

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE
MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK
THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. VI

January, 1935

No. 1

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword. Theo. Laetsch	1
"May God Preserve unto Us a Pious Ministry!" L. Fuerbringer	12
A Comparison of the King James and the Douay Version. Geo. A. W. Vogel	18
Die Philister. P. E. Kretzmann	25
Der Schriftgrund fuer die Lehre von der satisfactio vicaria. P. E. Kretzmann	33
Dispositionen ueber die altkirchliche Evangelienreihe....	35
Miscellanea.....	46
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.....	54
Book Review. — Literatur.....	73

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein *weiden*, also dass er die Schafe unterweise, wie sie rechte Christen sollen sein, sondern auch daneben den Woelfen *wehren*, dass sie die Schafe nicht angreifen und mit falscher Lehre verfuehren und Irrtum einfuehren. — *Luther*.

Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr bei der Kirche behaelt denn die gute Predigt. — *Apologie, Art. 24.*

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?
1 Cor. 14, 8.

Published for the
Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.



ARCHIV

the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, avoid all secular occupations which might draw them away from their sacred office, beware lest they unscrupulously and selfishly solicit a call, and conduct themselves in a manner causing the congregation to hold the Gospel in due reverence." A *Seelsorger*, too, needs a *Seelsorger*. Of one outstanding pious pastor and theologian—I cannot recall just now who it was—it is reported that he preferred the younger and more modest brethren in the ministry as his *Seelsorger* that he might not be influenced by the person, but give his whole attention to the word spoken by that brother. At the same time the public and private words of a trusted and experienced president, visitor, or older brother in office will do much, by the grace and faithfulness of God and with the aid of diligent and fervent and persistent prayer on our part, to preserve among us a pious ministry and to keep our church-life free of unwholesome influences.

David said to Solomon: "Be strong therefore and show thyself a man and keep the charge of the Lord, thy God," 1 Kings 2, 2. 3. We need to have that same word addressed to ourselves in these times. With faint-heartedness we can accomplish nothing. "Show thyself a man." God needs men to carry on His work, men who are firm and who refuse to retreat. "And keep the charge of the Lord, thy God." Wait on the ministry with which you have been entrusted. That includes everything. Serve God! Do what God expects of you!

L. FUERBRINGER.

A Comparison of the King James and the Douay Version.

A conference paper; somewhat abridged.

The treatment of this subject is occasioned by the jubilee of Luther as translator. It was the example of Luther that spurred others to action in giving the Holy Scriptures to the people in their own vernacular. In the era of the Reformation the Bible was translated into practically all the leading languages of Europe. Luther's work was the pattern for all of them. Luther finished the New Testament in 1522; Tyndale followed with his English translation of the New Testament in 1525. It was done partly in Hamburg and partly in Wittenberg, Cologne, and Worms. It was printed in 15,000 copies. The beauty of diction in the King James Version is due to Tyndale's translation. Miles Coverdale, in translating the Bible into English, used Luther's version and the Vulgate as the basis. This version, to use the very words of its subtitle, was "faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn into English" and was published under the authority of Thomas Cromwell in 1535, one year after Luther's complete Bible had appeared. Two years later Matthew's Bible

appeared, but it was never popular. Besides the text it contained caustic comments against Romanism. Its text was a compilation of the two preceding versions. A series of versions and editions followed. The Great Bible, the first to be "appointed to be read in churches," was a large folio volume put at some convenient place in churches, so that it might be read by the people. Besides the Great Bible there were the editions by Taverner, the Geneva or "Breeches Bible," the Bishops' Bible, a version made by a group of bishops, which, however, never became popular. The Geneva Bible was the most popular version until 1611. It omitted the Apocrypha, the first one to do it, was a small portable volume, sold at a low cost, and passed through 120 editions. The Geneva Bible continued to be printed in England till 1616, in Amsterdam till 1644. The Bishops' Bible appeared in twenty editions, the last appearing in 1606; its last edition of the New Testament in 1618. This is an eloquent testimonial to the avidity with which the English-speaking people read the Scriptures. It was a golden age of Bible-reading.

One need not stretch his imagination to see that Rome could not sit idly by and permit the world to read the Bible in the vernacular of the people without some counter-move. The Bible was read by no means only by Protestants. These translations, or versions, were Protestantism's most effective weapons while Rome stood empty-handed, without a suitable polemic weapon to protect itself over against those of its own people who were reaching out to these Protestant translations. Rome's official Bible, the only authentic version of Scripture since the days of Trent, was the Vulgate, available only in Latin. Rome was in a dilemma in that Bible-reading age. But it has a shrewdness of its own; it meets emergencies in a way both unique and cunning. When in a land governed by a monarch, Rome will leave no stone unturned to provide that monarch; when in a land where the constitutional principle of separation of Church and State is established, Rome will submit to that principle to its own advantage; if education is the watchword, Rome builds schools and universities, while illiteracy is encouraged in other Roman Catholic lands; when the Bible is read extensively, Rome will produce a Bible.

The version that ensued was the Douay Version. It received its name from the city of Douay in Northeastern France. Sometimes it is called the Reims-Douay Version, since the New Testament was completed in Reims in 1582, just fifty-seven years after Tyndale's New Testament. The Old Testament was completed in 1609 in the city of Douay. Douay is noted in history as a place of refuge for English Catholics. Catholic books to be distributed in England were published in Douay. Dr. Allen, in 1568, established an English college in that city for the education of priests for service in England.

During the French Revolution both the college and the printing-presses were driven out of France and reestablished in Durham, England. The translators were Drs. William Allen, Gregory Martin, and Bristow. The title-page says that the Douay Version was "faithfully translated out of the authentical Latin," meaning, of course, the Vulgate, which had been declared authentic, of equal authority with the original Hebrew and Greek texts, by the Council of Trent (1546). Waterworth, p. 19: "Moreover, the same sacred and holy synod ordains and declares that the said old Vulgate edition be in public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions held as authentic and that no one is to dare or presume to reject it under any pretext whatever." (Sess. IV.) Thus the Douay Version was to say in English what the Vulgate said in Latin; the Douay Version, then, is the official Roman Catholic version, the Catholic Bible. There were three reprints of the New Testament and one of the Old Testament between 1582 and 1750. It was little used.

The Authorized, or King James, Version is too well known in our circles to be in need of any extended introduction. The Authorized Version of 1611 owes its origin to the complaints of the Puritans, who maintained that they could not subscribe to the *Prayer-book* because it embodied translations from the Great Bible, which, they said, was "a most corrupted translation." The existing versions contained obsolete words and phrases. There was need for a new translation, one that was to embody all that was good in the existing translations while avoiding their faults. This led King James I of England "to bethink himself of the good that might ensue by a new translation." Fifty-four translators were appointed, including High Churchmen, Puritans, generally speaking, the best scholars in England; however, only forty-seven took active part in the task. This company of translators sat in sections at Westminster, Oxford, and Cambridge. These companies submitted their translations for mutual review to the entire company before final action was taken in adopting the final results. They had the original Hebrew and Greek texts to refer to besides many other ancient documents of great value. The "received text" of Erasmus was the basis for the New Testament. Never before had such an amount of careful labor been spent on an English Bible. The Authorized Version is essentially a revision of the Bishops' Bible. The version appeared under royal sanction and authority, commended by the best scholarship of the age. It soon won general favor. For three centuries it held its place as the Bible of the English-speaking world. The rare grace and purity of its diction, its dignified and reverential spirit and attitude, have endeared it to millions of hearts and made it the most widely read book in the English language. Prof. William Lyon Phelps of Yale will have nothing to do with more recent translations because of the literary

charm of the Authorized Version. It is unlike the Douay Version, which was never accepted in circles other than Roman Catholic, and rightly so; for the diction of the Douay is stiff, and some of its translations are so extremely literal as to border on the ridiculous.

In making a comparison of the Douay and the King James version, we are interested in their various features, particularly in the doctrines they set forth. Much could be said from the literary standpoint. Just a few examples. The spelling and form of proper nouns in the Douay Version strikes one as rather peculiar. For Joshua we read Josue; Chronicles are called Paralipomenon; Ezra is called Esdras; the Song of Solomon is Canticle of Canticles; Hosea is Osee; Obadiah is Abdias; Zephaniah is Sophonias. Anyway, proper nouns are transliterated in the various versions in a rather loose fashion, Luther not excepted, and since the Douay Version was to have the unique distinction of being Roman Catholic, we can understand that it would not do to use the accepted spelling of the Protestant versions. Whether or not the following examples of literary diction are preferable to the King James Version I shall let you judge. Ex. 24, 4, 5: "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord; and rising in the morning, he built an altar at the foot of the mount and twelve tables according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of Israel, and they offered holocausts [Vulgate: *holocausta*; A. V.: burnt offerings] and sacrificed pacific victims of calves to the Lord" (Vulgate: *victimis pacificas*; A. V.: peace-offerings). In Ex. 8, 17 we are told that Moses "struck the dust of the earth, and there came sciniphs [A. V.: lice] on men and beasts." Ps. 120 is called "a gradual canticle" (A. V.: song of degrees). Note: The Douay number Psalms 9 and 10 as one psalm; hence after the 9th Psalm the numbering differs from the King James Version. Thus we might expect to find only 149 psalms in the Douay, but nevertheless there are 150, since Ps. 147 is given as two psalms (1—11 and 12—20). The 23d Psalm will present a good example of the English employed by the Douay. It reads:—

"The Lord ruleth me: and I shall want nothing. He hath set me in a place of pasture. He hath brought me up, on the water of refreshment; he hath converted my soul. He hath led me on the paths of justice, for his own name's sake. For though I should walk in the midst of the shadow of death, I will fear no evils, for thou art with me. Thy rod and thy staff, they have comforted me. Thou hast prepared a table before me, against them that afflict me. Thou hast anointed my head with oil; and my chalice which inebriateth me, how goodly is it. And thy mercy will follow me all the days of my life. And that I may dwell in the house of the Lord unto the length of days." (Ps. 22.)

Matt. 5, 29 we read: "If thy right eye scandalize [A. V.: offend] thee, pluck it out." So "scandalize" is used in Matt. 18, 6: "But he that shall scandalize one of these little ones that believe in me," etc. In v. 7 of the same chapter we read: "Woe to the world because of

scandals." The daily bread in the Lord's Prayer is called the "super-substantial" bread. Matt. 6, 22: "If thy eye be single, thy whole body shall be lightsome. 23. But if thy eye be evil, thy whole body shall be darksome." When Elizabeth brought forth her son, "the neighbors and kinsfolk congratulated with her" (Vulgate: *congratulabantur ei*; A. V.: rejoiced with her), Luke 1, 58. According to the Douay Version, Paul exhorts 1 Cor. 5, 7: "Purge out the old leaven, that you may be a new paste." John 19, 14: "And it was the parasceve of the pascha, about the sixth hour" (Vulgate: *parasceve Paschae*; A. V.: preparation of the passover). Matt. 26, 17: "And on the first day of the Azymes [Vulgate: *die azymorum*; A. V.: unleavened bread] the disciples came to Jesus." Acts 20, 17: "And sending from Miletus to Ephesus, he [Paul] called the ancients [Vulgate: *maiores*; A. V.: elders] of the church." May this suffice on the literary side; after all, this is only of secondary importance.

Every new translation of the Sacred Scriptures is of vital interest to the Church, primarily in order that the Church may know whether the thoughts and words of the original text are carefully, honestly, and correctly rendered. A translation, to be justified in laying claim to being a translation, must bring the exact meaning of the original, without interpolation, addition, or distortion. It must be unbiased in doctrine; it dare not have a pet doctrinal ax to grind. A translation must be truthful; it must bow to the words and statements as penned by the holy writers. The relation of a translation to the original must be borne in mind. The Bible was not intended for the Greek and Hebrew nations alone. Nor are Greek and Hebrew scholars the only ones in whose possession the sacred treasures of Scripture are to remain. The Word of God is intended to be read by all nations and tongues. Holy Scripture is given to the world in a great variety of languages with a great variety of letters and sounds, so that the sacred truth approaches each one in his native tongue in an appropriate relation to his understanding. On Pentecost the Holy Spirit caused the apostles to declare the heavenly truth to the people present in the languages understood by them, even as they said: "We do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God," Acts 2, 11. Thus every faithful translation of Scripture is a means of conveyance of the divine truth to those who hear or read it. In the words of Dr. Pieper: "Die Uebersetzungen haben nur deshalb und insofern Autoritaet, als sie den Grundtext wiedergeben. Alle Uebersetzungen muessen es sich gefallen lassen, dass sie immer von neuem daraufhin geprueft werden, ob sie mit dem Grundtext uebereinstimmen. . . . Was in griechischer Sprache Gottes Wort ist, das ist auch in deutscher oder englischer Sprache Gottes Wort, insofern der deutsche oder englische Text eine wirkliche Uebersetzung des griechischen Textes ist." (*Christliche Dogmatik*, I, 417. 418. 420.) We see: This fact is so

compelling that the knowledge of the ancient languages has never been made a condition in the Christian Church for entry into the ministry. Dr. A. T. Robertson, who at the time of his recent death was probably the greatest authority on New Testament Greek grammar, says: "It ought to be taken for granted that the preacher has his Greek Testament. This statement will be challenged by many who excuse themselves for making no effort to know the Greek New Testament. I do not say that every preacher should become an expert in his knowledge of the New Testament Greek. That cannot be expected. I do not affirm that no preacher should be allowed to preach who does not possess some knowledge of the original New Testament. I am opposed to such a restriction. But a little is a big percentage on nothing, as John Broadus used to say. This is preeminently true of the Greek New Testament." (*The Minister and His Greek New Testament*, p. 15.)

Dr. Robertson is far from advocating that ministers should make no effort in the direction of learning to read the Bible in the original languages; in fact, he uses some rather hard expressions against those who do not keep up their knowledge, or make no effort in gaining a knowledge, of these languages. He does say, however, that with the aid of reliable translations one may be able to preach the Gospel of Christ. How this is possible Dr. Pieper explains when he says: "Wir stehen vor der Tatsache, dass unter den allgemein bekannten Bibeluebersetzungen keine einzige sich findet, in der nicht die christliche Lehre in allen Teilen zum Ausdruck kaeme und die ihr entgegenstehenden Irrtuemer verworfen waeren. Das trifft auch zu in bezug auf die Vulgata der roemischen Kirche. Das *ipsa conteret caput tuum* der Vulgata, 1 Mos. 3, 15, wird abgewiesen durch die richtige Uebersetzung der vielen Stellen, in denen Christus als der einzige Erretter von Suendenschuld und Tod gelehrt ist. . . . Auch die Rechtfertigung allein durch den Glauben, ohne des Gesetzes Werke bringt die Vulgata klar zum Ausdruck Roem. 3, 28. . . . Wer in einer Disputation mit Papisten *disputandi causa* sich auf den Vertrag einlaesst, dass die Vulgata zugrunde gelegt werden soll, behaelt damit noch immer eine Waffe in der Hand, womit er den Gegner siegreich ueberwinden kann." (*Chr. Dogm.*, I, 419.)

A translation is a commentary. A translator does not merely transliterate the letters and syllables, transmute sounds, or give word for word foreign words and idioms. No one would say that we no longer possess the authentic Word of God in the Old Testament because the present text is written in the square Aramaic characters and not in the ancient Hebrew script, a variety of the Phenician such as that used in the Siloam inscription or the Maccabean coins. On the contrary, the translator ascertains the sense, the idea, and then gives expression to that idea, the sense, in the most precise and appropriate way possible. It is admitted that close literal translations

are sometimes misleading and worse than loose paraphrasing. Much of the beauty of Luther's version is to be found in his happy way of putting the thoughts of the original into idiomatic German in a manner as though the original writers had spoken German. The 23d Psalm is a good example. Thus Luther translates the answer that the apostles gave Jesus when He had asked them, Luke 22, 35: "When I sent you without purse and scrip and shoes, lacked ye anything?" "Nie keinen." In the German: "Habt ihr je Mangel gehabt? Sie sprachen: Nie keinen." It was a compelling question, and it demanded a forceful answer, and Luther knows how to put it into German. The original uses the word *oudenos*, none, not one. A double negative has its place in German (Thomas's *Practical German Grammar*, p. 371 b; also *Grimm's Dictionary*, *sub kein*); but a double negative is not in the original, neither would it do in English. No one, however, would accuse Luther of taking liberties with the sacred text by the way he translated the apostles' answer.

It is a valuable asset in any pastor's library to have various versions and translations. I would call attention to the translations of the British and American revisers of 1881. No doubt the Revised Version is a better translation than the Authorized Version from the standpoint of literal rendition; yet it, too, has some objectional features, and it lacks the quaint charm and grace of the King James Version. "Jehovah is my Shepherd" in the R. V. will not easily displace "The Lord is my Shepherd" in the A. V. It is a sad error when the R. V., for instance, makes Job say: "Then without (*min*) my flesh shall I see God," Job 19, 26, in the preferred reading. Other translations of more or less merit are those by Young, Rotherham, Moulton, Moffatt, Montgomery, Weymouth, the *Twentieth Century New Testament*, the *American Translation* by J. M. P. Smith and Goodspeed. Scholarly as they are, they are full of many strange and objectional features. Even the Jewish Publication Society issued a new translation of the Old Testament in 1917. It is interesting to read in its preface "that the Jew cannot afford to have his Bible translation prepared for him by others" and then to note its bias in translation. It translates Is. 9, 5 (6): "For a child is born unto us, a son is given unto us; and the government is upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Pele-joez-el-gibbor-Abi-ad-sar-shalom." In a footnote the enlightening comment is made: "That is, Wonderful in counsel is God the Mighty, the Everlasting Father, the Ruler of Peace." A translation is a commentary; if it comes from the pen of a Jew, a Modernist like Smith and Moffatt, or a Catholic, we may make up our minds to find support therein for their own peculiar beliefs. If the text is too compelling, we may be prepared to find footnotes that are to set the reader right. It is a precious quality in a translator to treat the text objectively.

Des Moines, Iowa. (*To be concluded.*) GEO. A. W. VOGEL.