

geschrieben sei, wenn man sich auf die Angaben in Cl. 2, 311 und im Luther-Kalendarium von Gg. Buchwald (SVRG 147, 1929, S. 23) verlassen darf.

Das Literaturverzeichnis, an sich fast zu vollständig, insofern auch Selbstverständliches und Allgemeines angeführt wird, hat doch Lücken, die nicht sein dürften. Die Beiträge von L. Ihmels zur Lutherforschung werden ignoriert (z. B. Das Dogma in der Predigt Luthers 1912), ebenso die von Georg Merz. W. Link ist zwar mit einem Aufsatz in *Ev. Theol.* 1934/35, nicht aber mit seiner großen Monographie von 1940 vertreten. Von E. Wolf fehlt die Abhandlung „Zur Verwaltung der Sakramente nach Luther und lutherischer Lehre“ von 1938 (jetzt *Peregrinatio* 1954 S. 243 ff.). Die für dieses Thema wichtige Monographie von W. Maurer, *Bekenntnis und Sakrament* 1939 wird nicht genannt. Von der katholischen Forschung werden nur die Beiträge von Iserloh verwertet. Wilh. Wagners Aufsatz in der *ZkTh* 61, 1937, S. 29–98 über die Kirche als *Corpus mysticum* beim jungen Luther durfte dem Verf. nicht entgehen. Auch aus H. Grisar wäre manches zu lernen. Denn im übrigen greift der Verf. in der Nutzung der Lutherliteratur weit bis ins 19. Jahrhundert zurück – mit Recht. Daß K. Barths berühmter Aufsatz über „Ansatz und Absicht in Luthers Abendmahlslehre“ schon 1923 in *ZdZ* zu lesen war, nicht erst in der Aufsatzsammlung von 1928, ist wohl nicht nur chronologisch von Wichtigkeit.

Zum Ganzen: Der Verf. läßt sich von der bei Luther gelegentlich begegnenden Parole von der „Mittelbahn“, der *via media* leiten (vgl. S. 334). Das prägt seine ganze Auffassung und Darstellung vom Denken Luthers. Das gibt ihr einen gewissen, nicht zu leugnenden Wert. Aber das nimmt ihr auch den Elan, mit dem allein die theologische Arbeit an Luther dem Reformator ganz gerecht zu werden hoffen kann.

Münster i. W.

K. G. Steck

Calvin: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, in two volumes, edited by John T. McNeill, translated by Ford L. Battles (= *The Library of Christian Classics*, vol. XX and XXI). Philadelphia (Westminster Press) 1960. Lxxi, 1734 pp., \$ 12.50.

„Whereby, beside all other commodities that a faithful translation of so good a work may bring, the one benefit is moreover provided for such as are desirous to attain some knowledge of the Latin tongue, (which is at this time to be wished in many of those men for whose profession this book most fitly serveth,) that they shall not find any more English than shall suffice to continue the Latin withal . . .“

This is a quotation from Thomas Norton's first Elizabethan English translation of the *Institutes* (1599). Even to-day any translator of the *Institutes* is once more well advised to use as a constant compendium to his task Norton's introduction and translation, in order to be aware of the many pitfalls in his path. The close adherence to the Latin text – on the one hand – may induce the translator to adhere to closely to the original, and thus not give an idiomatic rendering in his own and modern language, but if – on the other hand – he translates to freely without regard to the precise Latin terminology with its cogent reasoning, he might not only misinterpret and misrepresent but also bypass the characteristics of Calvin's theology.

In the main, the book here under review, is a good example of an attempt to put the *Institutes* faithfully and intelligently before a modern reader without deviating to much from the masterly Latin of Calvin. At the same time, Norton's advice of the command of the Latin is an advice, which the modern student should take heed of very carefully.

The greatness of the work of translation is highly enhanced by the enormous work of research put into it, by the vast amount of footnotes, appendixes, bibliographies, etc., which enable the student to see Calvin and the impact he left on his time and on theological thinking up to the present day.

It can be only attempted here to give impressions and observations, which occurred to the reviewer, on parts and technical points, which may not have any intrinsic cohesion, to anyone acquainted with or desirous to make use of the trans-

lation. Let it be said, that whatever faults may be registered (and he is not doing his task as a reviewer who does not find faults with the work he is to review), this is a brave and scholarly and conscientious attempt to bring Calvin from the remoteness of time and thought to the modern reader. In the following I will try to put before the reader in small paragraphs (a-h) disjointed, and yet – to me – relevant observations.

a) Before using the translation in two volumes, I suggest that a preliminary study of the layout of the work should be undertaken, in order to extract the maximum results: Apart from the introductory matter (vol. I, pp. i–lxxi), apart from the most elaborate and scholarly apparatus of bibliographies and indexes (vol. II, pp. 1525–1734), the translation of each printed page should draw naturally the first attention to the reader.

1) Not only has almost every page a very fine portion of explanatory footnotes, with references to other works relating to the 'matter under discussion' and with theological or historical comments, but the page itself needs specially to be scrutinised with its cleverly devised hints to other editions of the Institutes and other matter. In this connection vol. I, p. xxvii is a must for the student if he wishes to use the translation intelligently.

In order to enforce my argument: Book II, chapter xvii: "Christ rightly and properly said to have merited God's Grace and Salvation for us" (cf. vol. I, pp. 528 ff.) appears first in the 1559 edition („recte et proprie dici, Christum nobis promeritum esse gratiam et salutem") as a result of the discussion between Camillus Renuus (1545) and Laelius Socinus (1555), with the Scotist sphere of thought that, if the Will of God works in an absolutely unconditioned manner, the bestowal of Grace is to be attributed to God only, and not to the meritum Christi. In a footnote to page 528 reference is made to Socinus, but the significance of the chapter escapes the reader unless he notes very carefully the tiny letter *e* (p. 528), when the text of chapter xvii begins. (To the whole controversy on the meritum Christi, see A. Ritschl in loco in his „Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation".)

2) The good introductory matter in vol. I keeps the modern reader also well informed about the present state of Calvin research and its discussions. It mentions as well former translations, especially the English since Th. Norton, the famous John Allen (1771 to 1839), Henry Beveridge (1799–1863), the various Latin and French editions (cf. vol. I, pp. xlii ff. and vol. II, pp. 1527 ff.).

Already then the main criticism launched against the translator of the Genevan Divine was that the great Elizabethan Th. Norton by being overscrupulous in preserving the Latin form of speech had done a 'serious injury to the English style'. How far the opposite is valid criticism, by being more liberal in the translation of the original Latin terminology, so charged with highly theological meaning, perverts or does injury, misconstrues or obscures Calvin's concise meaning, remains to be seen.

b) Reference should be made in this connection to the fine list of editions of Calvin's Institutes and its various translations here (vol. II, pp. 1526 ff.). The handy Latin text edited by A. Tholuck (1834–35) has served countless generations of students, until the grand work of Peter Barth and W. Niesel in their scholarly edition of 1957 and 1959 seems to replace Tholuck's standard Latin text. Reference should here be made to the German translation by O. Weber (vol. I = Buch 1 & 2: 1936; vol. II = Buch 3: 1937; vol. III = Buch 4: 1938 in the Neukirchen edition). This translation receives no mention among the bibliography (vol. II, p. 1529) here.

c) Footnote II (vol. I, p. 40) draws attention to a profound observation by Calvin in the relationship between God and man: The wellknown tag „si integer stetisset Adam", with its related doctrine of the status of the "imago Dei" not only explains Calvin's conception of the complete Otherness and transcendent Sovereignty of God, but played such an important part also in the 1930es in Germany in the discussion between Barth and Brunner: The „Natürliche Theologie der Deutschen Christen" trying to fit and adapt themselves to the new Order of

National-socialism, with terms like "Order" and „Schöpfung“, found in Barth a "Nein", in his reply to Brunner (though I feel Brunner never thought politically nor is he to be equated with Gogarten and the German Christian pronouncements), even denying the "Anknüpfungspunkt" in the Natural Theology as ever existing between man and God, stressing to the contrary the sole priority of Revelation. The small notice here (vol. II, p. 1531 and vol. I, p. liii with footnote) to Barth and Brunner, deserves greater prominence to remind the reader of the impact on the revolution in theological thinking of the 30es on the Continent, and the indebtedness to Barth by the Church in resisting the evil pilosophy of National-socialism. The whole vocabulary of the period was highly charged with significant terms like „Offenbarungsmächtigkeit“, „duplex cognitio“ („doppelte Offenbarung“), „Erhaltungsgnade“, or that God is „irgendwie erkennbar“ in nature. God – nature – Grace – Revelation – knowledge: these are keywords of Calvin's theology at all times.

d) The *Introduction* to the translation here referred to, gives a good survey of the structure of the Institutes, its place in history, etc.

The good bibliography of Authors illustrates the wide range of reading and knowledge by Calvin and his relying on and familiarity with S. Augustine (vol. II, pp. 1594–1601), Peter Lombard (pp. 1618 f.), S. Thomas Aquinas (pp. 1626 f.), to mention only a few in this double column *Index of Authors*, which covers roughly 40 pages here (pp. 1592–1634).

The *Bibliographical Apparatus* (vol. II, pp. 1523 to 1734) of roughly 200 pages is not only a profound piece of scholarly work but does at the same time enable the student to delve into all aspects of the study of Calvin.

Probably a few more typical Calvin theological terms could have enriched the *Index of Latin Words*: Though the important terms "virtus" finds reference in the subject index in English (vol. II, p. 1709), a reference in the Latin index seems also indicated. In this connection the repeated occurrence of the term in the Institutes (especially pp. 1370 ff.) is instructive. As I make reference to the other Eucharistic term "exhibere" (here in my review, p. 405), the lack of reference to "repraesentare" (which is so closely linked with the discussion) in the Index of Latin Words has to be mentioned also. There is that other highly significant word "servare" in connection with the doctrine of Baptism and Regeneration (vol. II, p. 1340), which should find inclusion in the Index of Latin Words.

And as the term "virtus" has just been mentioned, and as Calvin's Eucharistic doctrine has often been labelled as 'Virtualism', I would like to draw the Anglican student's attention to Robert Isaac Wilberforce's "The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist" (London 1854) with its special and interesting discussion of Calvin's "virtue" and "virtual", the "virtus sacramenti" and the "res sacramenti", etc. (op. cit., pp. 119 ff. and pp. 209 ff.); see also here in the work under review, vol. II, p. 1361 footnote 5.

e) Though the Translator's Note (cf. vol. I, p. xxiii) states explicitly that extensive study of Calvin's vocabulary is at the back of the present English translation, and though it has been his aim to achieve a reasonable consistency in rendering Calvin's terminology into English, I feel bound to say that the translator seems to have slipped in his task in a most vital rendering of a theological term in connection with Eucharistic doctrine: It is the 'key word' in Calvin's terminology, so characteristic in the sixteenth century Eucharistic discussion, "exhibitio", "exhibere", occurring at least fourteen times in chapter xvii of Book IV, and again many times in chapter xviii. The doctrinal definition that the consecrated elements are "signa exhibitiva", signs that 'exhibit' Christ present, and not "signa repraesentiva", signs that 'represent' Christ absent, had already been strongly asserted by Martin Bucer (see *Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan.-April 1947, pp. 64 ff.: Martin Bucer's Letter to John A Lasco on the Eucharist), and taken over by Calvin.

Already at the Ratisbon-Colloquy it was stated: ". . . ita nos docemus, cum pane consecrato exhiberi corpus Christi sumentibus; nec docemus fieri transsubstantiatio . . ." (Acta Colloqu. Ratisb., printed 1542 February, p. 62).

Beveridge in his English translation employs consistently (except in one passage: Book IV, xvii, 5 "obsignat exhibitionem" = "when he seals that offer") the English equivalent "exhibit". It may be argued that the American translator here feels that the English word does not convey the Latin meaning, but on the other hand, he uses so many English renderings to this specific Latin term, that the reader does not have a chance to note that all these various English words have in the Latin only the one terms: "exhibitio, exhibere". The various renderings of the Latin are bewildering: "showing" IV, xvii, 8. 10 (twice). 11 (twice). 16; "are shown" IV, xvii, 18; IV, xviii, 12; "set before" IV, xvii, 3; "giving of Himself" IV, xvii, 5; "display" IV, xvii, 11; "setting forth" IV, xvii, 14; "reveals Himself" IV, xvii, 30; "exhibits" IV, xvii, 21.

Though in the footnote (vol. II, p. 1371, note 30) reference is made to the matter under discussion, yet in the Index VII of Latin Words and Phrases (cf. vol. II, p. 1372) the only reference to "exhibitio Christi" is a false reference, as it refers probably to the footnote 30 on p. 1371.

If the translator wishes to adhere to his own various renderings for the same word, at least an indication in brackets in the text to the original Latin term – or in a footnote – seems to be highly advisable.

The Introduction (cf. vol. I, p. xlii) knows and acknowledges Th. Norton's translation, without heeding Norton's warning: "If I should grant myself liberty after the natural manner of my own tongue, to say that in English which I conceived to be the meaning in Latin, I plainly perceived how hardly I might escape error, and on the other hand, in this matter of faith and religion, how perilous it was to err. For I durst not presume to warrant myself to have his meaning without his words . . ." (Thomas Norton's Introduction to his translation of the Institutes, 1599).

f) The 'hygienic' treatment of the original text in order to satisfy the sense for scholarly clarity of the modern reader seems to me to sacrifice occasionally the rugged beauty of the first Elizabethan translation:

"I was sometime a fig tree, log, block, that served for nought:
The workman doubted what of me were fittest to be wrought:
A form to sit upon, or else a Priap God to be.
At length he thought, the better was a God to make of me!

(Institutes I, xi, 4). Or:

"Where all other living creatures do grovelling-wise behold the
ground, to man is given an upright face, and he is
commanded to look upon the Heaven, and to advance
his countenance toward the stars . . ."
(Institutes I, xv, 3).

These two quotations are Th. Norton's translation (in modern spelling). Now compare with it the insipid rendering in the English Institutes under review (vol. I, p. 104 and p. 186). There is even no indication to the verse-like character of the quotations from Horace and Ovid (though reference is made in the footnote to the sources), rather inconsistently I feel, when otherwise the English translation of the Vergil passage (vol. I, pp. 57 f.) keeps the verse-like character of the original.

g) It is only natural that the Anglican reader would turn foremost to those parts of the Institutes, which have been under discussion in the "Ecclesia Anglicana" and through the Thirty-Nine Articles since the sixteenth century: Predestination (vol. II, pp. 920-987 = Book III, xxi - xxiv), that "decretum quidem horribile, fateor", as Calvin himself confesses (vol. II, p. 955, and footnote 17), and closely linked with it the teaching on Regeneration in its relation to Baptism, to refer only to two headings. The doctrine of the Eucharist has its own points and we refer here in our review to it (section e). Toleration or tolerance in connection with Servetus, the problem of Authority and the Church, the teaching on Natural theology and knowledge are the other characteristics with which we connect Calvin.

The discussions as to the affinity of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, in how far they might be interpreted as Catholic, Lutheran or Calvinistic

occupied a considerable part of the early nineteenth century of English Theologians, may it be Evangelicals or Tractarians.

Richard Laurence („The Doctrine of the Church of England upon the Efficacy of Baptism“), who was then Regius Professor and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford (1818) (cf. also his Bampton Lectures for 1804: „An Attempt to Illustrate those Articles of the Church of England“) is only one of the many which hotly defended the tenor of the Articles against Calvinistic teaching, leaning rather towards Lutheranism. The controversy in connection with the famous ‘Gorham-Case’ on Regeneration in the 19th century is another occasion to voice most vehemently the pros and cons of the contending parties. And now, at this juncture of the 60es of our present century, when discussing the authority for Church of England pronouncements and for the gauge of Anglican Theology, once more the doctrinal background is under examination. The apparent and accepted statement of the synonymity of Baptism – Regeneration, of the validity and efficacy of the Sacrament was under review: Specially studied in connection with Calvin’s dictum as seen in the historical context of his guarding his doctrine against the erroneous teaching of Anabaptism: those to harsh and even unacceptable statements with their tragic consequences in Baptismal Doctrine. His chapters in Book IV (chapters xv, xvi and xvii) should be closely studied therefore (vol. II, pp. 1303–1359). „Nos autem“, he observes, „respondemus, opus Dei . . . infantes, qui servandi sint, ut certe ex ea aetate omnino aliqui (!) servantur, ante a Domino regenerari, minime obscurum est . . .“ (Book IV, xvi; here in English vol. II, p. 1340). (Cf. also Laurence, op. cit., at the end of the book in his ‘Sermon’, pp. 13–15).

To distinguish between Regeneration and Baptismal Regeneration leads to those stern confessional pronouncements, rooted in Calvin, like „The Westminster Confession of Faith“ (presbyterian; 1643). („Westminster Confession“, article x: „ . . . elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit . . .“ and in article xxviii of the same Confession it states in connection with Baptism: „ . . . Grace and Salvation are not so inseparably annexed to it, as that . . . all that are baptised are undoubtedly regenerated . . .“

h) God in his Sovereignty, transcending all Creation, the Deus to Whom alone Glory is due, can never for Calvin be that intimate God in the Manger, the God in Christ sharing the joys and sorrows of man like the God of Catholic faith or even Luther’s personal God. From there only God’s decree of Predestination can solicit some kind of understanding.

The crucial article xvii „Of Predestination and Election“ of the Anglican Thirty-Nine Articles has been since its formulation an object of a variety of interpretations. Whatever conclusion may be drawn, it is not explicitly stated, that some are predestinated to eternal damnation. The present Dean of St. Paul’s, Dr. W. R. Matthews, has some cogent observations on the subject in his little brochure „The Thirty-Nine Articles“ (London 1961): „In article xvii the question of predestination to damnation is evaded by an artful modulation, as it were, in another key . . . the second part (sc. of the article) which should logically deal with those not elect to salvation, embarks upon a confused reflection on the psychological effects of being convinced that one is predestined to damnation . . .“ (p. 12). To conclude this discussion, it is worthwhile to remind the reader of the words of the great Anglican Divine Richard Hooker in his „Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity“, Book V, Appendix i, touching predestination (Everyman’s edition, pp. 507–543): „Prescience as prescience hath in itself no causing efficacy (p. 512) . . . it appeareth, that the foresight which God hath of all things proveth not his forappointment of all things which are foreseen . . .“ (p. 513). The evil of sin is within the compass of God’s prescience, but not of predestination, nor foreordaining will . . . (p. 521)“.

Oxford

C. L. A. R. Hope