

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

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

Vol. VI

February, 1935

No. 2

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword. (Concluded.) Theo. Laetsch.	81
Zur Bedeutung der Taufe Jesu. J. T. Mueller	93
A Comparison of the King James and the Douay Version. Geo. A. W. Vogel.	102
“Die Schrift kann nicht gebrochen werden.” P. E. Kretzmann.	114
Der Schriftgrund fuer die Lehre von der satisfactio vicaria. P. E. Kretzmann	121
Dispositionen ueber die altkirchliche Evangelienreihe.	125
Miscellanea.	133
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.	141
Book Review. — Literatur.	153

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein *weisen*, 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.



ARCHIVE

10.

bleiben wir bei dieser in der Schrift selbst an die Hand gegebenen Erklärung der Bedeutung der Taufe Jesu. Wir armen Sünder können des tätigen Gehorsams Jesu, seiner *obedientia activa*, nicht entbehren. Wie Jesus durch seinen leidenden Gehorsam (*obedientia passiva*), sein unschuldiges, heiliges Leiden und Sterben, den Schaden unserer Sünde gutgemacht hat, so hat er auch durch seinen Lebensgehorsam (*obedientia activa*) alle Gerechtigkeit für uns erfüllt, das Gesetz Gottes an unserer Statt gehalten und uns so vom Fluch und der Verdammnis des Gesetzes erlöst. Auch auf diesen Teil seines stellvertretenden Gehorsams legt die Schrift schätzenswerthes Gewicht, Röm. 5, 19; Gal. 4, 4. 5. Und nur wenn wir den ganzen Gehorsam Christi in sein Erlösungswerk hineinziehen, finden wir den rechten, vollen Trost, der uns in den Worten des Apostels entgegentritt: „Christus ist des Gesetzes Ende; wer an den glaubt, der ist gerecht“, Röm. 10, 4. J. L. Müller.

A Comparison of the King James and the Douay Version.

A conference paper; somewhat abridged.

(Concluded.)

In the light of what has been said, then, let us examine the Douay Version and see whether it differs from the Authorized Version in its doctrinal statements. If there are any differences, what shall we hold concerning them? To begin with, we find that its Old Testament has forty-six books, while the King James Version has only thirty-nine. These additional books are commonly known in the Church as the Apocrypha, the spurious books. We find them scattered throughout the Old Testament. Tobias and Judith are inserted between Nehemiah and Esther. About six chapters are added to Esther, beginning chapter 10, 4. Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus come between the Song of Solomon and Isaiah; Baruch follows Lamentations. To Daniel there are added two extra chapters, one about Susanna and the Elders, and the other about the Bel of Babel and the Dragon. In the text of Daniel seventy-six verses containing the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Men in the Furnace are appended to the third chapter. At the end of the Old Testament we find the two books of Maccabees. The edition of the Douay Version in my possession and used in this treatise is the Murphy Edition, published by the John Murphy Company of Baltimore and New York with the approbation of the late Cardinal James Gibbons. Opposite the title-page we are told that it “is an accurate reprint of the Reims and Douay edition with Dr. Challoner’s notes.” Every book is preceded by a brief introduction; footnotes are copious. Concerning

Ecclesiasticus we are told that "it is not in the Jewish canon; but it is received as canonical and divine by the Catholic Church, instructed by apostolic tradition, and directed by the Spirit of God." Concerning the books of the Maccabees it is stated: "As to their authority, though they are not received by the Jews, saith Augustine (lib. 18, *De Civ. Dei*, c. 36), they are received by the Church, who, in settling her canon of the Scriptures, chose rather to be directed by the tradition she had received from the apostles of Christ than by that of the scribes and Pharisees. And as the Church has declared these two books canonical, even in two general councils, *viz.*, Florence (1439) and Trent (1546), there can be no doubt of their authority." This is the typical line of argumentation of Romanism.

Do the Apocrypha deserve a place in the Old Testament canon? Here we enter upon a question that deserves more space than we are able to give within the limits of this paper. May it suffice to state that the Apocrypha were rejected by the Reformation as non-canonical for the following reasons, in which we whole-heartedly concur to this day: —

1. None was ever received in the Old Testament canon by the Old Testament Church.
2. They are quoted nowhere in the New Testament.
3. They contain fabulous and false statements as well as false teaching, *e. g.*, prayer for the dead, also sacrifices for the dead, 2 Macc. 12, 43; 14, 41; sorcery, Tobias 6.

It is quite obvious why Rome should hold so tenaciously to these apocryphal writings, why even church councils should have been drafted into service as late as the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In the Maccabean book Roman Catholicism finds its only proof for prayer and sacrifice for the dead. In including the Apocrypha in the Old Testament canon, Rome finds itself at variance with the very translator of the Latin Vulgate, Jerome († 420). In the preface to the Vulgate he plainly stated: "*Quidquid extra hos [i. e., the twenty-two canonical books, according to the numbering of Josephus, Wars, I, p. 885] inter Apocrypha ponendum.*" The English Church remained true to the judgment of Jerome, based upon historical fact; likewise Luther, who regarded them as "Buecher, so der Heiligen Schrift nicht gleichgehalten und doch nuetzlich und gut zu lesen sind." Since 1827 the Authorized Version has not included the Apocrypha.

It is quite probable that none of us will ever use the Douay Version other than in our polemics or for the sake of comparison or for curiosity. Members of the Roman Catholic Church tell us that their Church does not discourage the reading of the Bible; they show us the Douay Version in their homes; they point to the preface, where it is said that the version appears at the earnest solicitation of the laity and with the definite approval of the Holy See. What

kind of translation is this that is produced by a Church that anathematizes Bible societies and frowns upon a general distribution of Scriptures? Let us look at its text and compare it with the Bible so dear to us. In order that we may remember a few passages and have them in readiness when the occasion demands it, let us examine some of the outstanding differences in translation.

Genesis 3, 15.

<p>A. V.: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.</p>	<p><i>Douay</i>: I will put enmities between thee and the woman and thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel.</p>
---	---

Here we have a passage that is generally accepted in orthodox Biblical circles as being Messianic. The difference between the King James and the Douay lies in the translation of the word הוּא. The Douay merely translated the *ipsa* of the Vulgate. Dr. Eduard Preuss (*Unbefleckte Empfängnis*, p. 231) states that Jerome translated *ipse*, but that the Sixtine edition by Pope Sixtus changed it to *ipsa*. Some deny this, however. Who is right, the Douay or the King James? It is true that the pronoun הוּא is used for both the masculine and the feminine gender in the Pentateuch, except eleven times, when it is written with a jod for the feminine. If the unpointed pronoun הוּא were our only evidence here, matters would not be so simple. But since the verb *bruise* is the necessary predicate verb, which must agree with its subject in person, gender, and number, and since this verb, יִשְׁפֹּךְ, appears in the masculine singular, there can be no doubt in the mind of any one that the pronoun הוּא is to be translated masculine and that it refers not to the woman, but to the Seed. Seed being neuter in English, the A. V. naturally and correctly translates, "It shall bruise thy head."

Genesis 37, 35.

<p>A. V.: And all his sons and all his daughters rose up to comfort him; but he refused to be comforted; and he said, For I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning.</p>	<p><i>Douay</i>: And all his children being gathered together to comfort their father in his sorrow, he would not receive comfort, but said: I will go down to my son into hell, mourning.</p>
---	--

The Douay translators present no uniform translation for the Hebrew word הוּא. In Gen. 42, 38 we read again that Jacob says: "If mischief befall him [Benjamin], . . . then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to hell." In Sam. 2, 6 the Douay translates: "The Lord killeth and maketh alive, he bringeth down to hell and bringeth back again." David says to Solomon, 1 Kings 2, 6: "Do therefore according to thy wisdom and let not his [Joab's] hoary

head go to hell in peace." Wherever the word *sheol* occurs, it is almost without exception translated *hell*. Now, this would seem peculiar because it is most evident that Jacob could not have in mind that Joseph, being dead, was in hell, in damnation. The Vulgate translates *sheol infernum*. But the Douay translators had an object in view when they left the translation of *sheol* in such an unsettled state. The footnote to our passage removes the veil. It reads: "In *hell*, that is, into limbo, the place where the souls of the just were received before the death of our Redeemer. For allowing that the word *hell* sometimes is taken for the grave, it cannot be so taken in this place, since Jacob did not believe his son to be in the grave (whom he supposed to be devoured by a wild beast) and therefore could not mean to go down to him thither; but certainly meant the place of rest where he believed his soul to be." Rome teaches a limbo, and somehow her Bible must at least approach this teaching. It would not do to translate *sheol grave* under such circumstances. (An exception is made in Ps. 88, 3, where *sheol* is translated *grave*. Here it is used synonymously with קֶרֶב, and here we are told that the Lord does not remember those who are in *sheol-kereb*, and they are cut off from His hand.) Here we have a glaring instance of sectarian translation, which does not give us the thoughts of God, but the thoughts of man in support of the pet doctrine of limbo and, what is intimately connected with it, of purgatory. Such translation is in need of glosses and footnotes.

1 Samuel 13, 1. 2.

A. V.: Saul reigned one year; and when he had reigned two years over Israel, Saul chose him three thousand men of Israel.	Douay: Saul was a child of one year when he began to reign, and he reigned two years in Israel. And Saul chose him three thousand men of Israel.
--	--

Without maintaining that the King James Version here is perfect, we have to say that the Douay is simply wrong without excuse. The analogy of Scripture forbids such a translation. That Saul was only one year old when he began to reign is impossible in the face of 1 Sam. 9, 1. 2: "Now, there was a man of Benjamin, whose name was Kish; . . . and he had a son, whose name was Saul, a choice young man and goodly; and there was not among the children of Israel a goodlier person than he; from his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people." Even the footnote does not help the reader, where we are told: "That is, he was good and like an innocent child." The fault lies in the fact that Drs. Allen, Martin, and Bristow slavishly translated a faulty version and not the sacred original. They gave a literal translation of Jerome's Latin: "*Filius unius anni erat Saul, cum regnare coepisset.*" The literal translation of the Hebrew is: Son of year Saul in his reigning. To put this

There is a considerable difference between doing penance and repenting. In the sense of Scripture *repent* means a complete change of mind and heart, as is seen from the word *μετανοέω*, from *μετά*, after, and *νοῦς*, mind. The call of John meant that all should repent of their sins and accept Jesus, the Savior of the world. To do penance implies the rendering of a service, to suffer as an act of atonement for sin. It is known how the Roman Catholic Church introduced corporal austerities and mental offices, solitude, silence, the endurance of heat and cold, and bodily chastisement. This system of penances led to the sale of indulgences. Faith has no place in that system. The Roman system of "repentance," 1) contrition of the heart, 2) confession by mouth, 3) satisfaction by works, is couched in the language of the Douay translators, who make John and Jesus say, "Do penance." The Vulgate says, "*Poenitentiam agite.*" It is true that we find the word *poena* in *poenitentia*, the idea of punishment, and not the idea of *mutatio mentis*, as in the Greek. The Latin has no adequate word to express *μετάνοια*. Lacking a better word, *poenitentia* had to be used. It is interesting to note that the German word *Busse* may be traced etymologically to *buessen*. Even here there is nothing to suggest *Sinnesaenderung*. The English *re-pent* has the same root, *poena*. But in common usage *Busse* and repentance have come to have the meaning of *μετάνοια*. There is a world of difference, then, between doing penance and repenting. The Bible knows nothing about penance. When Douay translates repent, as in the case of Judas, Matt. 27, 3, it is the Greek word *μεταμέλομαι*, which carries the thought of regret rather than repentance. This error of making penance out of repentance takes a rather peculiar turn when Douay translates Rev. 9, 20, 21: "And the rest of the men who were not slain by these plagues did not do penance from the works of their hands that they should not adore devils, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood, which neither can see nor hear nor walk; neither did they penance from their murders, nor from their sorceries, nor from their fornication, nor from their thefts."

Luke 1, 28.

A. V.: And the angel came unto her and said, Hail, thou art highly favored; the Lord is with thee.
Douay: And the angel being come in, said unto her: Hail, full of grace; the Lord is with thee.

"*Ave, gratia plena,*" says the Vulgate; but the original says, *κεχαριτωμένη*. This is the passive perfect participle of *χαριτώω*, to make accepted or acceptable. In John 1, 14 we are told that the Word that was made flesh is "full of grace and truth." In the original it says Jesus is *πλήρης χάριτος*. The Douay Version makes both Jesus and Mary "full of grace." (Vulgate: John 1, 14: "*plenum gratiae.*") A Church that prays to Mary needs a Mary that is full of grace.

The Douay Version is made to order. Upon this passage hinges the Mariolatry of Rome, while the simple statement made here is that the angel Gabriel greets Mary as one who was graciously accepted by the Lord to become the virgin mother of our Savior, one much graced by this choice.

1 Cor. 9, 5.

<p>A. V.: Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as the other apostles and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?</p>	<p><i>Douay</i>: Have we not the power to carry about a woman, a sister, as well as the rest of the apostles and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?</p>
---	---

In the footnote we are told why this passage is given in this form when we read: "Some erroneous translators have corrupted this text by rendering it 'a sister, a wife,' whereas it is certain St. Paul had no wife (chap. 7, 7. 8) and that he only speaks of such devout women, as, according to the custom of the Jewish nation, waited upon preachers of the Gospel and supplied them with necessaries." So here we have the support for celibacy and a housekeeper for the priest. Some "erroneous translators" corrupted the text, we are told. Who are they? We read in the original: *ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν*. Jerome translates: "*Numquid non habemus potestatem sororem mulierem circumducendi?*" It certainly seems self-evident that a sister is a woman, not a man; so what else than "wife" could this term *gynaika* mean? A simple glance at your Greek concordance will disclose the fact that there is no other word for wife than *gyne*. The context decides whether it is to be rendered woman or wife. In support of this let us summon the Douay Version as a witness. We read Matt. 5, 28: "Whosoever shall look on a woman to lust after her hath already committed adultery with her in his heart." In this case there is nothing to indicate whether the *gyne* (woman) is married or unmarried. In v. 31 of the same chapter we read: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce." Here we have the same word, *gyne*, as above, but the context compels us to translate wife, not woman. According to Mark 1, 30, Peter did not have a woman, but a wife. It is true that Paul had no wife, but in this passage he tells the congregation in Corinth that he has a right to have a wife and refers to the example of Peter and the other apostles.

Ephesians 5, 31. 32.

<p>A. V.: For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.</p>	<p><i>Douay</i>: For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. This is a great sacrament; but I speak in Christ and in the Church.</p>
---	---

There are a number of differences here, but I shall restrict my consideration to the words *mystery* and *sacrament*. The King James reads mystery; the Douay reads sacrament. Who is right? The Vulgate says: "*Sacramentum hoc magnum est.*" Here apparently we are to find "Biblical" authority for one of Rome's seven sacraments, the sacrament of matrimony. The original has the word *μυστήριον*, from which the English word *mystery* is derived. Jerome translates this word either *mysterium* or *sacramentum*, apparently without any particular reason and according to no definite rule. The Latin word *sacramentum* has an interesting history. In the Greek Catholic Church the term for sacrament is *μυστήριον*. Question XCIX of *The Orthodox Confession* of the Eastern Church reads: *Τί ἐστὶ μυστήριον*; In the Latin translation this word reads: "*Quid est mysterium sive sacramentum?*" (Cf. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, II, 374.) On the history and meaning of this interesting word Dr. Hoenecke says:—

"In der Kirchensprache, zunaechst natuerlich der abendlaendischen Kirche, ist das Wort aus der Vulgata gekommen, die das griechische Wort *mysterion*, womit die griechischen Vaeter in alter Zeit schon Taufe und Abendmahl bezeichnen, wie die abendlaendischen Kirchenvaeter mit der Uebersetzung *sacramentum* das Gleiche tun, durch *sacramentum* uebersetzt. In der Schrift hat das Wort *mysterion* weder auf Taufe noch auf Abendmahl Bezug, auch nicht auf die Ehe, wie die Roemischen immer gerne darstellen. Abgeleitet wird das Wort *sacramentum* von *sacrare*. . . . Es bedeutet also eigentlich eine geweihte, heilige Sache. So wird *sacramentum* das Geld genannt, welches in Rom die Parteien im Rechtsstreit beim Pontifex Maximus niederlegten, und zwar unter der Bedingung, dass der gewinnende Teil sein Geld zurueckerhielt, der verlierende aber es der Staatskasse zu ueberlassen hatte. Auch der Soldateneid heisst *sacramentum*. In diesem Sinne, als Soldatenschwur, *iuramentum*, wendet zuerst Tertullian (220) das Wort *sacramentum* auf die Taufe an; aber die spaetere Bedeutung liegt ihm ferne." (*Dogmatik*, IV, 443.)

Quenstedt: "The word *sacrament* is understood 1) in a very general sense, for any hidden or secret thing. Thus the incarnation of Christ, 1 Tim. 3, 16; the union of Christ and the Church, Eph. 5, 32; the calling of the Gentiles, Eph. 3, 3, etc., are called *mysteria*, which the old Latin interpreter translated *sacramenta*. Thus the fathers called every mystery and every sacred doctrine that was not very plain a *sacrament*, as the *sacrament* of the Trinity, the *sacrament* of the incarnation and of faith." (Quoted in Schmid, *Doct. Theol.*, p. 524.)

It is strange indeed that the Douay translates the word *mysterion sacrament* only in this one instance, although the word occurs twenty-seven times in the New Testament. It is true that the Vulgate has *sacramentum* here. But this is not the only passage in the Vulgate where the word *sacramentum* occurs; in fact, we find *sacramentum* eight times in the Vulgate, Eph. 1, 9; 3, 3, 9; 5, 32; Col. 1, 27; 1 Tim. 3, 16; Rev. 1, 20; 17, 7. In some instances we find that the Vulgate

uses the words *mysterium* and *sacramentum* interchangeably, *viz.*, Eph. 3, 3: *sacramentum*; 4: *mysterium*; 9: *sacramentum*. Col. 1, 26: *mysterium*; 27: *sacramentum*. Rev. 17, 5: *mysterium*; 7: *sacramentum*. The translators of the Douay would not dare to call anything else than matrimony a *sacramentum*, since none of the other sacraments is described by that word. And should this word occur in any other connection, the "proof" here in Eph. 5 might appear doubtful even to the innocent readers of the Douay. Even the "authentic" Vulgate will not lend support to Roman Catholic claims nor to the Douay Version when it comes to teaching that matrimony is a sacrament. And here, after all, Christ speaks of the Church and not of matrimony.

Hebrews 13, 16.

A. V.: But to do good and to communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased. Douay: And do not forget to do good and to impart; for by such sacrifices God's favor is obtained.

By good works God's favor is obtained — according to Catholic teaching. According to the teaching of Holy Writ the good works of God's children please God. Let us trace this matter through the Vulgate to the original text. This passage reads in the Vulgate: "*Talibus enim hostiis promeretur Deus.*" The word in the original is *εὐαρεστέω*, and it occurs only three times in the New Testament and only in the Epistle to the Hebrews. We read Heb. 11, 5, 6: "By faith Henoah was translated that he should not see death; and he was not found because God had translated him; for before his translation he had the testimony that he *pleased* God. But without faith it is impossible to *please* God." (Douay Version.) Here we find the identical word *euaresceo* as in chapter 13. In these two instances the Vulgate translates correctly *placere*, and the Douay *please*. There is no reason why the identical word should be translated in 13, 16 "to obtain favor." The etymology of the verb is plain, *εὖ*, well; *ἀρεστός*, pleasing, acceptable. The Douay is so legalistic that it cannot render the first two passages as it did the one in question without defeating its own purpose; for, after all, it is not good Catholic doctrine to say: "Without faith it is impossible to *obtain God's favor*," when we are supposed to believe (chap. 13, 16): "Do not forget to do good and to impart; for by such sacrifices God's *favor is obtained*."

Having considered some objectional translations, we wonder whether the entire version is to be judged accordingly or whether there are some passages that are given in a happy translation. Indeed, there are many. And here we are reminded of a statement made by Dr. Pieper: "Die Sprache der Schrift ist so einfach, sonderlich in den *sedes doctrinae*, dass jede Uebersetzung, die ueberhaupt den Namen einer Uebersetzung verdient, den Grundtext wiedergeben muss. Wer einerseits das Griechische des Neuen Testaments ver-

steht und andererseits der Sprache, in die er uebersetzen will, maechtig ist, muss sich schon besondere Muehe geben, wenn er eine Uebersetzung liefern will, die den Grundtext *nicht* wiedergibt." (*Chr. Dogmatik*, I, 418.) Just a few examples:—

Is. 53, 4. 5: Surely he hath borne our infirmities and carried our sorrows: and we have thought him as it were a leper and as one struck by God and afflicted. But he was wounded for our iniquities, he was bruised for our sins: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his bruises we are healed.

Matt. 1, 21: And thou shalt call his name Jesus. For he shall save his people from their sins.

Rom. 3, 23—28: For all have sinned and do need the glory of God. Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to the showing of his justice in this time; that he himself may be just and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus Christ. Where is then thy boasting? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? No, but by the law of faith. For we account a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the law.

2 Cor. 5, 19—21: For God indeed was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing to them their sins; and hath placed in us the word of reconciliation. For Christ therefore we are ambassadors, God as it were exhorting by us. For Christ, we beseech you, be reconciled to God. Him, who knew no sin, he hath made sin for us, that we might be made the justice of God in him.

Passages such as these could be adduced by the hundreds, showing that justification by faith and not by works is taught in the Douay Version. The same could be done concerning any of the seats of doctrine of our Christian faith. There is great comfort in this. Regardless of its errors it would be a great blessing if even the Douay Version could be in every Roman Catholic home and would be read. By no means, however, is this to imply that we endorse or even recommend the reading of that version when the King James Version is available, which far more clearly gives us the Word written by the apostles and the prophets.

Strange to say, but let it be said in all fairness, there are some passages in the Douay Version that are to be preferred to the translation in the Authorized Version. This essay wishes to be fair in its investigation, and so let us quote a few examples of such passages that are preferable in the Douay Version. I discovered only a negligible number; those, however, that I found I shall quote.

Luke 10, 7.

<i>Douay:</i> And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they have.	<i>A. V.:</i> And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give.
---	---

Those of us who learned the passage "Esset und trinket, was sie haben" feel somewhat empty-handed when we are about to instruct

our congregations on the basis of this passage as it reads in the King James Version. The Vulgate translates: "*Quae apud illos sunt.*" The original reads: *τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν*. *Para* with the genitive means from, denoting the source; hence the disciples were to eat and drink what was "from" them, what was given by them (by those in whose house they remained). The meaning is that they could accept with a good conscience such support as would be forthcoming.

Acts 20, 28.

<i>Douay:</i> Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops.	<i>A. V.:</i> Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.
---	--

"Wherein," *ἐν ᾧ*, "the Holy Ghost hath placed you" is better than "over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you."

1 Cor. 11, 27.

<i>Douay:</i> Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord.	<i>A. V.:</i> Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink the cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord.
---	---

The Douay says "or," the Authorized says "and"; the original says *ἢ*, or. Cardinal Gibbons finds in this passage an argument for Communion under one kind. He says: "The apostle here plainly declares that by an unworthy participation in the Lord's Supper under the form of either bread or wine we profane both the body and the blood of Christ. How could this be so unless Christ is entirely contained under each species? So forcibly indeed did the apostle assert the Catholic doctrine that the Protestant translators have perverted the text by rendering it: 'Whosoever shall eat this bread *and* drink the chalice,' substituting *and* for *or*, in contradiction to the Greek original, of which the Catholic version is an exact translation." (*Faith of Our Fathers*, p. 290.) It is true that in this instance the Douay follows the reading which is adopted by most translators and commentators. But the cardinal is not fair to "the Protestant translators," whom he accuses of perverting this text. Luther is the prince among Protestant translators, and he translates "oder." The edition of Gibbon's *Faith of Our Fathers* that is in my possession is that of 1904. Is it possible that Cardinal Gibbons had not heard about the British and American revised versions of 1881? During his lifetime Cardinal Gibbons was a well-informed man, and we believe he knew what Luther's version and the revised versions said on this point; therefore it could not have been ignorance that induced him to make such a statement. But the cardinal was a child of the Pope, and papal polemics are not honest. Luther's version said "oder" since

1522 without harm to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper under both kinds. And the Revised Version of 1881 says "or," also without converting any one to the Roman faith concerning Communion under one kind. Paul makes the simple statement here that one becomes an unworthy communicant by either eating the bread unworthily or unworthily drinking the cup. It is a serious matter when one is partaking of Communion. If anything, the sword turns on the cardinal in this case. His is a mutilated Communion, and his withdrawal of the cup from the laity finds its condemnation here. Nevertheless the Douay is correct in its rendering of *ἢ*, or. The King James translators here adopted the less well-attested reading *καί*, and.

"Im Auslegen seid frisch und munter. Legt ihr's nicht aus, so legt was unter," this sarcastic statement of Herder finds its application in the most serious objection that must be raised against the Douay Version. There is not a single passage in that version that tells the simple evangelical truth expressed by the original writers but that a footnote is appended to make the passage say, not what it really says, but what Rome wants it to say. It would lead too far to treat this objection exhaustively; one example may suffice. We heard that Rom. 3, 28 is given correctly. Now hear the footnote: "By faith,' etc. The faith to which the apostle here attributes man's justification is not a presumptuous *assurance* of our being justified, but a firm and lively *belief* of all that God has revealed or promised. Heb. 11. *A faith working through charity* in Jesus Christ. Gal. 5, 6. In short, *a faith* which takes in hope, love, repentance, and the use of the sacraments. And *the works* which he here excludes, are only *the works of the law*, that is, such as are done by the law of nature or that of Moses, antecedent to the faith of Christ; but by no means such as follow faith and proceed from it."

In conclusion: We must be grateful that, whether we read the Holy Scriptures in the original or in translation, we read God's Word and have the attending promise of its blessing. Faulty as some translations may be, they present Christ and Him crucified. It is a particular fruit of the Reformation by Luther that the English-speaking Roman Catholic laity now possesses a Bible in its vernacular the text of which says in plain language that man is justified by faith, "without the works of the Law." We properly retain our King James Version in preference to the Douay Version for reasons partly mentioned in this essay; but even our superior version will be of no benefit to us unless we read, ponder, study it, and make it a light unto our path and a lamp unto our feet. May it be said of the members of our Church, particularly of us preachers, that in His Law we "meditate day and night."

Des Moines, Iowa.

GEO. A. W. VOGEL.