

The **LUTHERAN** **CLARION**



Lutheran Concerns Association
149 Glenview Drive, New Kensington, PA 15068-4921

July 2015
Volume 7, Issue 6

A District President Responds: Doctrinal Supervision Revisited

In the May 2015 issue of the *Clarion*, Rev. Dr. Martin Noland wrote an article titled "Doctrinal Supervision and the Becker Case." He quoted the constitutional responsibilities of the LCMS, described Dr. Matthew Becker's "public advocacy for positions contrary to the public doctrine of the LCMS" and said that "there are faults in the doctrinal supervision system of the LCMS..."

Below is Montana District President Forke's response to Dr. Noland's article.

[If you don't have your copy of the May issue handy, go to <http://lutheranclarion.org/> and click [Newsletter] on the left.]

In the May 2015 issue Dr. Martin Noland addressed the need for the Synod to revisit the manner in which it conducts doctrinal supervision. I wish to commend him for his measured approach and affirm most of his recommendations. We are at a crucial point in the history of our Synod. We should not underestimate the need for determined doctrinal supervision lest the Synodical Union perish through its inability to preserve its confession. What follows are further recommendations from one who has been in the trenches for some time now.

The most difficult times of my life have been when I have had to say (all too frequently), "Brother (sister), because you continue to hold this position, or because you continue to behave in this way, you can no longer be a member of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod." The human toll of those words weighs heavily on anyone who has to say them and they must not be taken lightly. They must be spoken only when the evidence is overwhelming and all opportunities for repentance have been exhausted. Add to all that the personal cost meted out by someone, somewhere in the Synod who is sure to write that the only reason the District President (DP) removed Pastor XXX is because the Pastor held to closed communion.

This reality is the reason I must disagree with Dr. Noland's fifth recommendation. The human cost is real, and it will impact judgments that must be made. Substituting one set of humans (DPs) for another set of humans (independent judiciaries) cannot control for this human element. The only control for the human element lies in the congregations, which should be encouraged to elect to the position

of District President not the flashiest, the most cutting edge, or the most business-minded man, but the man who is most capable of upholding the confession of the faith.

Another possible solution for the problem before the Synod should be considered. Presently the reconciliation process does not distinguish between conflict grounded in behavior and conflict grounded in the teaching of false doctrine. These are fundamentally different cases. In the case of behaviorally driven conflict, most situations will call for reconciliation to take place through mutual confession and absolution. In the case of doctrinal conflict one party may be guilty of teaching false doctrine and the other party completely innocent. While both circumstances will ultimately have bearing on the confession of the Synod, certainly false doctrine is the more dangerous, for its seeds quickly spread.

The Synod should discuss adding a section of bylaw dealing specifically with false doctrine. I propose that bylaw 2.18 (now titled "Reinstatement of Individuals into Membership") be retitled "Expulsion of Individuals from Membership in the Synod as a Result of Persistent Adherence to False Doctrine." (The current 2.18 would become 2.19.) The praesidium might be the gate keeper, determining whether this were the proper bylaw for each case filed with it. A committee should be appointed at the Synodical Convention to deal specifically with this issue.

In addition, Article XI. B.1 (the President's supervision regarding doctrine and administration) of the Constitution should be strengthened to clarify that the President of the Synod has the duty to uphold the confession of the Synodical Union by bringing charges against District Presidents for failure to perform the duties of their office.

One final recommendation is in order. The Synod should carefully examine bylaws 2.14—2.17 (expulsion of Congregations or Individuals, expulsion of a District Presidents, expulsion of a President, expulsion of Individuals as a Re-

"The Synodical Union that cannot uphold its confession is no Synodical Union at all."

In this Issue of *The Lutheran Clarion*

Doctrinal Supervision Revisited.....	1
Controversy Over Translating the Bible, Part II	2
Open Letter to the LCMS	3
Please Add Your Name to Ours.....	4

sult of Sexual Misconduct or Criminal Behavior) by asking whether it is proper for a case to be thrown out as a result of technical error in following the bylaws or procedures. This point of bylaw has the potential of allowing workers who, in fact, hold to false doctrine, or who are behaving badly, to remain on the roster of the Synod, for no other reason than that someone missed a detail of a procedure. Perhaps there is a better way.

These three recommendations deal with circumstances where the institutional inertia of the Synod hinders the proclamation of the Gospel. The Synodical Union that cannot uphold its confession is no Synodical Union at all. The 2016 convention may be the time when holding fast to the confession of the faith can be elevated to its rightful prominence.

Rev. Terry Forke

Pastor, Trinity Lutheran Church, Harlowton, MT
President, Montana District LCMS

Controversy Over Translating the Bible (from Jerome to the Present), Part II¹

Rev. Dr. Cameron Alexander MacKenzie presented the following paper on January 19, 2015, at the 2015 LCA Conference in Fort Wayne, Indiana.

In Part I, Dr. MacKenzie showed how tradition plays a strong role in translation controversies. He described the struggles Luther encountered when he did his translation, i.e., the Greek and Hebrew text vs. the Vulgate. Dr. MacKenzie continues below with his explanation of how text, style and ideology (theology) influence the translations.

When it came to translating the Scriptures, therefore, Luther was no traditionalist. Besides the text, Luther also employed a style and vocabulary that annoyed his critics, for instead of a literal translation, Luther committed himself to readable German. Another of Luther's critics, Friedrich Staphylus, described Luther's proceedings this way:

For it is evident that Luther in his translation hath both corrupted the text omitting and altering the very words and also hath depraved the sense of the text by false and heretical glosses partly added in the margin, partly foisted in the text it self. So by clipping away the termes of the text, and patching on the subtle shifts of his owne braine, he hath gaily coloured his pernicious doctrine with the painted shethe of pretended scripture.³⁷

Staphylus went on to offer seven examples of Luther's "liegerdemain" as he called it. Among other points, the Catholic apologist charged Luther with mistranslating Ephesians 6:13 by omitting the phrase, "as the perfect" ("*als die vollkommenen*") in order to advance his doctrine of man's total depravity. However, this was really a question of the underlying text

Thank You Balance-Concord, Inc.

Balance-Concord, Inc., has been a most faithful contributor to **The Lutheran Clarion** in honor of the sainted **Rev. Raymond Mueller** and the sainted **Rev. Edgar Rehwaldt**, both of whom faithfully served the Synod and Balance-Concord, Inc., for many years.

The Clarion is most appreciative of such continued support from Balance-Concord, Inc., as well as the wonderful support of our readers. These contributions make it possible to bring you substantive articles by respected and qualified authors on issues affecting YOUR Synod. Please continue your support. It is both appreciated and needed.

since the phrase in question is in the Vulgate ("*omnibus perfectis*") but not the Greek.³⁸ Staphylus also accused Luther of misleading readers in his rendering of Romans 3:20 in the interests of justification by faith *alone*, since Luther employed *nur* ("only") in his translation ("*Durchs Gesetz ist nur erkantnus der Sünden* [emphasis mine]")³⁹ even though a literal translation of either the Latin or Greek would simply say, "By the lawe we have knowledge of sinne." So this is a criticism of Luther's style. Staphylus also criticized Luther's word choice in 1 Timothy 4:14 against the sacrament of ordination, for Luther had rendered *presbyteriou* (Latin, *presbyterii*) as *Der altisten* (literally, "the elders") instead of "priesthood."⁴⁰ In short Luther's critics saw his choice of words, style, and text as evidence of his heretical bent. Although such critics were not especially convincing in their own times,⁴¹ they did move Luther to write in defense of his translation efforts, and in so doing, he provided insights into his own thinking about the task of Bible translation.⁴² For example, in answer to those who complained about his departure from a literal translation, Luther explained that he was not interested in a translation that employed stilted and unnatural German. He wanted one that ordinary people could understand. This is what he wrote:

We do not have to inquire of the literal Latin, how we are to speak German....Rather we must inquire about this of the mother in the home, the children on the street, the common man in the market place. We must be guided by their language, the way they speak, and do our translating accordingly. That way they will understand it and recognize that we are speaking German to them.⁴³

This principle was an important one for Luther, though not absolute. For Luther conceded that "where everything turns on a single passage," one must keep to the original "quite literally [*nach den buchstaben behalten*]." ⁴⁴ Luther offered an example in John 6:27, "Him has God the Father sealed [*versiegelt*]." "It would have been better German," Luther added, "to say, 'Him has God the Father signified [*gezeichnet*],' or 'He it is whom God the Father means [*meinet*].' But I preferred to do violence to the German language rather than to depart from the word."⁴⁵ Elsewhere, Luther cited a couple of other instances in which he retained a literal rendering, one of them Psalm 68:18, "Thou has led captivity captive." A more idiomatic rendering would have been, "Thou hast set the captives free." But in this instance,

/continued on page 4/

Open Letter to The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod

Dear *Clarion* Readers, Members of Synod and Members of Member Congregations,

Below is the wonderful confessional message from Synodical President Harrison relative to what a Synodically rostered teacher has advocated and is now being allowed to stand without consequence because of a decision made in a District of the Synod.

Regarding a recent decision of a panel not to proceed with charges regarding a public false teacher in the LCMS*

When a public teacher on the roster of Synod can without consequence publicly advocate the ordination of women (even participate vested in the installation of an ELCA clergy person), homosexuality, the errancy of the Bible, the historical-critical method, open communion, communion with the Reformed, evolution, and more, then the public confession of the Synod is meaningless. I am saying that if my Synod does not change its inability to call such a person to repentance and remove such a teacher where there is no repentance, then we are liars and our confession is meaningless. I do not want to belong to such a synod, much less lead it. I have no intention of walking away from my vocation. I shall rather use it and, by the grace of God, use all the energy I have to call this Synod to fidelity to correct this situation.

Matt Harrison

* Posted at the LCMS Witness, Mercy, Life Together web site (<http://wmltblog.org>) on January 26, 2015.

Simply put, the Synod is once again at a defining point as an "orthodox" church body. The Board of Directors of Lutheran Concerns Association calls upon the presidents of every District of Synod, of every Synodical institution of higher learning and every regent thereof as well as every member of every elected board/commission to publicly indicate their unqualified support for President Harrison in his statement above or resign their position forthwith. It is time to be as bold in the secular world of today as Luther was at the Diet of Worms: "Here I stand....." We are in GOD'S CHURCH, not a secular semi-religious philosophical organization or in a governmental legislative body where too often the accepted practice in actuality truly is flim-flamming constituents.

LCA Board of Directors,

Mr. Walter C. Dissen, President
Mr. Scott Diekmann, Vice President
Rev. Jerome Panzigrau, Secretary Treasurer
Rev. Dr. Kristian Kincaid
Mr. John Klinger
Mr. Scott Meyer, Esq.

Rev. Dr. Martin Noland
Rev. Andrew Preus
Rev. David Ramirez
Mr. Leon Rausch
Mr. Don Zehnder

¹⁴ "Now therefore fear the LORD and serve him in sincerity and truthfulness. Put away the gods that your fathers served beyond the River and serve the LORD. ¹⁵ And if it is evil in your eyes to serve the LORD, choose whom you will serve, whether the gods your fathers served in the land of Egypt, or the gods of the Amorites in whose land you dwell. But as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD." Joshua 24:14-15 ESV

ALL Clarion Readers are encouraged to add your name to this Open Letter—see the box "Please Add Your Name to Ours" on page 4 of this issue. Thank You!



Please Add Your Name to Ours

All **Clarion** readers are encouraged to add your name to the Open Letter (page 3).

You can do this by emailing LCA Secretary Rev. Jerome Panzigrau at jpanzigrau@comcast.net or President Walter Dissen at wdissen@aol.com or using their U.S. mail address which appears in each issue. Your name, post office address, telephone number and congregation in which you hold LCMS membership is required. It is planned to list the signers in a future **Clarion** and providing your name is considered permission to list it. Please add **YOUR** name today!

Luther preferred to keep the literal because it pointed to Christ's redemptive work. "These," he said, "are the captivities that Christ has taken captive and done away: death can no longer hold us, sin can no longer incriminate us, the law can no longer accuse our conscience."⁴⁶ In this instance, Luther retained the literal rendering for the sake of its theological significance.

But Luther provided yet another example that pointed in another direction. In Psalm 91:5-6, the Psalmist wrote, "You will not fear the terror of the night, nor the arrow that flies by day, nor the pestilence that stalks in darkness, nor the destruction that wastes at noonday." This time, Luther's concern was the difficulty of knowing what particular misfortunes were pointed to by the images of terror, arrow, pestilence, and destruction. So in order not to foreclose any possible interpretations, Luther retained a literal translation.⁴⁷ In this case, uncertainty about the meaning motivated Luther's decision.

"For Luther, translating the Bible was for the purpose of communicating God's Word and that required clear, natural German."

Clearly, therefore, one should not interpret Luther's remarks about a readable vernacular text to mean that he never translated literally. Nevertheless, it remains true that the Reformer worked diligently to make his version understandable to the person who was going to read it or hear it. In defending his translation in particular instances, he continually raised the question, "What German could understand something like that [*Welcher deutscher versteht solchs*]?" as if to say, why translate at all if your reader will not comprehend the message? For Luther, translating the Bible was for the purpose of communicating God's Word and that required clear, natural German.⁴⁸

A good translator, therefore, had to be an expert in *two* languages – the original and his own! Luther described his translation process for the Old Testament in this way:

[The translator] must see to it – once he understands the Hebrew author – that he concentrates on the sense of the text; asking himself, "Pray tell, what do the Germans say in such a situation?" Once he has the German words to serve the purpose, let him drop the Hebrew words and express the meaning freely in the best German he knows.⁴⁹

First, what does the Hebrew say? Then, how would a German say it? That was Luther's method.

Given the demands of such a method, it's clear that not everybody can be a successful translator. But Luther certainly was. He knew his Hebrew and his Greek – and he knew his German, as the success of his Bible through the centuries demonstrates. Of course, for Luther himself, linguistic and literary merits were hardly the point. He wanted a Bible in the language of the people so that they might learn from it all about Christ as their Savior from sin. That was its purpose. That was its goal.

Luther was not the only one in the 16th century to think this way. So what the Reformer started, others pursued. In England, for example, Luther inspired the first translators, William Tyndale and Miles Coverdale, directly,⁵⁰ and what they began *in English* after the example of Martin Luther, their successors built upon so that the King James Version of 1611 is really a culmination of previous efforts and its text is directly related to the versions that came before it.⁵¹ In fact, one of the editors of the King James Version wrote in the preface:

Truly...wee never thought from the beginning, that we should neede to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principall good one, not justly to be expected against; that hath been our indeavour, that our mark.⁵²

So the very first rule given to the translators was that "The ordinary Bible read in the Church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the truth of the original will permit." A later rule specified that when faithfulness to the original required a departure from the Church's text, then the KJV translators should use the English text found in Tyndale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, the Great Bible, or the Geneva versions.⁵³ In this way, the King James Version became heavily indebted to its predecessors and, in fact, a commonly quoted statistic is that in those parts originally translated by Tyndale, 90% of the King James text is still Tyndale's version.⁵⁴

Therefore, what began in England with Tyndale as a radical departure from the traditional Bible eventually became the founding of another tradition! Through the course of the 16th century, new versions of the English Bible started with the text of a predecessor and "improved" it, usually by bringing it more into line with the original languages. So in the late

DEAR FAITHFUL CLARION READER,

In some past years at about this time the LCA treasury has started running low on funds. LCA can sure use your help!

Reflect on the content of Rev. Dr. MacKenzie's and District President Forke's articles in the context of the LCMS today and you will see how **The Lutheran Clarion** continues to focus on presenting and upholding the truth of God's Holy Word.

If you would like to help defray costs of publishing a solid, Confessional Lutheran periodical, there's an enclosed envelope so you can mail your check to Lutheran Concerns Association, 149 Glenview Drive, New Kensington PA 15068-4921. Do it now. **Thank you!!**



1530's, when the King of England first authorized an official Bible for his church, the principal translator in charge of this project, Miles Coverdale, did not start afresh but employed an earlier version which, in turn, had incorporated much of Tyndale's pioneering effort into its own text. As an "official" Bible, Coverdale's achievement, the so-called Great Bible of 1539, was an important milestone in the construction of a tradition. Thirty years later, when Queen Elizabeth authorized a new official Bible, the Bishops' version of 1568, the result was a revision of the Great Bible; and in 1611, the King James Version was a revision of the Bishops'.⁵⁵

But all the while English Protestants were translating and improving their version of the Bible, English Catholics were attacking such efforts from the perspective of their own tradition. As was the case with Luther's Bible, so too with the English versions from Tyndale (1525) to King James (1611), there developed alongside the Bibles a body of controversial literature regarding the merits of various English versions as well as the propriety of the enterprise in the first place. The English debate proceeded along the same grounds as that surrounding Luther's Bible: text, style (including terminology), and, especially, doctrine.

This is hardly surprising, at least in the beginning, because William Tyndale's pioneering work reflected Luther's in several respects. For example, Tyndale's very first effort at publishing the New Testament, the so-called Cologne Fragment (1525), included only the first several chapters of Matthew since the imperial authorities interrupted it before the printer could complete it.⁵⁶ Nonetheless it clearly displayed Lutheran influence. For one thing, there was the table of contents. Tyndale's work reproduced Luther's organization of the New Testament books that reflected the Reformer's questioning the canonicity of Hebrews, James, Jude, and Revelation, by grouping them, unnumbered, at the end.⁵⁷

Tyndale's prologue also revealed Lutheran influence. The first three pages were basically a translation of the first two pages in Luther's introduction to the September Testament.⁵⁸ Even more importantly, Tyndale's work demonstrated Luther's understanding of the Gospel, "The righteousness that before God is of value, is to believe the promises of God, after the law hath confounded the conscience." Tyndale explained, "When God's law hath brought the sinner into knowledge of himself, and hath confounded his conscience and opened unto him the wrath and vengeance of God; then cometh good tidings. The Evangelion sheweth unto him the promises of God in Christ, and how that Christ hath purchased pardon for him, hath satisfied the law for him, and appeased the wrath of God. And the poor sinner believeth, laudeth and thanketh God through Christ, and breaketh out into exceeding inward joy and gladness."⁵⁹

Clearly, Tyndale was advancing Luther's view of justification by means of an English Bible. And what he began in 1525 with the Cologne Fragment, Tyndale continued in subsequent editions of the English Bible and his other writings. In his first major revision of the New Testament, published in 1534, Tyndale did not reprint his original preface. He wrote a new one, but he did include several prefaces to New Testament books, and most of them show a marked dependence upon a Luther original.⁶⁰ The longest of Tyndale's prefaces is by far the

Rev. Daniel Jastram Called to Northern Asia



Rev. Daniel Jastram, who was Secretary-Treasurer for the Lutheran Concerns Association for many years, has accepted a call to serve the church as a missionary to northern Asia. He and his wife, Dr. Joan Jastram, will

be stationed in Tokyo where Rev. Jastram will serve as strategic mission planner for Japan, Korea, China, Hong Kong, Macau, Taiwan, Viet-nam, Thailand and the Philippines. He will evaluate and supervise theological educators throughout the area and, when needed, will teach at the Japan Lutheran Theological Seminary, Tokyo.

Rev. Jastram is the son of the Rev. Robert Jastram and Phyllis (nee Matthies), who accepted a call to serve in Japan as a missionary in 1953, and remained there for 23 years. Daniel lived in Japan until he returned to the United States to acquire his various degrees. He will now return to Japan to work as a second-generation missionary to continue the work his parents had done earlier.

Rev. and Mrs. Jastram will leave for Japan as soon as they can acquire the needed funding. **The LCA encourages you to support this endeavor;** write a check payable to LCMS (memo line: Jastram Asia Support) and mail to:

The Lutheran Church Missouri Synod
P.O. Box 790089
St. Louis MO 63179-0089

[Some of the information for this article was extracted from the May 2015 issue of the South Dakota District insert to *The Lutheran Witness*.]

one to Romans, which is a translation or paraphrase of Luther's preface to the same book. Like Luther, therefore, Tyndale recommended Romans as "the principall and most excellent part of the newetestament, and most pure Evangelion, that is to saye gladd tydinges and that we call gospel, and also a lyghte and a waye in unto the hole scripture. I thynke it mete, that every Christen man not only knowe it by rote and with oute the boke, but also exercise him selfe therin evermore continually, as with the dayly brede of the soule." Later in the same piece, Tyndale summarized Paul's message just like Luther, "Here of cometh it, that faith only justifieth, maketh rightewes, and fulfilleth the lawe, for it bringeth the sprete thorowe Christes deservinges, the sprite bringeth lust [i.e., delight], looseth the hert, maketh him free, setteth him at liberte, and geveth him strength to worke the dedes of the lawe with love, even as the lawe requiyrth. Then at the last out of the same faith so working in the herte, springe all good works by there awne accorde."⁶¹

Tyndale, however, was not a carbon copy of Luther. In some of these 1534 prefaces, he took direct issue with Luther though not by name. Regarding the epistle to the Hebrews, for example, Tyndale offered an orthodox explanation for the "hard knots" that Luther had cited in order to show why he questioned the book. Tyndale concluded his preface with a rhetorical question, "And seinge the pistle agreeth to all the rest of the scripture, yf it be indifferentye lokod on, how shuld it not be of auctoryte and taken for holye scripture?" Even more forcefully, regarding James, Tyndale, while acknowledging Luther's various arguments against the book, nevertheless stated, "Me thynketh it ought of right to be taken

for holy scripture.”⁶²

The connection between Tyndale and Luther did not escape the defenders of the old religion in England. From the beginning, they indicted Tyndale as a heretic right along with Luther. Probably the best known of Tyndale’s critics, Thomas More, wrote *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies* (1529) and included in the title this phrase, “the pestilent secte of Luther and Tyndale, by the tone bygone in Saxony, and by the tother labored to be brought into England.” More’s *Dialogue* is a wide ranging criticism of the reformers that included an attack upon their translations of the Bible – an attack best summarized in More’s own words, “Who so callyth [it] the newe testament calleth it by a wronge name except they wyll call it Tyndals testament or Luthers testament. For so had Tyndall after Luthers counsayle corrupted and changed it frome the good and holsom doctrine of Cryste to the devylysh heresydes of theyr owne that it was clene a contrary thing.”⁶³

Although More claimed that deliberate mistranslation affected more than “a thousand textys” in Tyndale’s New Testament, he restricted himself to discussing just seven of them in order to document Tyndale’s deliberate avoidance of traditional terminology for the sake of promulgating false doctrine. According to More, these included using “seniors” (later editions “elders”) for “priests”; “congregation” for “church”; “love” for “charity”; “favor” for “grace”; “knowledge” for “confession”; “repentance” for “penance”; and “a troubled heart” for “a contrite heart.” By such substitutions, More claimed, Tyndale would “make the people wene [i.e., know] further that such artycles of our faythe as he laboreth to destroy and whyche be well proved by holy scripture were in holy scripture nothyng spoken of.”⁶⁴ In other words, Tyndale rejected traditional terminology in order to reject traditional doctrine.

Basically, More was right, and Tyndale admitted as much in his *Answer to Sir Thomas More’s Dialogue* (1531) while, of course, insisting that the new theology – and translation – were correct. On the one hand, Tyndale defended his particular renderings as accurate expressions of the Greek; but on the other, he contended that yes, indeed, the new terminology corrected current and false opinions. For example, Tyndale argued that by “congregation” instead of “church” readers would understand “the whole multitude of all that profess Christ” rather than just “the juggling spirits” of the Roman clergy.⁶⁵ He also defended “repentance” instead of “penance” since the text was not referring to any works of satisfaction but rather had in view, “Repent, or let it forethink you; and come and believe the gospel, or glad tidings, that is brought you in Christ, and so shall all be forgiven you; and henceforth live a new life.”⁶⁶ Like Luther, Tyndale offered his translation in order to advance the true and saving doctrine, so he chose his terminology accordingly.⁶⁷

“...tradition also contributed to [Gregory] Martin’s choice of terminology, since he employed words like ‘advent,’ ‘penance,’ ‘chalice,’ ‘aultar,’ and ‘host’ to show readers that such ecclesiastical terms ‘procede even from the very words of Scripture.’”

The More-Tyndale debate occurred just a few years after the appearance of Tyndale’s first complete New Testament (1526), but it raised issues that continued to appear over the course of the century in connection not just with Tyndale but with later versions of the Bible as well. The most thorough of the Catholic critics of the Protestant versions during the Reformation period was Gregory Martin, himself the principal translator of the Rheims New Testament (1582), the first Catholic version in English. Besides the New Testament, Martin also published an extensive analysis of the Protestant Bibles,⁶⁹ and to the translation itself he appended an introduction that justified the entire undertaking. In that introduction he defended his text, terminology, and style, all in the interests of a vernacular Bible, profitable for instruction in life and doctrine, and “specially for deciding the doubttes of these daies.”⁷⁰

By 1582, of course, the Council of Trent had declared the Latin Vulgate to be “authentic Scripture”;⁷¹ and Martin listed the council’s decision as his fifth reason (out of 10) for translating “the old vulgar Latin text, not the common Greeke text.” His first reason, however, was not ecclesiastical authority as such but pure traditionalism, “It is so auncient, that it was used in the Church of God above 1300 yeres agoe, as appeareth by the fathers of those times.” In subsequent reasons he claimed the authority of both Jerome and Augustine and maintained, “It is that, which for the most part ever since hath been used in the Churches service, expounded in sermons, alleaged and interpreted in the Commentaires and writings of the auncient fathers of the Latin Church.” In other words, long standing usage had created a prejudice in favor of the Vulgate.⁷²

Similarly, tradition also contributed to Martin’s choice of terminology, since he employed words like “advent,” “penance,” “chalice,” “aultar,” and “host” to show readers that such ecclesiastical terms “procede even from the very words of Scripture.” Conversely, like Thomas More, Martin repeated the charge that Protestant translators used “usual English words...to deceive the reader.” In fact, Martin argued for a Latinate style that reflected not only the vocabulary of the Latin text but also its word order, “We presume not in hard places to mollifie the speeches or phrases, but religiously keep them word for word, and point for point, for feare of missing, or restraining the sense of the holy Ghost to our phantasie.” Admittedly, this could result in rather awkward English, e.g., “Against the spirituals of wickedness in the celestials” (Eph. 6:12) or “As infants even now borne, reasonable, milke without guile desire ye” (1 Peter 2:2). To clarify any ambiguities, the Rheims New Testament included copious marginal notes and annotations. Encumbered by no doctrine of the perspicuity of the Scriptures, the Catholic translators did not have to produce an easy-to-read version, and in point of fact, they did not.⁷³

Make a Note for Monday, January 18, 2016



LCA is busy planning for the 2016 LCA conference at Don Hall’s in Fort Wayne, IN. The speakers we have so far: Dr. David Menton (Answers in Genesis), Dr. John Pless (CTS), Dr. Roland Ziegler (CTS), Dr. Jack Kilcrease (Calvin College). A panel will discuss by-laws, reconciliation and adjudication: Attorneys David Hawk and Walter Dissen; Dr. Martin Noland and Rev. William Kilps.

Protestants did not leave Martin's claims and criticism unanswered. In fact, the King James translators used their introduction "To the Reader" to respond in part to their critics, defending their use of the Hebrew and Greek texts and their choice of vocabulary. With respect to the latter, they positioned themselves between extremes, rejecting not only the Catholic insistence on Latinate (and hardly English) terms but also the Puritan (actually, Tyndale's) policy of avoiding "olde Ecclesiastical words," and instead, "betak[ing] them to other," e.g., "washing" for "baptism" and "congregation" for "church." But this retreat from Tyndale was only partial – perhaps another tradition was beginning to settle in. "Elders" and "repentance" both stayed in the text.⁷⁴

Rev. Dr. Cameron Alexander MacKenzie

Chairman of Historical Theology

Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana

Part III of Dr. MacKenzie's presentation will continue with the modern era and the Revised Version (1881) as scholars were calling for a successor to the King James Version.

- 1 An earlier version of this essay appeared in *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 53(2013):15-41.
- 37 Friedrich Staphylus, *The apologie of F. Staphylus. Intreating of the true understanding of holy scripture* (Antwerp: J. Latius, 1565), fol. 66^v. Friedrich Staphylus (1512-1564) was a German theologian and imperial councillor, who converted from Lutheranism to Catholicism in 1552. A doctor of theology, he represented the Catholic side against Melancthon, his former teacher, at the Colloquy of Worms in 1557. His *Apologia* first appeared in 1561, well after Luther's death, but I am using it here because the Catholic apologist, Thomas Stapleton, translated it into English as a part of his polemic against English Protestant Bibles. See my *The Battle for the Bible in England 1557-1582* (New York: Peter Lang, 2002), 91-109. For Staphylus's life and work, see *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 17 vols. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), s.v. "Staphylus, Friedrich," and *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 11 vols. (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1957-67), s.v. "Staphylus, Friedrich."
- 38 For these textual comparisons, I am using a modern critical edition of the Vulgate, *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, ed. Robertus Weber, 3rd ed., 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969, 1983) and a contemporary reprint of the so-called "textus receptus." This is H KAINH AIAQHKH *The New Testament: The Greek Text Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611* (n.p.: The Trinitarian Bible Society, n.d.).
- 39 For Luther's German, I have quoted in the text the version recorded by Staphylus but I have tested the accuracy of Staphylus's charges by examining a facsimile of the *September Bible*: Martin Luther, *Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Wittenberg 1522: "SEPTEMBERTESTAMENT"* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994).
- 40 Staphylus, fol. 66^v-73^r. His other complaints include 1 Corinthians 9:5 (against clerical celibacy), Acts 3:1 (against canonical hours), Acts 3:12 (against meritorious works), and Colossians 2:8 (against the social order).
- 41 Nonetheless, Emser's New Testament, after revision by Johann Dietenberger and Johann Eck, went through 65 subsequent editions. OER, s.v. "Emser, Hieronymus."
- 42 See especially his *On Translating: An Open Letter* (1530), LW 35:177-202 (WA 30^l:632-46), and *Defense of the Translation of the Psalms* (1531), LW 35:203-23 (WA 38:9-17, 69). For Luther as a translator, see Kooiman, 96-117; Gritsch, "Luther as Bible Translator"; Bluhm, *Luther Translator of Paul*; Heinz Bluhm, *Martin Luther: Creative Translator* (St. Louis: CPH, 1965); Reu, *Luther's German Bible*, 257-84; and W. Schwarz, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation: Some Reformation Controversies and Their Background* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1955), 167-212.
- 43 LW 35: 189 (WA 30^l:637.18-22).
- 44 LW 35:194 (WA 30^l:640.20-21).
- 45 LW 35:194 (WA 30^l:640.22-24).
- 46 LW 35:216 (WA 38:13.15-17).
- 47 LW 35:216-17 (WA 38:13.22-14.32).
- 48 LW 35:189 (WA 38:637.26). Also LW 35:190, 191 (WA 38:638.1-2 and 638.16-17).
- 49 LW 35:213-14 (WA 38:11.28-32).
- 50 Bluhm, *Creative Translator*, 169-232, and Heinz Bluhm, "Martin Luther and the English Bible: Tyndale and Coverdale," in G. Dünnhaupt, ed., *Martin Luther Quincentennial* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1984), 112-25.
- 51 Works that do an excellent job of tracing these relationships include: Charles C. Butterworth, *The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible 1340-1611* (Phil.: University of Pennsylvania Press 1941) and Westcott, *History*, 123-284.
- 52 "Preface to the Version of 1611," in Alfred W. Pollard, ed., *Records of the English Bible: The Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525-1611* (London: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, 1911), 369.
- 53 For the rules, see David Norton, *A Textual History of the King James Bible* (Cambridge: University Press, 2005), 7-8.
- 54 See, for example, G. E. Duffield, "Introduction," in *The Work of William Tyndale* (Appleford, Berkshire, England: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1964), xxv-xxvi, and J. F. Mozley, *William Tyndale* (London: SPCK, 1937), 108; but Gordon Campbell, *Bible: The Story of the King James Version 1611-2011* (Oxford: University Press, 2010), 15, says only 83%.

- 55 Westcott, *History*, 67-121.
- 56 For the story of Cologne Fragment, see Mozley, *Tyndale*, 56-66, and Edward Arber, ed., *The First Printed English New Testament translated by William Tyndale*, facsimile ed. (London: n.p., 1871).
- 57 (The New Testament) [Cologne: Peter Quentell, 1525], fol. Bv^r. This is the first item in T. H. Darlow and H. F. Moule, *Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible, 1525-1961*, rev. ed. by A. S. Herbert (London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1968). I have consulted the copy in the microfilm collection produced by University Microfilms International (Ann Arbor, MI), *Early English Books I (Pollard and Redgrave, STC I), 1475-1640*. For a summary of Lutheran influences evident in this edition, see David Daniell, *William Tyndale: A Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 108-33, and F. F. Bruce, *History of the Bible in English* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 31-36.
- 58 Cf. *The Cologne Fragment*, fol. Aii^r-Aiii^r (top two lines) and "Vorhede," *The September Bible*, [fol. 2^v]. Mozley, *Tyndale*, 63, estimated that nearly half of Luther's introduction made it into Tyndale's but that Tyndale added so much additional material that the Luther portion was only an eighth of the total.
- 59 William Tyndale, "A Pathway into the Holy Scripture," in Duffield, *Tyndale*, 12-13. Tyndale reworked his prologue into a separately published "Pathway." Duffield's modern language edition of the latter is careful to point out differences between the two, but I have checked my quotations, cited from Duffield, against the original edition, *The Cologne Fragment*, fol. Bii^r.
- 60 See specifically the prefaces to 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians (almost an exact translation), 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy (almost an exact translation), 2 Timothy, Titus (almost an exact translation), Philemon, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and the three epistles of John. These are conveniently found in William Tyndale, *The New Testament*, ed. N. Hardy Wallis, facsimile ed. (Cambridge: University Press, 1938), and LW 35:357-411. According to William A. Clebsch, *England's Earliest Protestants, 1520-1535*, reprint ed. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1980), 144-45, "Hardly a thought expressed in these pieces [Tyndale's prefaces] is not to be found in the German's prefaces." On the other hand, Daniell, *Tyndale*, 326, calls them "almost, but not quite, pure Luther."
- 61 Tyndale, *The New Testament* (1534), 293, 297. Here's Luther in the same places: "This epistle is really the chief part of the New Testament, and is truly the purest gospel. It is worthy not only that every Christian should know it word for word, by heart but also that he should occupy himself with it every day, as the daily bread of the soul" (LW 35:365) and "So it happens that faith alone makes a person righteous and fulfills the law. For out of the merit of Christ it brings forth the Spirit. And the Spirit makes the heart glad and free, as the law requires that it shall be. Thus good works emerge from faith itself" (LW 35:368-69). For the Luther original, see *The September Bible*, fols. ai^r and ai^r.
- 62 Tyndale, *The New Testament* (1534), 502, 521.
- 63 Thomas M. C. Lawler, Germain Marc'hadour, and Richard C. Marius, eds., *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, vol. 6: *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), Part I: 285. For the More/Tyndale debate, see Rainer Pineaas, *Thomas More and Tudor Polemics* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1968), 36-119, and Heinz Holeczek, *Humanistische Bibelfilologie als Reformproblem bei Erasmus von Rotterdam, Thomas More und William Tyndale* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 279-358.
- 64 More, *A Dialogue*, Part I, 290.
- 65 William Tyndale, *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*, Parker Society Edition (Cambridge: University Press, 1850), 14-15.
- 66 Tyndale, *Answer*, 23.
- 67 It's interesting to observe that Luther used similar non-traditional terminology in his *September Bible*. In the following examples, I have placed Luther's terminology next to that of Jerome Emser's New Testament (1527), in which he "corrected" Luther, *Das new testament nach lawt der Christliche kirchen bewerte text, corrigirt und widerum zu recht gebracht* (Dresden: Wolfgang Stöckel, 1527). Emser's work is available in the microform collection, *Early Printed Bibles* (Leiden: IDC, 1989), HBW-4/1. Luther used "Elltistnen" not "priestern" (Titus 1:5); "gemeyne" not "kirchen" (Mt. 18:17); "Bessert euch" not "Thuet buss" (Mt. 3:2); and "holdselige" not "voll genaden" (Luke 1:28).
- 68 *The New Testament of Jesus Christ, translated faithfully into English, out of the authentic Latin....* (Rhemes: John Fogny, 1582). For a demonstration of its "Catholic" character, see my *Battle for the Bible*, 187-210. The Old Testament came out only many years later, 1610-11. For Martin's biography, see OER, s.v. "Martin, Gregory."
- 69 *A discoverie of the corruptions of the holy Scriptures by the Heretikes of our daies...* (Rhemes: John Fogny, 1582).
- 70 Pollard, *Records*, 301. Martin worked with others on the translation so the introduction may also include the contributions of others.
- 71 H. J. Schroeder, ed., *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (St. Louis: B. Herder, 1941), 18, 297.
- 72 Pollard, *Records*, 302-303. Regarding the Latin text, see my *Battle for the Bible*, 187-201.
- 73 Pollard, *Records*, 308.
- 74 Pollard, *Records*, 370, 375-76.



Want to Read *The Clarion* Online?

If you would rather receive a digital version of *The Clarion* in your electronic mailbox, please send your email address to Ginny Valleau at gzolson2000@yahoo.com. We will remove your name from the hard copy mail list and add it to the email list.

The Lutheran Clarion

The official publication of the Lutheran Concerns Association, a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization.
Circulation: 5,400



Published regularly to support issues and causes within The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod which build faithfulness to true Confessional Lutheranism and to be a clear voice of Christian concern against actions and causes which conflict with faithfulness to the One True Faith.

The address for all matters pertaining to the LCA is:
149 Glenview Drive
New Kensington, PA 15068-4921

Editorial Board: Mr. Walter Dissen (Chairman)
Mr. Scott Meyer
Rev. Jerome Panzigrau

Mrs. Ginny Valleau: Layout, Printing & Mailing

Faithful Lutheran individuals who are members of LCMS congregations are invited to submit articles of approximately 500 words for consideration. Inquiries are welcome. Manuscripts will be edited. Please send to: Mr. Walter Dissen

509 Las Gaviotas Blvd, Chesapeake, VA 23322
(757-436-2049; wdissen@aol.com)

The Board of Directors for the LCA:

Mr. Walter Dissen (President)
Mr. Scott L. Diekmann (Vice-President)
Rev. Jerome Panzigrau (Secretary-Treasurer)

Rev. Dr. Kristian Kincaid Rev. Andrew Preus
Mr. John Klinger Rev. David Ramirez
Mr. Scott Meyer Mr. Leon L. Rausch
Rev. Dr. Martin Noland Mr. Donald Zehnder

<http://www.lutheranclarion.org>

Lutheran Concerns Association
July 2015



Lutheran Concerns Association
149 Glenview Drive
New Kensington, PA 15068-4921