Brepols, Turnhout, 2002, p. 116. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. On Koberger see: Hans Lülfing, art. “Koberger, Anton”, in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 12 (1979), p. 245-246. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Quoted by Christoph Reske, *Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet: auf der Grundlage des gleichnamigen Werkes von Josef Benzing*, Harrassowitz, 2007, p. 657. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Stefan Füssel, “Early Modern German Printing”, in *Camden House History of German Literature*, Vol. 4. Early Modern German Literature 1350-1700, ed. by Max Reinhart, Camden House, Woodbridge, 2001, p. 234. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. See Eric Marshall White, “Newly Discovered Fragments from Three ‘Made up’ Delft Bibles of 1477”, in *Quaerendo* 37 (2007), p. 147–161; Mart van Duijn, “Targeting the Masses. The ‘Delft Bible’ (1477) as Printed Product”, in *‘Wading Lambs and Swimming Elephants’. The Bible for the Laity and Theologians in the Late Medieval and Early Modern Era*, ed. by Wim François and August Den Hollander, Peeters, Leuven, 2012, p. 1–19. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Gergely Juhász, “Martin Luther”, in *Tyndale's Testament*, ed. by Paul Arblaster, Gergely Juhász, and Guido Latré, Brepols, Turnhout, 2002, p. 116. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. On the call for reformation prior to the Protestant Reformation see: Erika Rummel, “Voices of Reform from Hus to Erasmus,” in Thomas A. Brady, Jr., Heiko A. Oberman, and James D. Tracy (eds.), *Handbook of European History* *1400-1600: Late Middle Ages****,*** *Renaissance and Reformation* vol. 2, Brill, Leiden, 1995, p. 61–91. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. There are many recent works on Luther, e.g. Peter Marshall, *1517: Martin Luther and the Invention of the Reformation*, Oxford University Press, 2017; Eric Leland Saak, *Luther and the Reformation of the later Middle Ages*, Cambridge University Press, 2017; Lyndal Roper, *Martin Luther: Renegade and Prophet*, Bodley Head, London, 2016; Olivier Rimbault, *Imaginaire et pensée: Désiré Erasme, Martin Luther, Nicolas de Cues : trois imaginaires, trois modèles de pensé*, Presses universitaires de Perpignan 2016; Scott H. Hendrix, *Martin Luther: Visionary Reformer*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2015. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Andrew Pettegree, *Brand Luther*, Penguin, New York, 2016, p. 144. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Pettegree, *Brand Luther*, p. 144. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Pettegree, *Brand Luther*, p. 144. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Gergely Juhász, “Cat. 38: Biblia Rabbinica” in *Tyndale's Testament*, p. 94-95. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Gergely Juhász, “Cat. 29: Vetus testamenti multiplici lingua nunc primo impressum” in *Tyndale's Testament*, p. 84-85. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Gergely Juhász, “The Bible and the early Reformation period” in *Tyndale's Testament*, p. 25-33. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. The editio princeps Flavius Josephus, *De antiquitate Judaica. De bello Judaico*, Johann Schüssler, Augsburg, 1470 (USTC 746500) was repeatedly reprinted. First vernacular translation saw the light of day in 1482: Flavius Josephus, *Destructien van Jerusalem en van al den lande van Judeen*, Gheraert Leeu, Gouda, 1482 (USTC 435519) followed by the Catalan edition: *Lo libre deles antiquitats judaycas*, Nicolás Spindeler, Barcelona, 1482 [=1483] (USTC 333102). The first French edition came out ten years later: *De la bataille judaique*, [Jean Maurand] pour Antoine Vérard, Paris, 1492 (USTC 71201). [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. See *Tyndale’s Testament*, p. 82ff. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. See more on Luther’s translation strategy in Gergely Juhász, art. “Translation Theory, Luther and”, in *Encyclope of Martin Luther and the Reformation*, ed. by Mark A. Lamport, Rowman & Littlefield, London, p. 765-768. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Martin Luther, *Ein Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen. An Open Letter on Translating* (Treasures of the Taylorian, Ser. 1: Reformation Pamphlets, 1), Taylor Institution Library, Oxford, 2017, p. 20-21. Of course Luther’s choice of words is influenced by his theology according to which one cannot *contain* God’s grace, it can envelop one but one cannot receive it within him. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Martin Luther, *Die Bibel nach Martin Luthers Übersetzung: Lutherbibel*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, 2017; Margot Käßmann, and Martin Rösel (eds.), *Die Bibel Martin Luthers: ein Buch und seine Geschichte*, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, Leipzig, 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
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