

Dresdener Aufführung ist bei Jakob Bacchtold (so, und nicht Bächtold!) nicht angegeben; S. 40 muß es wohl Aus- statt Aufgaben heißen. Frei von solch kleinen Mängeln ist die Edition des Textes. Diese würde, zusammen mit den Erwägungen Giovanolis über Bühne und Regie – die Aufführungen in Zürich und Straßburg berücksichtigend –, eine Wiederaufführung von Gwalthers «Nabal» ohne weiteres ermöglichen; ob die mangelnde Latinität der heutigen Zeit ein solches Vorhaben wohl zuläßt?

Kurt Jakob Rüetschi, Luzern

Der Rezensent wäre als Gwalther-Bibliograph dankbar, wenn er einen Standortnachweis erhielte über die bei P. Bahlmann, *Die lateinischen Dramen von Wimpfelings Stylpho bis zur Mitte des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Münster 1893, S. 105 und danach bei Giovanoli S. 36 erwähnte Gwalthersche Fassung des «Nabal», die Paul Grebner aus Schneeberg (Sachsen) unter seinem Namen 1566 in Antwerpen veröffentlichte.

Irena Dorota Backus

The Reformed Roots of the English New Testament.

The Influence of Theodore Beza on the English New Testament, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, The Pickwick Press, 1980 (Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 28), 216 S., \$ 11.–

In *The Reformed Roots of the English New Testament*, Irena D. Backus has ventured into an area of reformation research that has not received too much attention in recent years. She has done so with scholarly acumen, a high degree of skill and with considerable success. As is apparent from the subtitle of the small volume, the author's focus is the examination of Theodore Beza's Greek and Latin New Testaments and possible relationships between these and the authorized English New Testament of 1611.

The examination is carried out with painstaking attention to the sources, particularly to Beza's 1598 edition of the New Testament, printed in Geneva. By comparing selected sections of this edition with the 1560 Geneva edition, the 1576 Thomson edition, the so-called "Bodleian Bishops" of 1602 and the 1611 Authorized Version, Backus is led to conclude that Beza's influence on the English translators is discernible. In order not to claim too much, the author limits herself to making such claims for the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts, the Pauline Epistles, and Hebrews. She is careful to note dependence by the A. V. translators on Beza's textual authority without wholly committing herself to the much more difficult issue of whether or not there existed theological dependence. In fact, she asserts with some conviction that "The revisers were not interested in Beza from the point of view of doctrine, but from the point of view of an authoritative edition of T. R. with a critical apparatus and exegetical material" (p. 93). Notwithstanding such dependence, Backus does conclude her

study by acknowledging that the authorized translators evolved “an individual style by frequent consultation of the other English versions and by their own inventiveness” (p. 172).

Backus' two hundred and sixteen page booklet is a small gem. Not only does it reflect the scholarship of its author but it proves indirectly how translators and exegetes of the late 16th and early 17th centuries utilized one another's skills, regardless of denominational and regional boundaries. Though Beza's rigidly determinist Calvinism might have been objectionable to at least some of the scholars who worked on the A.V., his reputation as textual scholar of the New Testament was beyond reproach.

By her own skillful and patient analysis Dr. Backus has shown some significant links between Geneva and England in the period under discussion, thus opening the doors to further investigation of the fascinating factor of cross fertilization in the process of evangelical reform – not only by those who tackled the structures of the church, but, indeed, by the scholars who cherished the church's Canon and sought to transmit its treasured word in faithfulness to establish manuscripts and codices.

An added bonus of this Pickwick Publication is its attractive appearance, a preface by Basil Hall of Cambridge and a relatively error-free text (one meets a theologican (p. XI), wonders why Baptism is capitalized when salvation is not (p. 11) and why “original sin” requires “the” (p. 11) when “Lord Jesus” goes without the article (p. 123). These and some other minor typing errors do not however detract from the value of this study by Dr. Backus.

While the last word on the matter has not yet been written this work is commendable for its sound research and careful analysis and serves well as an important contribution to the study of roots and relationships in the process of translating the Bible into the vernacular.

E.J. Furcha, Montreal

Karl Barth – Martin Rade, Ein Briefwechsel

mit einer Einleitung von Christoph Schwöbel, Gütersloh, Gütersloher Verlags-
haus Gerd Mohn, 1981, 292 S., 2 Abb., Ln., DM 78.–

Für kurze Zeit wirkte der junge cand. theol. Karl Barth als Redaktionshelfer an der «Christlichen Welt», der maßgebenden Zeitschrift des freien Protestantismus, deren Herausgeber während 45 Jahren Martin Rade war. Aus dieser Zeit stammte eine lebenslängliche Freundschaft, die sich im vorliegenden Briefband nicht nur in Sachdiskussionen, sondern auch im vertraulichen Gespräch eines alten und eines jungen Theologen ausdrückt. Rade bietet Barth in einer äußerst gespannten Zeit, nämlich im September 1914, das Du an, und Barth ist unsicher, als was er nun seinen Freund, dem er weder politisch noch theologisch zu folgen vermag, zu betrachten habe. Die Anreden seiner Briefe schwanken denn