

Musculus, Gwalther, Luther, Erasmus

Primus Truber as the First Slovenian Translator of Scriptural Texts

BY KOZMA AHAČIČ

The method employed by Slovenian Protestant writers in translating biblical texts¹ (that is, texts which were not adapted but translated in the modern sense of the term) has been the subject of many studies. The numerous researches, however, have provided no reliable key to these writers' basic procedures in translating biblical texts into Slovenian. Some scholars based their discussions of the source texts on the claims of the Protestant writers themselves, rather than on analysis, while those who did conduct analyses focused on details rather than on the overall concept, or else lacked access to all the texts required for such analyses.

Our analysis of the Bible translations by Slovenian Protestant writers,² the results of which are outlined in the present article, has therefore encompassed passages from all such translations, comparing them to all potential source texts. The findings include a fascinating discovery: in translating the Psalms, the first Slovenian translator of the Bible, Primus Truber [Primož Trubar] (1508–1586),³ relied not only on Luther's translation but, above all, on the annotated Latin translation by Wolfgang Musculus and the German translation by Rudolph Gwalther. This in turn indicates the wide influence exerted by the last two authors in the Slovenian-speaking areas of the 16th century.

1. A Survey of the Major Studies to Date

Truber's translation work has been studied by many researchers to date. A detailed discussion of Truber's translation of the Gospels has been provided

¹ Biblical texts are the only group of texts where Slovenian Protestant writers never allowed themselves occasional interpretative departures from their sources. The Postils, on the other hand, translated from German sources, reveal occasional divergences, which are only to be expected.

² Kozma Ahačič, *Zgodovina misli o jeziku in književnosti: protestantizem*, Ljubljana 2007, 257–282.

³ Truber published his Scripture translations in the following works: TE 1555, TT 1557, TT 1560, TL 1561, TPs 1566, TL 1567, TT 1577, TT 1581–82. They are most readily accessible in the edition: *Biblia Slavica* 4/3, Paderborn 2006.

by *Ivan Grafenauer*.⁴ Having collected the key statements of Truber himself on his translation procedures and sources, he conducted a comparative analysis of Matthew 2,13–18 in the Greek original, the Vulgate, and the translations by Truber and Luther. While Grafenauer brilliantly comments on Truber's claims about his knowledge of particular languages, he unfortunately seems to have lacked access to Erasmus' translation, as well as to certain other – correctly identified – sources. Thus it is a further misfortune that he should have chosen to analyse precisely TE 1555, where the oscillation between Luther's and Erasmus' influence is strongest. It was for this reason that Grafenauer – as will be shown later – partly drew the wrong conclusions:

«Truber based his translation on Luther's. In certain places, however, where he found Luther's translation too free, he drew closer to the Vulgate, basing some passages partly on Luther and partly on the Vulgate. In addition, there remains a handful of passages where Truber may have adhered to other sources, which will require a closer examination [...]»

Anton Breznik,⁵ in his article on the literary tradition in «Evangeliji in listi», concludes that Truber's translations of the Psalms mainly follow the Vulgate.

A Czech scholar, *Václav Burian*, published in 1928 a much-cited work on the traces of Czech literature in older Slovenian texts,⁶ which also addresses the influence of the Czech literature and language on Truber's translation solutions and language. Since his conclusions are most often presented as proven facts, it should be noted that we find many of his claims inaccurate and mistaken.

In his preface to the Glagolitic first part of the New Testament from 1562,⁷ Truber reports that the (Croatian) New Testament was being translated via more than one Latin, German, Italian, and – on account of certain older words – even Czech translation of the Bible, although the translators chiefly followed the versions by Erasmus and Luther. From this statement, Burian concludes that Truber must have drawn on words from the 1540 utraquist Czech Bible (Česká biblí) in his Slovenian New Testament translations as well. To prove his claim, he adduces parallel passages from the 1540 Czech Bible, Truber's translation, Luther's translation, and the Vulgate. According to Burian, Truber would have resorted to Czech in employing such

⁴ *Ivan Grafenauer*, O Trubarjevem prevodu evangelijev, in: *Dom in svet* 27, 1914, 297–303.

⁵ *Anton Breznik*, Literarna tradicija v 'Evangelijih in listih' [1. del], in: *Dom in svet* 30 (1917), 170–174.

⁶ *Václav Burian*, Po stopách češství ačeské knihy v starším slovinském písemnictví, in: *Slavia* 8 (1928), 14–46.

⁷ Cf. *Mirko Rupel*, Slovenski protestantski pisci, Ljubljana 1966, 131.

words as *mošnja*, *služabnik*, *anež*, *vodec*, *bogastvo* (◌bog), *milost*, etc. These words, however, already occur in works written or published before Truber's earliest translations of the Scripture!⁸ Moreover, Burian's suggestion that words such as *mirnik*, *zmirnik*, *možica*, *pomilosrdje*, *poročenje*, *obraz*, *nedomiseln*, etc. might have been transferred by Truber to Slovenian with the aid of Reschelius' [Rešl's] *Dictionarium latino-bohemicum* (1560) or *Dictionarium Bohemico-latinum* (1562) is highly questionable, for most of the words listed there may be traced in Truber's writings at least since 1557.

*France Kidrič*⁹ cites the conclusions reached by Breznik and Grafenauer. As a similar approach is adopted by all subsequent surveys, I do not present them in detail.

According to *Jože Pogačnik*,¹⁰ Truber's translation of TE 1555 was based on Luther and the Vulgate, and verified against the Greek original by Vergerius.

The analysis of *France Rozman*¹¹ argues that Truber's translation followed Luther rather than the Greek original, displaying „considerable autonomy“ at times. The parallel passages cited and analysed mostly stem from Matthew's Gospel, but also from elsewhere. Unfortunately, Rozman, too, failed to consult Erasmus' translation, or many passages might have been interpreted differently.

Jože Rajhman's article on the translation methodology of Slovenian Protestants¹² presents the then European view on translation, placing in its context some of Truber's statements on translating.

Expounding on the thoughts voiced by Truber in his introduction to TE 1555, *Janko Moder*¹³ allows the possibility that Truber might have acquired some Greek and Hebrew on his own, or given the final form to passages interpreted by his helpers and collaborators from the originals. He compares Truber's and Dalmatin's translations of two biblical passages (Luke 7,41–47 and Luke 16,11–17), as well as their Greek originals and Luther's translations, noting Truber's «independence» of Luther in rendering certain

⁸ E.g. *mošnja* (TC 1550, TC 1555), *služabnik* (TC 1550, TC 1555), *vodec* (TC 1555), *bogastvo* (bog) (TC 1550, TC 1555), *milost* (since TC 1550), etc.

⁹ *France Kidrič*, *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva od začetkov do Zoisove smrti*, Ljubljana 1929–1938, 69.

¹⁰ *Jože Pogačnik*, *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva 1: Srednji vek, reformacija in protireformacija*, manirizem in barok, Maribor 1968, 149.

¹¹ *France Rozman*, *Kako je Trubar prevajal Sveto pismo Nove zaveze?*, in: *Bogoslovni vestnik* 46/3 (1986), 227–245.

¹² *Jože Rajhman*, *Metodologija prevajanja slovenskih protestantov*, in: *Štiristo let prevajanja na Slovenskem*, Ljubljana 1985 (*Zbornik Društva slovenskih književnih prevajalcev* 10), 27–32.

¹³ *Janko Moder*, *Ob Trubarjevih «treh rečeh»*, in: *Štiristo let prevajanja na Slovenskem*, Ljubljana 1985 (*Zbornik Društva slovenskih književnih prevajalcev* 10), 33–66.

places. By his own admission, Moder did not consult Erasmus' translation, relying instead on the research conducted so far.

*Kajetan Gantar*¹⁴ addresses the translations of individual words in Truber's and Dalmatin's versions of Paul's speech before the Areopagus. While he finds the notion of Truber and Dalmatin slavishly clinging to Luther's translation exaggerated, he does not attempt to identify their source texts.

In her article on the problems of Truber's style, *Martina Orožen*¹⁵ opines that calques of syntactic patterns occur in Truber's translations more frequently than in Dalmatin's, although both translated the Bible via Luther (her authority for this is Rozman's paper). What is important, she points out that the questions of authentic versus calqued syntactic patterns may be solved by comparing the syntactic encodings in Truber, Krelj, and Dalmatin against parallel German and Latin texts. The above conclusion thus appears premature, even in the light of her own words.

*Klaus Detlef Olof*¹⁶ compares Luther's and Truber's understanding of translation activity.

Comparing Truber's and Dalmatin's translations of David's Psalter in relation to the Hebrew original, the Latin Vulgate, and Luther's German version, *Francka Premk*¹⁷ believes that Truber's translation of the Psalms takes into account – directly or indirectly – the Hebrew text as well. Her book «Korenine slovenskih psalmov»¹⁸ portrays through an extensive, but methodologically inconsistent analysis the relations obtaining between the Hebrew original of the scriptural Psalter, some of its translations into Latin, German, and Modern Slovenian, and Truber's and Dalmatin's translations. Her study is entirely subordinated to proving that Truber, when translating the Psalms, considered the original Hebrew text as well. While she does acknowledge that Truber's expansions of meaning often mirror Gwalther's translation, her presentation of these findings, too, is methodologically inadequate. As for

¹⁴ Kajetan *Gantar*, Konfrontacija med antiko in krščanstvom: Nekaj opažanj ob Trubarjevem in Dalmatinovem prevodu Pavlovega govora na Areopagu, in: Štiristo let prevajanja na Slovenskem, Ljubljana 1985 (Zbornik Društva slovenskih književnih prevajalcev 10), 83–87.

¹⁵ Martina *Orožen*, Gramatična in leksikalna preobrazba Dalmatinovega knjižnega jezika ob Japljevem prevodu biblije (1584 – 1784 – 1802), in: Protestantismus bei den Slowenen – Protestantizem pri Slovencih, Wien 1984 (Wiener slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 13), 153–179.

¹⁶ Klaus *Detlef Olof*, Mittelalterliches und neuzeitliches Sprachverständnis am Beispiel der Übersetzer Luther und Trubar, in: 16. stoletje v slovenskem jeziku, književnosti in kulturi, Ljubljana 1986 (Obdobja 6), 517–527.

¹⁷ Francka *Premk*, Primerjava med Trubarjevem in Dalmatinovim prevodom Davidovega psaltra v razmerju do hebrejskega izvornika, latinske Vulgate in nemške Luthrove predloge, in: 16. stoletje v slovenskem jeziku, književnosti in kulturi, Ljubljana 1986 (Obdobja 6), 529–543.

¹⁸ Francka *Premk*, *Korenine slovenskih psalmov*, Ljubljana 1992.

Musculus' translation, no comparison is carried out at all despite references to Musculus' «commentaries» on the Psalter, these, however, are said to have served Truber merely as «auxiliary suggestions» (alongside Gwalther's text). Nor does Premk engage in any comparative research to substantiate her thesis that Musculus' detailed glosses on particular words merely clarified for Truber the original Hebrew text. Indeed, Musculus' work appears to have been included in her research only when the text of the study was already completed. Methodologically, the most pressing omission is the failure to synthesise Truber's general method in translating the Psalms (which may have, of course, undergone some changes in the eleven years of his engagement with the Psalter).

*Matej Rode*¹⁹ lists the terms by which the Slovenian Protestant writers refer to «translating», describing their subsequent development. Moreover, in an article on translation in the Protestant period,²⁰ he cites and discusses the Slovenian Protestants' key statements on translating, lists the ten terms for translation, and questions whether translating sacred texts, even the Bible, as practised at the time was «translation» in the modern sense at all. This last reservation is rejected in the same volume by Majda Stanovnik²¹ and Kajetan Gantar.²²

A number of papers by *Igor Grdina*, later assembled in a book,²³ contain important remarks on Truber's knowledge of languages. Of particular importance to understanding Truber's translation work is the observation that, in Truber's view, the southwestern and southeastern varieties of spoken German were not identical.²⁴

Majda Stanovnik's articles on translation during the Protestant period have been collected and supplemented in a monograph, «Slovenski literarni prevod 1550–2000». It is owing to the well-conceived chapter «Trubarjev prevod konstituira slovensko slovstvo»²⁵ («Truber's Translation Constitutes

¹⁹ *Matej Rode*, *Od preobračanja do prevajanja: Prispevek k preučevanju prevajalskega izrazja*, in: *Štiristo let prevajanja na Slovenskem*, Ljubljana 1985 (Zbornik Društva slovenskih književnih prevajalcev 10), 103–105.

²⁰ *Matej Rode*, *Slovenski protestantizem in prevajanje*, in: *16. stoletje v slovenskem jeziku, književnosti in kulturi*, Ljubljana 1986 (Obdobja 6), 555–561.

²¹ *Majda Stanovnik*, *Razprava o prevajanju*, in: *16. stoletje v slovenskem jeziku, književnosti in kulturi*, Ljubljana 1986 (Obdobja 6), 563–564.

²² *Kajetan Gantar*, *Nekaj misli o slovenskem protestantizmu in prevajanju*, in: *16. stoletje v slovenskem jeziku, književnosti in kulturi*, Ljubljana 1986 (Obdobja 6), 565–567.

²³ *Igor Grdina*, *Od Brižinskih spomenikov do razsvetljenstva*, Maribor 1999, 121, 176–177, 195.

²⁴ In fact, the difference between the colloquial German familiar to Truber and, on the other hand, Luther's literary language was considerable even by native speakers' standards. According to *Grafenauer*, *O Trubarjevem prevodu evangelijev*, 298, South German printers would originally furnish their reprints of Luther's Bible translation with glossaries, explaining the words unfamiliar to the South Germans.

²⁵ *Majda Stanovnik*, *Slovenski literarni prevod 1550–2000*, Ljubljana 2005, 13–42.

the Slovenian Literature») that the present discussion does not comment at length on Truber's statements on translation (although they are quoted for transparency's sake). Stanovnik's chapter compares Truber's and Luther's views on translation and their reasons and motives for translating, focusing on such issues as the (im)possibility of translation, its legitimacy, cause and aim, the relation between the original and translation, and between the translation and its reader. In addition, she addresses the questions of the translator's tasks and qualities. Here she draws a demarcation line between Truber's views on translating the Bible, where strict adherence to the source text is required, and translating an auxiliary, non-biblical text, which is expanded and clarified by the translator as it unfolds. Although this procedure seems to blur the line between translation and interpretation, Stanovnik demonstrates that Truber did distinguish between the two. She believes that Greek was not as inaccessible to him as he claimed, but that he was aware of the clear-cut hierarchy of his language knowledge: it is enough to «understand» the language of the original (for his own part, he claims to understand Latin, German, and Italian) but necessary to «know» the language of the translation (as he knows Slovenian). Moreover, Truber was aware that the demands of individual texts vary; his own translations are classified in Stanovnik's analysis as «literary».

The chapter on the literariness of the Bible and of its translation²⁶ analyses and compares several translations of two biblical passages for their literary quality (Matthew 14, 1–12 and Matthew 25, 1–13): the original text of the first passage is thus compared to the Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Truber (1555), Dalmatin (1584), and Kastelec (1680), while the analysis of the second is extended to still additional parallels – Anonymous after Stapleton (ca. 1600), Hren-Čandek (1613), and Schönleben (1672). Having limited her analysis to the translation of Matthew's Gospel, and further narrowed it down to the «literary» aspect rather than the source vs. translation relation, Stanovnik still claims in her introduction that Truber relied primarily on the Vulgate and the German Bible, and partly on Erasmus' expositions, although most of the examples analysed actually reveal the influence of Erasmus' New Testament translation.

Majda Merše has analysed in detail several individual characteristics of translations, particularly of those with German source texts. Thus she compares the translation solutions involving the types of verbal action as used by 16th century Slovenian Protestant writers in the light of their German sources (Luther, Spangenberg),²⁷ aspect and tense in Truber's and Dalmatin's Bible

²⁶ *Stanovnik*, Slovenski literarni prevod 1550–2000, 129–166.

²⁷ *Majda Merše*, Vrste glagolskega dejanja v delih slovenskih protestantskih piscev 16. stoletja in tuje prevodne predloge, in: *Slavistična revija* 46/1–2 (1998), 55–71.

translations,²⁸ and the lexical characteristics of the Postils – again, in further comparison with the source texts.²⁹

Finally, the topic recurs in a number of works which merely repeat or quote the above conclusions.

2. *Primus Truber's Own Account of His Sources for Bible Translations*

Primus Truber repeatedly describes his approach to translating scriptural texts. True, his references to his sources are partly aimed at underlining the theological appropriateness and correctness of his translation, but his statements nevertheless provide us with an appropriate framework for further discussion, and are therefore worth quoting.

- For TE 1555, he (or rather, both he and Petrus Paulus Vergerius, as indicated by the plural) allegedly used the Greek original, complementing it with translations from the Greek into Latin, German, and Italian, but chiefly with Erasmus' translation of the New Testament; of great help were also Erasmus' «Annotationes».³⁰
- In the report sent to Duke Christoph of Württemberg on 9 February 1555, Vergerius records his attempts to persuade Truber to translate the New Testament into Slovenian: Truber would follow Luther's translation, and then other translations would be consulted for comparison as well.³¹
- Truber, in a letter to Heinrich Bullinger dated 13 September 1555, claims to know neither Greek nor Hebrew.³²
- In the same letter to Bullinger (13 Sept 1555), he tells of Vergerius' at-

²⁸ Majda *Merše*, Vid in čas v Trubarjevih in Dalmatinovih biblijskih prevodih, in: 36. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture, Ljubljana 2000, 21–34.

²⁹ Majda *Merše*, Prepoznavnost in značilnosti besedja slovenskih protestantskih postil 16. stoletja, Slavistična revija 55/1–2 (2007), 65–84.

³⁰ «Mi uletim nashim preurazhenu fmo ueden imeili pred febo, ta praui ftudeniz tiga Nouiga Teftamenta, kir ie Gershki piffan, rauen tiga fmo mi tudi gledali na tu preurazhene tih nouih inu ftarih vuzhenikou, kateri fo ta nou Teftament is tiga Gerskiga Iefika vta Latinski, Nemshki inu vlashki preobernali, Ner vezh pag na Erafmou Roterdamou nou Teftament, htimu fo nom nega annotationes fylnu pomagale.»

³¹ «[...] monebam illum ipsum ministrum [sc. Truberum], quo pacto procedere deberet in negotio versionis in linguam Sclavicam, ut scilicet Martini Lutheri versionem sequeretur, donec conferremus cum aliis versionibus [...]» (*Grafenauer*, O Trubarjevem prevodu evangelijev, 298).

³² «Der herr Vergerius [...], der hat dits jar mit mir vill gehandelt, damit mich vnterstuende aus latein vnd teutsch das neu testament in die windisch sprach zuuerdolmetschen, welches jme, nachdem mich vntüglich, dieweil griechisch noch hebraisch nicht kann, erkhen, abgeschlagen, bis mir von der ganzen khirchen meines vatterlands ist aufgeregt» (*Jože Rajbman*, Pisma Primoža Trubarja, Ljubljana 1986, 24).

- tempts to persuade him to translate the New Testament into Slovenian via Latin and German.³³
- In TT 1557 he says (when explaining how time-consuming the work is!) that he keeps on his desk two Latin, two German, and one Italian New Testament translation, as well as a Croatian missal and Erasmus' «Annotationes» and other commentaries.³⁴
 - In TT 1557 he claims not to know an iota of Hebrew, nor to read Greek³⁵ very well.³⁶
 - In a letter to Bullinger dated 13 March 1557, he expresses his approval of an Italian Bible translation received from Zürich (most likely Brucioli's translation; cf. Grafenauer 298).³⁷
 - In a letter to Hans Ungnad dated 4 November 1561, he suggests that Stephan Consul should translate as he has done himself: after Luther and others.³⁸
 - In a letter to Bullinger dated 1 February 1559, he reports that the works of Gwalther and Musculus have proved most helpful in his translation of the Psalter into Slovenian,³⁹ adding that he has already translated and annotated 33 Psalms.
 - In his 1562 preface to the Glagolitic first part of the New Testament, Truber reports that the Croatian New Testament translation has required

³³ See previous footnote.

³⁴ «Vnd nachdem mein dolmetschen gehet langsam von stat / von wegen meines schwären Predigamptes / dem ich zu fordest außwarten muß / Vnd das ich im dolmetschen alweg zwey Lateinisch / zwey Teutsch / vnd ein Wälsch new Testament / Jtem / ein Crobatisch Meßbuch / wölches newlich zu Venedig mit Latinischen Buchstaben gedruckt worden / vor mir muß haben / vnd ehe ich ein jedlichs wort / insorderheit einer jeder Translation / auch die Annotationes Erasmi / vnd andere Commentaria darüber besihe vnd erwege / wölcher Translation ich volgen soll / mit dem gehet vil zeit hin» (TT 1557: b 4b).

³⁵ For a good explanation of the two passages on his unfamiliarity with Greek, see *Grđina*, Od Brižinskih spomenikov do razsvetljenstva, 188–189.

³⁶ «Ich kenne kein Hebreischen buchstaben / Griechisch kan nicht wol lesen / wölche zwo Sprachen einem jeden / der die Bibel verdolmetschen wil / zu forderst von nötten seind / das er sie wol vnd grundtlich verstehe. Vnd wiewol (Gott lob) die Bibel / vnd sonderlich bey disen vnseren zeiten / von jren etlichen / auß dem Hebreischen vnd Griechischen / in die Lateinische / Teutsche vnd Wälsche sprach / gut vnd verstendig ist verdolmetscht / wie alle Gelernten dauon zeugen» (TT 1557: a 4a–a 4b).

³⁷ «Porro rogo tuam pietatem, vt me fideliter commendes tuis symmistis, collegis et fratribus, precipue tum domino Bernhardo de Senis et dicas ei, quod illa translatio Italica, que nuper a quodam Jtalo Geneue facta, mihi apprime placet et me multum iuuat in versione Schlauica» (*Rajhman*, Pisma Primoža Trubarja, 27).

³⁸ «Sprach jch, er soll dollmetschen, wie jchs dem Luthero vnnd anndern nach recht verdolmetscht hab» (*Rajhman*, Pisma Primoža Trubarja, 97).

³⁹ «Gruest die herren ewr chorbrueder, furnemblich den herrn Gualtherum jn meinen namen; sein arbeit vnd des Musculi jn psalterium dient mir gantz wol zu meinem windischen psalter. Jch hab schon 33 psalm vertirt, hab auch die argumenta vor vnd annotationes jn margine vnd expositiones in fine wie der herr Walther gesetzt» (*Rajhman*, Pisma Primoža Trubarja, 36).

more than one Latin, German, and Italian – and, because of certain words, even Czech – Bible translation, but that the translators are chiefly following the versions by Erasmus and Luther.⁴⁰

- In his preface to TPs 1566, Truber states that he has translated the Psalms in eleven years, mainly on the basis of Latin translations but also of German ones. The statement is probably intended to forestall those who might reproach him for not following Luther's version.⁴¹ Such reproaches indeed arose, as is evident from a letter written by Matthias Klombner to Gallus: Klombner taxes Truber with having translated the Psalter via Zwingli rather than Luther,⁴² which is not supported by our analysis.

3. An Analysis of the Sources for Truber's Bible Translations and of His Basic Translation Procedures

For a well-grounded discussion of Musculus' and Gwalther's influence on Truber's translation of the Psalter – the only Old Testament text translated by Truber – we should first examine Truber's approach to the New Testament books, which form the bulk of his translation oeuvre, since his translation of the Psalter would not have departed significantly from his established procedures. To this end we have analysed five passages from various New Testament books, followed by five Psalms from various parts of the Psalter. To facilitate comparison, we have further analysed the relevant translations by Georg Dalmatin, the first translator of the complete Bible into Slovenian, who – as established beyond doubt – followed Martin Luther's version.⁴³

⁴⁰ «Vnnd auff das E. Kün. May. vnnd andere / auch ein wissen haben / auß wölchen Büchern / vnnd was für ein sachen wir verdolmetschen / vnd ob wir mit vnserm Dolmetschen / Trucken / Geschriftten vnnd Buchstaben / vngedadelt / vnuerspott pleiben / vnd vor Gelerten der heiligen Schriftt / vnd der Crobatischen Sprache Erfarnen / bestehn werden oder nicht: So will ich hiemit / dauon auch ein kurtzen bericht thun. Wie wir haben vnnd gebrauchten gleichwol / mehr dann ein / Lateinische / Teutsche / vnnd Wällische (vnnd / von wegen ettlicher alten / Windischen Wörter / ein Behömische) Dolmetschungen der Bibel / Aber wir halten vns / vnnd volgen am Maisten / des Eraßmi vnnd Lutheri Translation. Vnd seind des vorhabens / wenn wir das new Testament haben vollendet / als dann so wöllen wir durch Brieff vnnd zuschreiben / bey den Hochgelerten Theologen der Hebreyschen sprach vnd Geschriftten erfarnen / vnd Vniuersiteten Rath suchen / wölcher Dollmetschung / es sey im Latein / Teutsch oder Wällisch / wir doch fürnämlich vnnd am maisten volgen sollen» (Oskar *Sakrausky*, Primus Truber: Deutsche Vorreden zum slowenischen und kroatischen Reformationswerk, Wien/Ljubljana 1989 [Studien und Texte zur Kirchengeschichte und Geschichte 5/1], 218).

⁴¹ «Ieft fem lete Buque ainaift leit po zhafu inu resmishlaie tomazhil, Inu fdai Shtyri Mefce poredu drukal. Aku fe sledna beffeda steim Nemshkim Tolmazhenem nefgliha, Satu fe ne fmotite, Ieft fem vezh is Latinskih koker Nemshkih Tolmazherieu tomazhil.»

⁴² «Fragt, warum er den psalter nach dem Zwingl vertirt vnd nit Luthern gevolgt hat» (Mirko *Rupel*, Povabilo in odpoved Gašperju Melissandru, in: Slavistična revija 8/3–4 (1955), 220).

⁴³ The passages analysed include Matthew 26,17–25, Luke 1,26–38, Romans 3,21–31, 1 Corin-

3.1 *Truber's Translation of New Testament Texts*

We have compared the translations of the selected passages to all accessible works which might have been followed by Truber and Dalmatin:

1. Luther's German translation of the complete Bible, after the 1545 edition (LB)
2. Erasmus' Latin translation of the New Testament, after the 1542 edition (EB)
3. The Latin Vulgate (Vu)
4. The «Zwingli» Bible in German, after the 1531 edition (ZB)
5. Brucioli's Italian translation of the New Testament (BB)
6. Bernardin's lectionary (Be 1885)
7. The original Greek text of the New Testament (GB)

As revealed by our analysis, Truber based his New Testament translation on Erasmus' version, occasionally revising it with Luther's. Dalmatin, by contrast, strictly followed Luther, adhering to Truber's text wherever it did not depart from Luther's.

Before examining the relations between Truber's translation on the one hand and Erasmus' and Luther's on the other, we must, however, first outline and explain the role of the other examined translations as it emerges from the analysed passages.

3.1.1 *The Vulgate*

The differences between Erasmus' translation and the Vulgate, although numerous, are for the most part such as to be easily obliterated in translation. Nevertheless, there have remained enough evident discrepancies for a well-nigh unanimous agreement between researchers that Truber followed Luther, rather than the Vulgate, «with certain departures».

An examination of those departures reveals that, wherever the difference between the Vulgate and Erasmus is capable of being reflected in the Slovenian translation, the source followed by Truber is Erasmus. Listed below are the most conspicuous examples where Truber follows Erasmus while departing from both the Vulgate and Luther.

thians 2,1–5, 2 Thessalonians 2,1–4, and Psalms 1, 2,1–5, 30, 147, 150, in all of Truber's and Dalmatin's translations (the works are listed in the Bibliography section). Dalmatin's texts are taken from DB 1584, with due attention to potential major variations in the earlier editions. Truber's texts are taken from TE 1555 (Matthew 26,17–25), TT 1557 (Luke 1,26–38), TT 1560 (Romans 3,21–31), TL 1561 (1 Corinthians 2,1–5), TL 1567 (2 Thessalonians 2,1–4), and the Psalms from Ps 1566. We have also checked TT 1581–82 for variations, drawing attention to them if necessary.

<i>Passage</i>	<i>Truber</i>	<i>Erasmus</i>	<i>Vulgate</i>
Luke 1,28	periatliua	gratiosa	gratia plena
Romans 3,22	htim vřem, inu zhes vře te, kir Veruio	in omnes et super omnes eos qui credunt	super omnes qui credunt
Romans 3,24	ampag	autem	/
Romans 3,26	vletim	in hoc	/
Mark 16,2	viutro sgudo tiga peruiga dne tih Sobot	summo diluculo diei primi sabbatorum	valde mane una sabbatorum
1 Corinthians 2,1	pryzhouane Boshye	testimonium Dei	testimonium Christi

These major differences between Erasmus and the Vulgate could be identified even on the presupposition that Truber translated the other passages via Luther. As it transpires, however, that Truber followed Erasmus, the number of such passages is naturally much higher.

What, then, was the role of the Vulgate in Truber's translating? While Truber did not adopt it as a constant source text, he may well have followed it *in places*. The passages analysed yield a single example of this kind:

<i>Passage</i>	<i>Truber</i>	<i>Erasmus</i>	<i>Vulgate</i>
1 Corinthians 2,3	vti shibkoti	per infirmitatem	in infirmitate

Luther translates the phrase as «mit schwacheit». Truber, while not at variance with Erasmus, adopts the same solution as the Vulgate.

3.1.2 The «Zwingli» German Bible (ZB)

The observation concerning the Vulgate may be extended to all texts under comparison. With respect to the differences that could affect translation, the ZB text is identical to the LB text. In the few places displaying perceptible differences, Truber follows Luther. While ZB thus certainly never served Truber as a source text, it was an occasional aid in translating individual words. In the passages under discussion, Truber may have followed ZB in the following cases:

<i>Passage</i>	<i>Truber</i>	<i>Zwingli</i>	<i>Luther / Erasmus</i>
Matthew 26,24	Ta syn tiga zhloueka gre kiakai	Deß Menschen sun gadt dahin	Des menschen Son gehet zwar da hin / Filius quidem hominis vadit
Matthew 26,25	Moifter	meyster	rabbi / Rabbi
1 Corinthians 2,4	vlepih vkunshtnih beřfedah	in hüpschen worten	in vernüfftigen Reden / in persuasoriis

<i>Passage</i>	<i>Truber</i>	<i>Zwingli</i>	<i>Luther / Erasmus</i>
2 Thessalonians 2,4	vše tu, kir fe prai Bug, oli kar fe moli	alles das Gott genennet oder geeret wirt	alles das Gott oder Gottes- dienst heisset / omnem, qui dicitur Deus aut numen

In the first example, ZB may have influenced the omission of the particle. Similarly, the translation of the term *rabbi* (which is used by Truber as well, but as a translation of Erasmus' *magister*) as *mojster* is most plausibly attributed to ZB. Rendering the term *numen/Gottesdienst* as *vše tu, kar fe moli* – that is, *alles das geeret wirt* – likewise suggests Zwingli's model. The most interesting case, however, is the rendering of the Latin word *persuasoria*, translated by Luther in the sense of *kunštne/razumne besede* [«prudent speech»] and by Zwingli as *lepe besede* [«pretty words»], while the meaning of the Latin term lies somewhere in between. Here, Truber may have combined Luther's and Zwingli's interpretations.

3.1.3 Brucioli, Bernardin's Lectionary, and the Greek New Testament

No noticeable parallels have been discovered with Brucioli's text (1552), Bernardin's lectionary (Be 1885), or the Greek New Testament text,⁴⁴ especially Matthew's Gospel, for which the Greek text is listed as one of the sources.

As BB 1552 follows Erasmus' translation quite faithfully, Truber may have used it as a kind of Latin-Italian dictionary and a syntactically simplified version of his source, Erasmus. Wherever Brucioli and Erasmus disagree (on average once or twice per page), Truber regularly follows Erasmus. In the rare cases where he does give precedence to Brucioli's version, a solution identical to Brucioli's is invariably found in Luther (who is the more likely source).⁴⁵

The texts from Bernardin's lectionary diverge from Truber's solutions (also) with respect to the lexicon, which suggests that Truber consulted them rarely, if at all. The passages Luke 1,26–38, Matthew 21,1–9, and Mark 16,1–8 have revealed no parallels. Even if Truber actually did consult Bernardin's lectionary, it has left no discernible traces in the Slovenian texts. A more accurate assessment of its role would thus require nothing short of an overall comparison between Bernardin's and Truber's lexicons, but it is ques-

⁴⁴ This is additionally supported by *Rozman*, *Kako je Trubar prevajal Sveto pismo Nove zaveze?*, 227–240.

⁴⁵ E.g. Romans 3,25: TT: *skufi to Vero vnega kry*; LB: *durch den glauben in seinem Blut*; BB: *per la fede nel sangue di esso*; or 2 Thessalonians 2,4: TL: *koker Bug*; LB: *als ein Gott*; BB: *come Iddio*.

tionable whether this time-consuming comparison would yield any tangible results.

3.1.4 Truber vs. Erasmus

Although Truber wrote as early as TE 1555 that he had chiefly relied on Erasmus' New Testament translation, the scholarship to date has – as demonstrated above – considered as his basic source Luther's translation, while the role of an important aid was attributed, above all, to Erasmus' «Annotationes». The analysis of selected passages, however, has identified as Truber's basic source Erasmus' Latin translation of the New Testament.⁴⁶ This, of course, is not to say that Truber did not follow Luther as well: rather, he primarily followed Erasmus, and Luther only occasionally. The tendency is best illustrated by a comparison of Truber's and Dalmatin's translations of Luke 1,26–38 with those by Erasmus and Luther.

Truber in this passage consistently follows Erasmus, while Dalmatin follows Luther. Below are some examples:

<i>Truber</i>	<i>Erasmus</i>	<i>Luther</i>	<i>Dalmatin</i>
potle	autem	vnd	inu
Galileisku	Galilaeae	in Galilea	v'Galilei
timu	cui	mit namen	s'imenom
fakai ti fi neshla miloft	nacta es enim gratiam	du hast gnade ... funden	ti fi ... gnado nafhla
nega Ozheta	patris eius	seines vaters	njegoviga Ozheta
jelt moshā ne snam	virum non cognosco	von keinem Manne weis	od obeniga Moshā nevem
inu ni ... ie leta shesti meffiz	et hic mensis est sexus illi	vnd gehet itzt im sechsten mond	inu gre sdaj v'fhefti Melsez
po tui beffedi	secundum verbum tuum	wie du gesagt hast	kakor fi ti govuril
bode ... prauizhno fturil	iustificabit	machet	dela
od te mifli	a mente	von ewrem sinn	od val'he mifli

⁴⁶ It may not be amiss to point out here an article by Štefan Barbarič, or Primož Simoniti's conclusion to his monograph on humanism in the Slovenian countries. On the pages given below, they suggest that it would be worthwhile to re-examine Erasmus' influence on Truber's work, both original and translated: Štefan *Barbarič*, Stik Primoža Trubarja z mislijo Erazma Rotterdamskega, in: Zbornik za slavistiku 3, Novi Sad 1972, 87–98; Primož *Simoniti*, Humanizem na Slovenskem in slovenski humanisti do srede XVI. stoletja, Ljubljana 1979, 233–234.

Passages of great theological significance are less suitable for identifying the source text,⁴⁷ but even here Truber often surprises us with his «Erasmian» solutions. A case in point is a passage from the Epistle to the Romans (Romans 3,28), on which Luther discourses at length in his open letter on translation.⁴⁸ The issue at stake is the word *allein*, which Luther adds to the original «in the spirit of the German language», producing the following translation: «So halten wir es nu / Das der Mensch gerecht werde / on des Gesetzes werck / *alleine durch den Glauben*.» Erasmus, of course, has no equivalent of *only*: «Arbitramur igitur *fide* iustificari hominem absque operibus legis.» In this, Truber follows Erasmus in both editions, TT 1560 and TT 1581–82, although he revised for TT 1581–82 the text of this very passage, merely two lines further down, in accordance with Luther's. Truber's translation runs: «Satu mi terdno dershimo, De ta zhlouik bode Prauizhin sturien *skufi to Vero*, pres tih del te Poftaue.» Dalmatin, by contrast, follows Luther, although his translation is clearly based on Truber's: «satu my térdnu dèrshimo, de Zhlovik pravizhen poftane, pres del te Poftave, *le skusi vero*.» We find it highly significant that Truber purposely chose not to follow Luther in such a key passage.⁴⁹

3.1.5 Truber vs. Luther

For all that, the role of Luther's text in Truber's translations (as evident from Section 4) is far from negligible. Sometimes Truber complements Erasmus' text with Luther's «additions» (e.g. Romans 2,22: «Ieft pag gouorim od lete» vs. «Jch sage aber von solcher»), although not regularly (e.g. Romans 3,25: Truber does not insert the addition «die fur jm gilt»). Certain phrases – especially those demanding a (longer) descriptive paraphrase in Slovenian – and words are often closely modelled on Luther. Listed below are some typical examples from the analysed texts:

Passage	Truber	Luther	Erasmus
Romans 3.25	pod teim Boshym poterplenem	vnter göttlicher gedult	quae Deus toleravit

⁴⁷ For such passages, the translator will naturally collate several texts and commentaries.

⁴⁸ Truber's acquaintance with this work is suggested by a passage from TC (1575: 191–192) and, as noted by Rajhman, by the preface to TE 1555 (*Rajhman*, Metodologija prevajanja, 29).

⁴⁹ Luther, it is true, justifies his translation by appealing to the nature of the German language as opposed to Latin: «Ob's gleich die lateinische oder griechische Sprache in diesen Redeweisen allen nicht tut, so tut's doch die deutsche und ist's ihre Art, daß sie das Wort «allein» hinzusetzt, auf daß das Wort «nicht» oder «kein» um so völliger und deutlicher sei [...], denn man muss nicht die Buchstaben in der lateinischen Sprache fragen, wie man soll Deutsch reden, wie diese Esel tun» (Martin Luther, Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen, 1530). However, the nature of the Slovenian language might have «required» *le (only)* just as well if Truber had so wanted.

<i>Passage</i>	<i>Truber</i>	<i>Luther</i>	<i>Erasmus</i>
Matthew 26.17	Velikunozhnu Iagne	Osterlamb	pascha
Matthew 26.18	pufti tebi poueidati	lesst dir sagen	dicit
Matthew 26.24	Bulshe bi nemu billu	Es were jm besser	bonum erat ei
Matthew 21.9	kir fo naprei shli inu fad hodili	das vorgieng vnd nach- folget	quae praecedebant, et quae sequabantur
Mark 16.5	fanem dolgim belim guantom	ein lang weis Kleid	stola candida
Mark 16.6	Iefufa Nazarenufa tiga Cryshaniga	Jhesum von Nazareth den gecreutzigten	Iesum Nazarenum, qui fuit crucifixus

3.1.6 *Truber – Independently*

Finally, two of Truber's translation solutions in the passages discussed defy direct identification with any parallel source. These appear to be his original solutions, formed in the spirit of the Slovenian language or under the influence of biblical commentaries. Both are cited below:

<i>Passage</i>	<i>Truber</i>	<i>Erasmus</i>	<i>Luther</i>
Romans 3,23	eden mumu drugiga ne vela	non ... est distinctio	es ist ... kein vnterschied
Mark 16,1	shlahrne difezhe ko- rene inu shalbe	aromata	specerey

3.2 *Psalms*

Having outlined Truber's basic approach to translating New Testament texts, we may now address more competently his approach to Old Testament Psalms – the only Old Testament text at which he ever tried his hand. We have compared Truber's version of the Psalms with the following works:

1. Musculus' 1556 Latin translation of the Psalter, extensively annotated (MPs)
2. Gwalther's translation of the Psalter in the 1831 edition⁵⁰ (WPs)
3. Luther's 1545 German translation of the complete Bible (LB)
4. the Latin Vulgate (*iuxta LXX and iuxta Hebraeos*) (Vu)
5. the German «Zwingli» Bible, after the 1531 edition (ZB)

⁵⁰ The text of this edition is confirmed by *Premk*, Korenine, 702 to be a transcript of the original 1558 edition, which we have been, for all our efforts, unable to access.

6. the Hebrew Bible with a comprehensive lexical analysis, explanation of the Hebrew words, and Greek and English translations
7. the Greek text of the Old Testament (the Septuagint)

The Psalter, being Truber's only Old Testament translation, was the only one where he could not resort to Erasmus. The Psalms analysed and compared in our study suggest that his translation procedures were basically the same as with the New Testament books. As his basic source texts he adopted Musculus' Latin translation of the Psalter, extensively annotated, and Gwalther's German translation, occasionally consulting Luther's version as well. No passage, however, points to a direct translation from the original Hebrew text.

3.2.1 *Musculus*

Musculus' abundantly annotated translation of the Psalms from Hebrew into Latin (MPs 1556) represents, by the standards of the time, a more than exemplary work. Each Psalm is cited and annotated in the framework of the following sections:

1. *argumentum psalmi* (the content of the Psalm):
 - *usus huius psalmi* (its use and purpose)
 - *dispositio psalmi* (its structure)
2. the text in the Latin translation (given by lines, by sections, or as a whole)
3. *lectio* (a text-critical commentary on the text cited)
4. occasionally: *divisio* (the division of the Psalm)
5. *explanatio* (an explanation of individual lines, sections, or the whole)
6. *observatio* (additional theological and content-related observations on the meaning of individual lines, sections, or the whole)

Where necessary, the title of the Psalm (*titulus*) is explained at the beginning as well.

This work provided Truber with an excellent overview of most of the extant translations, as well as of the original. All passages where the translations significantly diverge from each other are furnished in Musculus' *lectio* section with an extensive apparatus, which includes both the original Hebrew text (*Ebraeus*) and a number of translations:

- Ancient Greek (the Septuagint or *Graecus*),⁵¹
- both Ancient Latin translations: *iuxta LXX* (*Vulgata Latina*) and *iuxta Hebraeos* (*Hieronimus*),

⁵¹ In all probability he used the printed edition of the Septuagint published by Aldus Manutius in Venice, 1518.

- the label «Chaldean translation» (*Chaldaeus*) presumably refers to the Aramaic Targum of Psalms; it is almost certainly taken from Justinianus' 1516 Psalter edition, which includes a column headed *Periphrasis chaldaea*,
- an Arabic translation (*Arabs*), almost certainly based on the Arabic text as found in Justinianus (Ju 1516),
- the following New Latin translations:
 - an interlinear Old Testament translation brought closer to the Hebrew (Latin – Hebrew), prepared at the beginning of the 16th century by Santes Pagninus (*Pagninus*),
 - a translation of the Psalms from the Hebrew, furnished in Venice, 1515, by Felix Pratensis (*Felix*),
 - Justinianus' multilingual Psalter edition, published in 1516 in Paris and Geneva (*Iustinianus*),
 - a work titled «Psalmorum omnium paraphrastica interpretatio», published in 1536 by Joannes Campensis at Roskild (*Campensis*),
 - a Psalter published by Martin Bucer in 1539 under the pseudonym of Aretius Felinus (*Felinus*),
 - a Latin translation of the Old Testament, «Biblia Tigurina» (the Psalms were translated by Leo Juda and Theodore Bibliander), published in 1543 in Zürich (*Tigurina*).

Since, moreover, Musculus' *explanatio* section discourses on particular characteristics of the Hebrew words, Truber was occasionally able to approach the Hebrew text even without understanding it. Musculus addresses in detail certain language-specific characteristics, such as the use of tenses in various languages, as well as the theological meanings of some polysemantic terms.

3.2.2 Truber's Approach to Psalm Translation

In translating the Psalter, Truber adopted essentially the same approach as in the case of the New Testament books. It can be proved that he combined – as he claims himself – the translations by Musculus, Gwalther, and Luther. An analysis of texts taken from the beginning, middle and end of the Psalter (Psalms 1, 2, 1–5, 30, 147, and 150) yields the following figures:

<i>Psalm</i>	<i>Following Musculus alone</i>	<i>Following Gwalther alone</i>	<i>Following Luther alone</i>	<i>Following Musculus or Luther</i>	<i>Following Gwalther or Luther</i>	<i>Total</i>
Psalm 1	9	1	0	3	1	14
Psalm 2.1–5	2	0	3	0	0	5
Psalm 30	8	7	2	2	6	25

<i>Psalm</i>	<i>Following Musculus alone</i>	<i>Following Gwalther alone</i>	<i>Following Luther alone</i>	<i>Following Musculus or Luther</i>	<i>Following Gwalther or Luther</i>	<i>Total</i>
Psalm 147	8	6	5	4	10	33
Psalm 150	0	1	1	0	3	5
<i>Total</i>	27	15	11	9	20	82

Of the 82 passages where the translations examined diverge, Musculus may be credited with 32 to 43 per cent of the solutions, Gwalther with 18 to 42, and Luther with 13 to 48 (there are a number of passages where Luther and Gwalther agree with each other). Parallel readings of most other Psalms (3–29, 90–100, 120–146, 148–149) yield a similar picture, while passages clearly suggesting a fourth source, such as the Hebrew text, have not been found.

Two-word translations, such as *častiti in hvaliti* (worship and praise) for *celebro*, *hvalo peti/hvaležno peti* (to sing praise/sing gratefully) for *psallo*, or *veselje in volja* (joy and will) for *voluntas*, are, as a rule, motivated by Musculus' commentary.⁵² Let us examine the last example. Truber uses the expressions *vellēlie inu vola*, «joy and will» (Psalm 1,2) to render the Hebrew פָּרַחֵי which is translated by Gwalther and Luther as *lust*, and by the Latin versions as *voluntas*. The scholarship to date has failed to solve the question why Truber should have employed two words in his translation. The answer, however, emerges readily enough after a consultation of Musculus' commentary (MPs 1556: 4), which states: «But the Hebrew term is broader than the translation *voluntas* (will), for the meaning of the former term involves a certain joy (*delectatio*) and delight (*voluptas*) or good mood (*iucunditas*).» This meaning, then, was added by Truber to the direct translation of the Latin word.⁵³

In addition to the examples charted above, there remain five passages where Truber diverges from all three, Musculus, Gwalther, and Luther.⁵⁴ Interestingly, none of them is directly motivated by Hebrew.⁵⁵ The facts out-

⁵² By contrast, a translation of this type is explained in *Premk*, Korenine, 63, as follows: «The amplification with the lexical addition *inu vola* is a result of Truber's own creativity.»

⁵³ A two-word translation, but a different one, is found in ZB as well: *lust und fröud*.

⁵⁴ This group represents 5.8 per cent of the total of 86 passages where the translations diverge.

⁵⁵ Three of the passages are modelled on Jerome (Trubar translates נִשְׁיִיחַ (Psalm 2,2) not as «his anointed one», which would match his major sources, but as *Criftul*, a solution only found in Jerome's translation – *Christum*); Psalm 147,4 (Truber adds the phrase *shnib*; Vu has *nomine suo*); and Psalm 147,11 (Truber adds the conjunction *inu* in imitation of *et*). One passage matches ZB (Psalm 30,11: the word *mene* is added for the sake of transparency), while one probably represents Truber's original reshaping of the text (Psalm 147,5: the translation is not literal: *le ne more preshteti* «cannot be counted» instead of *nima števila* «has no number»).

lined above should, of course, not mislead us into believing that Truber was unaware of the meanings of the Hebrew text – even if he (had) lacked all knowledge of Hebrew, he had commentaries at his disposal. What we contend is merely that he did not translate directly from the Hebrew.

Primus Truber's approach to translating biblical texts, as well as his choice of the source texts, suggest that he preferred to rely on the authoritative translations of his time, rather than interpret the original texts on his own or translate from the original languages. This is not to say, of course, that he was not interested in approaching the original texts – mastered by translators in varying degrees – or that he did not keep them at hand during the translation process (another question is how much Greek and Hebrew he actually knew). Above all he sought to avoid the risk that his interpretation might be inappropriate, infelicitous or even wrong.⁵⁶ In this light, Truber's approach to the New Testament texts is – from a theological perspective as well – highly interesting for his simultaneous reliance on Erasmus and Luther, while his approach to the Old Testament Psalms is especially fascinating for his use of Musculus and Gwalther alongside Luther. Musculus' influence in particular was very strong (partly due to the added commentaries), so that future evaluations of Musculus' work should not overlook his contribution to the final form of the Slovenian Psalms.

4. Summary

The paper examines the procedures of translating scriptural texts employed by the Slovenian Protestant writer Primus Truber (Primož Trubar) (1508–1586). Truber translated into Slovenian the entire New Testament, as well as the Old Testament Psalms. For a clearer view of Truber's procedures in translating the Psalms, the paper begins by citing his own statements on translating the New Testament texts, and continues by analysing these procedures in detail through the first half of the discussion. What transpires is that Truber translated the New Testament texts by combining two models: the Latin translation of the New Testament by Desiderius Erasmus and the German translation by Martin Luther. The paper continues by citing Truber's statements on translating the Psalms, summarising a comparative analysis of his potential models (Musculus, Gwalther, Luther, the Vulgate, the «Zwingli» Bible based on the edition of 1531, the Hebrew Bible, the Greek translation of the Old Testament – the Septuagint). In translating the Psalms, Truber appears to have pursued essentially the same method as with the New Testament: he combined three models, Musculus, Gwalther, and

⁵⁶ In Truber's day, a translator's mistake was prone to be regarded as heresy.

Luther, sometimes drawing on Musculus' notes as well, which is highlighted in the discussion (with an accompanying description of the structure of these notes). Of the 82 passages where the translations examined diverge, Musculus may be credited with 32 to 43 per cent of the solutions, Gwalther with 18 to 42, and Luther with 13 to 48 (there are a number of passages where two of the authors, Luther and Gwalther or Musculus and Luther, agree with each other). The results indicate the strong influence exerted by Musculus' and Gwalther's work in the Slovenian-speaking areas.

5. Main Sources

- TC 1550 Primus *Truber*, Catechismus, Tübingen 1550.
 TA 1550 Primus *Truber*, Abecedarium vnd der klein Catechismus, Tübingen 1550.
 TC 1555 Primus *Truber*, CATECHISMVS, Tübingen 1555.
 TE 1555 Primus *Truber*, TA EVANGELI SVETIGA MATEVSHA, Tübingen 1555.
 TT 1557 Primus *Truber*, TA PERVI DEIL TIGA NOVIGA TESTAMENTA, Tübingen 1557.
 TT 1560 Primus *Truber*, TA DRVGI DEIL TIGA NOVIGA TESTAMENTA, Tübingen 1560.
 TL 1561 Primus *Truber*, SVETIGA PAVLA TA DVA LISTY, Tübingen 1561.
 TPs 1566 Primus *Truber*, Ta Celi Pfalter Daidou, Tübingen 1566.
 TL 1567 Primus *Truber*, SVETIGA PAVLA LYSTVVI, Tübingen 1567.
 TPs 1567 Primus *Truber*, ENI PSALMI, TA CELI CATEHifmus, Tübingen 1567.
 TC 1575 Primus *Truber*, CATEHISMVS SDVEIMA ISLAGAMA, Tübingen 1575.
 TT 1577 Primus *Truber*, NOVIGA TESTAMENTA PVSLEDNI DEIL, Tübingen 1577.
 TT 1581–82 Primus *Truber*, TA CELI NOVI TESTAMENT, Tübingen 1581–1582.
 DB 1584 Georg *Dalmatin*, BIBLIA, Wittenberg 1584.
 BB Antonio *Brucioli* (transl.), Nuovo testamento di Giesu Christo salvatore nostro, Lyon 1552.
 Be 1885 *Bernardin* Splječanin, Lekcionarij Bernardina Splječanina po prvom izdanju od god. 1495, Zagreb 1885.
 EB Desiderius *Erasmus Roterodamus*, Novum testamentum per D. Erasmum Roterodamum novißime recognitum, Parisiis 1542.

- GB Greek text of the New Testament.
Ju Augustinus *Justinianus* (transl.), Psalterium, hebraeum, graecum, arabicum et chaldaicum, cum tribus latinis interpretationibus et glossis, Genuae 1516.
LB 1545 Die Luther-Bibel: Originalausgabe 1545 und revidierte Fassung 1912: 2. Ausgabe, Berlin 2000 (Digitale Bibliothek 29).
MPs Wolfgang *Musculus*, In sacrosanctum Daudidis Psalterium Commentarii, Basileae 1556.
Vu Vulgate, 1969.
WPs Rudolph *Gwalther*, Die kleine Bibel: Oder der Psalter Davids, Zürich 1831.
ZB Ulrich *Zwingli*, Die gantze Bibel, Zürich 1531.

Kozma Ahačič, Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Ljubljana

