

APOKRYFENE,  
BIBELSELSKAPET og  
en ROMKONVERTITT

"Mora mi strei med tuberkulosen store deler av livet."  
"Det var da hun var ei ungjente på rundt tjue år, at mora mi overlevde "den hvite pesten" - så vidt. Da hadde hun nettopp mistet ei søster, så foreldrene hennes hadde bare denne ene ungen i live da familien ble rammet igjen. Besteforeldrene min ble helt forandret etterpå. Selv morfar, som var erkekommunist den gangen i de "harde 30-åra", hadde alltid Bibelen på nattbordet etter det." (Erling Kjekstad; Nationen 08.04.20)

"No greater mischief can happen to a Christian people, than to have God's Word taken from them, or falsified, so that they no longer have it pure and clear. God grant we and our descendants be not witnesses of such a calamity."  
(Martin Luther; oppgitt kilde: The Table Talk of Martin Luther, William Hazlitt trans., 'Of God's Word', book 1, no. 12)



## APOKRYFENE, BIBELSELSKAPET OG EN ROMKONVERTITT

(Med en lang parentes om bibel-oversettelse og grunntekst.)

"The books called Apocrypha, not being of Divine confirmation, are no part of the Canon of Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God; nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than any other human writings." (The Westminster Confession of Faith)

"... in 1824, the encyclical epistle of Pope Leo XII mournfully complains of the Bible Societies, "which," it says, "violate the traditions of the fathers and the Council of Trent, by circulating the Scriptures in the vernacular tongues of all nations." (Louis Gaussen; God-Breathed)

"Now that "interconfessional co-operation" on Bible translation has been introduced, the national Bible Societies invite Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox scholars to join hands with liberal and evangelical "Protestant" scholars, with the object of producing Bibles which Protestants and Roman Catholics will use without distinction. Such a plan makes the inclusion of the Apocrypha, at least in some editions, quite inevitable. Hence the recent change in the rules <of BFBS in 1967>." (Trinitarian Bible Society; Bible Translations and the Apocrypha)

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; mars 2020

"-Egentlig liker jeg ikke å bruke et ord som apokryfene om de deuterokanoniske bøkene. De er ikke bøker som er lagt til Skriften, men bøker som alltid har vært der og som relativt nylig er tatt ut", forteller Dag Øivind Østereng til Dagen (21.02.20); han har levert Bibelselskapets styre og ledelse et brev med 60 underskrifter, hvor anmodes om en bibel-versjon med 73 bøker - et tillegg på 7. Forrige slik versjon kom etter Bibelselskapets apokryf-oversettelse i 1988. (Og heller ikke Bibelselskapet (eller Verbum) synes forøvrig lenger helt bekvem med "apokryfene"; nyoversettelsen (2018) benevnes også "Bibelens deuterokanoniske bøker".)

"... ikke bøker som er lagt til Skriften, men bøker som alltid har vært der ..."?

Jack Moorman (Forever Settled; The Dean Burgon Society Press; pp.20.25): "Regarding the Apocrypha, <Frederick> Kenyon says, "The Greek Old Testament includes a number of books which apparently circulated in the Greek-speaking world (led by Alexandria) and obtained equal acceptance with the canonical books. These never obtained entrance to the Hebrew Canon."

"Concerning the inclusion of the Apocrypha in the Old Latin version, Peter Ruckman quoting the International Bible Encyclopedia says, "The Old Latin manuscripts used by the Waldensians (1170-1600) do not contain the Apocrypha. The Apocrypha was added to many Old Latin manuscripts by the admirers of Origen and Augustine." (Apokryfene finnes i Origenes' Hexapla, uten at Origenes holder dem kanoniske.)

Edward F. Hills (The King James Version Defended; 5.ed.pp.125-9): "Jerome at first attempted to revise the Latin Old Testament, but in AD 390 he undertook the labor of producing a new translation directly from the Hebrew. This version, which Jerome completed in AD 405, later became known as the Latin Vulgate and is the official Bible of the Roman Catholic Church, having been so proclaimed at the Council of Trent (AD 1546).

In his prologue to his translation of the Old Testament Jerome gave an account of the canonical Scriptures of the Hebrew Bible and enumerated them exactly. Then he added: "This prologue to the Scriptures may suit as a helmed preface to all the books which we have rendered from Hebrew into Latin, that we may know that whatever book is beyond these must be reckoned among the Apocrypha." Thus Jerome was one of the first to use the term Apocrypha (non-canonical) to designate certain books which were included in the Septuagint and the Latin Old

Testament versions but had never been part of the Hebrew Scriptures. The names of these apocryphal books are as follows: Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, First and Second Maccabees, certain additions to the books of Esther and Daniel, First and Second Esdras, and the Prayer of Manasses. These books were written by Jewish authors between BC 200 and AD 100. Some of them were written in Hebrew or Aramaic and then translated into Greek. Others were written in Greek originally.

The Roman Catholic Church rejects First and Second Esdras and the Prayer of Manasses. Hence in the printed Latin Vulgate they are placed after the New Testament as an appendix and in small type. The other apocryphal books are mentioned by name in the Council of Trent, where they are declared sacred and canonical and a solemn curse is pronounced against all those who will not receive them as such. Accordingly, in the printed Latin Vulgate they are interspersed without distinction among the other books of the Latin Old Testament.

Protestants have always opposed this attempt of the Roman Catholic Church to canonize the Apocrypha for several reasons. In the first place, it is contrary to the example of Christ and His Apostles. Never in the New Testament is any passage from the Apocrypha quoted as Scripture or referred to as such. This is admitted by all students of this subject, including present-day scholars such as B.M. Metzger (AD 1957). This fact is decisive for all those who acknowledge the divine authority and infallible inspiration of the New Testament writers. And all the more is this so if it be true, as Metzger and many other scholars have contended, that Paul was familiar with Wisdom, James with Ecclesiasticus, John with Tobit, and the author of Hebrews (who may have been Paul) with 2. Maccabees. For if these Apostles knew these apocryphal books this well and still refrained from quoting or mentioning them as Scripture, then it is doubly certain that they did not accord these books a place in the Old Testament canon. According to C.C. Torrey (AD 1945), however, only in the Epistle to the Hebrews is there clear evidence of a literary allusion to the Apocrypha.

A second reason ... And additional evidence that the Jews did not recognize the Apocrypha as canonical is supplied by the Talmudic tract Baba Bathra (2nd century) and by the famous Jewish historian Josephus (circa AD 93) in his treatise Against Apion. Neither of these sources make any mention of the Apocrypha in the lists which they give of the Old Testament books. For, as Torrey observes, the Jews had but one standard, acknowledged everywhere. Only such books as were believed to have been composed in either Hebrew or Aramaic before the end of the Persian period were received into the Old Testament canon.

There is reason to believe, however, that the Greek-speaking Jews of Alexandria were not so strict as the Palestinian rabbis about the duty of shunning apocryphal books. Although these Alexandrian Jews did not recognize the Apocrypha as Scripture in the highest sense, nevertheless they read these books in Greek translation and included them in their Septuagint. And it was in this expanded form that the Septuagint was transmitted to the early gentile Christians. It is not surprising therefore that those early Church Fathers especially who were ignorant of Hebrew would be misled into placing these apocryphal books on the same plane with the other books of the Septuagint, regarding them all as Scripture."

"Augustine (AD 354-430) at first defended the canonicity of the Apocrypha but later came to a position not much different from Jerome's. There should be a distinction, he came to feel, between the books of the Hebrew canon and the "deuterocanonical" books accepted and read by the churches. Pope Gregory the Great (AD 540-604) also adopted Jerome's position in regard to the Apocrypha, and so did Cardinal Ximenes and Cardinal Cajetan at the beginning of the Protestant Reformation. Hence, the decree of the Council of Trent canonizing the Apocrypha is contrary to the informed conviction of the early and medieval Church. And this is the third reason why Protestants reject it."

Dog trykket Protestants apokryfene i appendiks til GT.

"In opposition to this practice Puritans and Presbyterians agitated for the complete removal of the Apocrypha from the Bible. In AD 1825 the British and

Foreign Bible Society agreed to this <BFBS's policy until 1967>, and since this time the Apocrypha has been eliminated almost entirely from English Bibles (except pulpit Bibles)."

3

En kan merke seg at sporene fra ideen om apokryfene som del av kanon, peker samme vei som modernismens foretrukne 'aleksandrinske' NT-tekst.

"-Alle bibeloversettelser frem til da <1900>, som har vært på dansk, hadde med de apokryfiske skriftene. Det er bare de siste 120 årene de ikke har inngått i vår bibel. Jeg tror det er sannsynlig at det på sikt vil komme en bibelutgave med de apokryfiske skrifter, sier" Bibelselskapets generalsekretær Paul Erik Wirgenes (Dagen 21.02.20), og kunne etterlate inntrykk av at Bibelen, tilgjengelig og lest i Norge til 1900 og senere, var med apokryfene. At Det norske bibelselskap i 1891 (før NT1904) utga apokryfløs lommebibel, er i sammenhengen en bagatell.

Når Det norske bibelselskap utgir sin første helbibel (1854) "Tilligemed det Gamle Testamentes apokryphiske Bøger", har dette som bakgrunn bokhandler C.A. Dybwads innbydelse til subskripsjon på en bibelutgave, okt. 1850. "Planen begrunnes med at det i bokhandelen ikke fantes noen bibelutgave med Apokryfene, og at Bibelselskapet ikke hadde planer om et opplag før den nye oversettelsen var ferdig." (Åge Holter (1966), s.161)

Det som i sammenhengen ikke er en bagatell, er at når salget av NT og Bibelen tiltar utover 1800-tallet, så utgjøres omkring to tredeler av utgaver fra BFBS, Det Britiske og Utenlandske Bibelselskap (jf. Holter s.219 og Kullerud (2016) s.149). BFBS trykket den norske helbibel i 1829. Mellom 1832 og 1867 trykket Chr. Grøndahl for BFBS (ved siden av 200 000 NT) "av hele Biblen fire utgaver i tretten opplag... omtrent 100 000 bibler". (Holter s.218) Uten apokryfene.

Generalsekretær Wirgenes holder det altså "sannsynlig at det på sikt vil komme en bibelutgave med de apokryfiske skrifter".

Forlengst har Bibelselskapet gitt oss 'idiomatiske', 'dynamisk ekvivalente' versjoner med 'aleksandrinske' NT-tekster; "Den katolske kirke i Norge har rost bibeloversettelsen som kalles Bibel 2011, og i 2017 ble den offisielt omfavnet av kirkesamfunnet. Med godkjennelse hele veien fra Vatikanet." (Dagen 21.02.20) Underlig utvikling over decenniene; eller kanskje ikke ...

"Bibelen ble formelt ikke satt på index før i 1564 <William Tyndale er brent før 1564>, men var blitt forbudt for legfolk alt ved kirkemøtet i Toulouse i 1229." (Eivind Berggrav i foredraget Bibelbølgen, 1954.)

"Forbudet holdt lenge. Det ble derfor bittert for Rom da bibelselskapene ble stiftet og satte seg til mål å spré Bibelen. Akkurat samme år som vårt norske bibelselskap ble stiftet, kunngjorde pave Pius VII at "bibelselskaper er en listig oppfinnelse". Bibelen var kirkesprengende og farlig, og den nye "list" var forkastelig. I 1864 satte ... navnebror Pius IX, bibelselskaper i klasse med sosialister, kommunister og frimurere. Det var likevel lekket ut en del bibler også til katolske kretser, og i 1897 forbød Leo XIII alle katolikker å kjøpe eller eie noen bibel som var gitt ut av protestantiske bibelselskaper. Det er overfor dette noe nesten kirkehistorisk, iallfall bibelhistorisk, over det som jeg personlig opplevde i Wien i 1951, da vi hadde en regionalkonferanse der for Verdens Forenede Bibelselskaper. Da ble styret mottatt hos den romerske kardinal Innitzer. Han holdt en tale og takket de protestantiske bibelselskaper for alt hva de hadde gjort for Bibelens oversettelse og spredning, og tilføyde at katolikkene stod i stor gjeld for den hjelp selskapene hadde yt-

et.

Med historien til bakgrunn var det nesten ikke til å tro.

Men det hadde sin forklaring.

Vi for vår del kan vel forme det slik at bibelbølgen etter hvert ble den romerske kirke for sterk. Sitt første spesielle uttrykk fikk dette i 1943 i pavens

encyklier "Divino afflante Spiritu", hvor alle trossende blir tilrådet å lese Bibelen, altså det stikk motsatte av det som koncilvedtaket i Toulouse gikk ut på. Som forberedelse var det i Rom blitt opprettet en bibelkommisjon til å ta seg av bibelarbeidet. Nå skulle ikke bare den gamle katolske oversettelse (Vulgata) legges til grunn, men også hos katolikken den hebraiske og den greske grunntekst."

If you can't beat them, ...

(Apropos "grunntekst" - og apropos 'oversettelse'; **En lang parentes:** Hva er denne 'Bibel 2011', "offisielt omfavnet av" romerkirken i Norge med "godkjennelse hele veien fra Vatikanet"?)

Som 1978/85-versjonen, er 'Bibel 2011' tekstgjengivelse i genren 'dynamisk ekvivalens' og deromkring; en metodikk frontet av Executive Secretary of the Translations Department of the American Bible Society (1946-1980), Eugene A. Nida: "Translation consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message" (Nida; Toward a science of Translating (1964)); dette prinsipielt ganske annerledes enn (reformatørisk) bibeloversettelse (i korthet): teksten gjengitt så nøyaktig som mulig og så fritt som nødvendig.

"The theology inherent in the theory of dynamic equivalence is related to a view of God, man, and the world closely associated with modern philosophy and the sciences based upon it." "God did not give eternal truths, says Nida, but granted communication. He revealed Himself through the imperfections of human language. It is not our duty to canonize the imperfect form, but it is our task to let the purpose of the revelation find expression in a different culture that has its own limitations."

"Since God has revealed His Word in a fixed and written form, the translator must be respectful of this form. Readable translations may be made without this respect, but they ignore God's words, "... to obey is better than sacrifice..." <1.Sam.15,22>. Obedience in Bible translating means a careful transmission of what God caused to be written. The translator should not attempt to mediate between God's Word and modern culture, but only render and transmit. Then God's Word itself will reach the people whom God in His grace wants to reach. This does not mean that translating is a mechanical activity <og van Bruggen skriver mer om det>."

"The comparison of a number of modern translations indicates that the years since 1881 have witnessed a growing uncertainty with regard to the New Testament text. Critics today no longer choose one manuscript or textual group as the basic text, but reconstruct from all sorts of manuscripts a new, hypothetical text. The Greek New Testament of the UBS, for example, is based upon the majority vote of a team of five textual scholars, but not on the majority of ninety percent of the manuscripts. The result is that the textual basis for modern translations is subject to fluctuation." (Jakob van Bruggen; The Future of the Bible; pp.78.75.99.124)

'Bibel 2011's tekstgrunnlag er hentet fra Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft (tidl. Württembergische Bibelanstalt); heriblant Nestle/Aland 27. NT-utgave (1993).

Tilbake til tiden rundt reformasjonen. "The Greek New Testament was first printed in 1514, although not published in a separate edition until 1522. This was the work of Francisco Ximenes, Cardinal Primate of Spain, and it formed part of his six-volume Complutensian Polyglot. In his Dedication to Pope Leo X, Ximenes wrote: "For Greek copies indeed we are indebted to your Holiness, who sent us most kindly from the Apostolic Library very ancient codices, both of the Old and New Testament; which have aided us very much in this undertaking". The resultant Greek text appears to be have been of the Byzantine type (and there is no evidence that Ximenes ever followed the Codex Vaticanus <B>."

"As Luther took the New Testament of Erasmus and made the German language, so Tyndale took the same immortal gift of God and made the English language." (Benjamin C. Wilkinson) "Erasmus no doubt was aware of the Vatican manuscript perhaps as early as 1521. His familiarity is more fully seen in his 1533 correspondence with Sepulveda regarding the differences between Vaticanus and Erasmus's Greek texts, and the prior's similarity to the text of the Latin Vulgate. Yet Erasmus chose not to correct his Greek text to reflect those differences. It is thought by many that Erasmus found Vaticanus to be inferior to the Greek manuscripts on which he built his texts - and perhaps a corruption of the Greek text - and thus chose not to use it." (A. Hembd; What today's Christian needs to know about Dr Kurt Aland; note 11) (Flere gjengir, som følger, Frederick Nolan's ... inquiry ... (1815) p.413: Before he <Erasmus> gave to the Reformation the New Testament in Greek, he divided all Greek manuscripts into two classes: those which agreed with the Received Text and those which agreed with the Vaticanus manuscript.)

De mest anti-bibelske publiseringer fant sted omkring 1860; Codex Vaticanus 1857 - et par år før Darwin's 'Origin' 1859, året for Konstantin Tischendorf's 'oppgivelse' (eller hva det var) av Codex Sinaiticus - publisert 1862. (1857 begynner forøvrig et arbeid retning revisjon av den engelske 1611-bibelen.)

Bill Cooper (The Authenticity of the New Testament Part 1; pp.48-9) forteller: "Tischendorf was a Lutheran in the days when denominations actually meant something, and Lutherans in the Vatican's eyes were the very worst of heretics. They were, after all, the spawn of that perfidious Martin Luther whose 95 Theses had almost brought down the Papacy back in 1517. So, what on earth was the Pope thinking of when he invited this perfidious Lutheran to a private audience? And what on earth was Tischendorf thinking of when he accepted the invitation? Tischendorf, surprisingly, is uncharacteristically reticent about it: "I here pass over in silence the interesting details of my travels - my audience with the pope, Gregory XVI., in May, 1843 - my intercourse with Cardinal Mezzofanti, that surprising and celebrated linguist - and I come to the result of my journey to the East."

Private audiences with any pope are only ever granted when their desired outcome is directly advantageous to the Papacy or the Vatican. They are never granted to those who can be of no material or political benefit. Try asking for one and see. Clearly, Gregory XVI had been given reason to hope that this Tischendorf, Lutheran though he be, could be of great use to the Papal cause, and this had been brought about by the oft-publicised desires of Tischendorf to 'improve' the text of the New Testament by finding one other than the Textus Receptus. What exactly was spoken between them must remain a Vatican secret, though the immediate upshot was that Tischendorf was allowed - against all precedent and the feigned histrionic objections on one of the Cardinals present - to examine Codex Vaticanus. Again, given the Vatican's feelings towards the Reformation and its Textus Receptus Bible, along with their consistent effort over so many centuries to either destroy, corrupt or somehow undermine that Bible, we are left merely to wonder what this very strange episode was all about, and what the Papacy hoped to gain by it. For be assured, that private audience was not granted for Tischendorf's benefit, nor for the Bible's, but for the Pope's." Og videre fra Tischendorf til Hort:

Wilbur N. Pickering (The Identity of the New Testament Text IV; pp.8.24) siterer "Ernest Cadman Colwell <who> might well have been described as the dean of New Testament textual criticism in North America during the 1950s and 1960s" : "The dead hand of Fenton John Antony Hort lies heavy upon us. In the early years of this century Kirsopp Lake described Hort's work as a failure, though a glorious one. But Hort did not fail to reach his major goal, He dethroned the Textus Receptus."

Hort, som allerede 1851 skrev om "that vile Textus Receptus"; Hort som gode ti år senere hevder at "'Protestantism' is only parenthetical and temporary".

Edw. Hills igjen (p.183): "Since AD 1881 many, perhaps most, orthodox Christian Scholars have agreed with Westcott and Hort that textual criticism is a strictly neutral science that must be applied in the same way to any document whatever, including the Bible."

"It was John W. Burgon (AD 1813-1888), ... who most effectively combated the neutralism of naturalistic Bible study... Because of his learned defense of the Traditional New Testament text he has been held up to ridicule in most of the handbooks on New Testament textual criticism; but his arguments have never been refuted."

John William Burgon (The Revision Revised (1883); sitater fra David O. Fuller; True or False; pp.201-15): "'Textual Criticism Made Easy," might very well have been the title of the little volume <Westcott & Hort's 'Introduction'> now under review; of which at last it is discovered that the general infallibility of Codex B is the fundamental principle"; "by an unscrupulous use of the process of reiteration, accompanied by a boundless exercise of the imaginative faculty, we have reached the goal to which all that went before has been steadily tending: that is, the absolute supremacy of codices B <Vaticanus> and Aleph <Sinaiticus> above all other codices, and when they differ, then of Codex B."

"Nothing comes after Dr. Hort's extravagant and unsupported estimate of Codices B and Aleph. On the contrary, Those two documents are caused to cast their somber shadows a long way ahead, and to darken all our future."

"... a pyramid balanced on its apex proves to be no unapt image of the textual theory of Drs. Westcott and Hort. When we reach the end of their Introduction we find we have reached the point to which all that went before has been evidently converging: but we make the further awkward discovery that it is the point on which all that went before absolutely depends also. Apart from Codex B, the present theory could have no existence. But for Codex B, it would never have been excogitated. On Codex B, it entirely rests. Out of codex B, it has entirely sprung.

Take away this one codex, and Dr. Hort's volume becomes absolutely without coherence, purpose, or meaning. One-fifth of it is devoted to remarks on B and Aleph. The fable of "the Syrian text" is invented solely for the glorification of B and Aleph, which are claimed, of course, to be "pre-Syrian." This fills forty pages more. And thus it would appear that the Truth of Scripture has run a very narrow risk of being lost forever to mankind. Dr. Hort contends that it more than half lay "perdu" on a forgotten shelf in the Vatican Library; Dr. Tischendorf, that it had been deposited in a wastepaper basket in the convent of St. Catharine at the foot of Mount Sinai".

"... the incident which will make the 17th of May, 1881, forever memorable in the Annals of the Church of England.

The publication on that day of the "Revised English Version of the New Testament" instantly concentrated public attention on the neglected problem, for men saw at a glance that the Traditional Text of 1530 years' standing (the exact number is Dr. Hort's, not ours) had been unceremoniously set aside in favor of an entirely different recension. The true authors of the mischief were not far to seek. Just five days before, under the editorship of Drs. Westcott and Hort, (Revisionists themselves) had appeared the most extravagant text which has seen the light since the invention of printing <, the W & H Greek NT>. No secret was made of the fact that, under pledges of strictest secrecy, a copy of this wild performance (marked "Confidential") had been entrusted to every member of the Revising body; and it has since transpired that Dr. Hort advocated his own peculiar views in the Jerusalem Chamber with so much volubility, eagerness, pertinacity, and plausibility, that in the end notwithstanding the warnings, remonstrances, and entreaties of Dr. Scrivener, his counsels pre-



vailed. And -- the utter shipwreck of the "Revised Version" has been, (as might have been confidently predicted) the disastrous consequence."

7

Og videre fra Hort til Aland (1915-1994); Cooper igjen (p.118): Kurt Aland "is a well-known figure in the critics' world. He is the authority behind several modern translations, not of the Bible, but of Gnostic corruptions of the Bible, all of them sprung directly from Westcott and Hort and the Alexandrian Gnostic texts. They only pose as the Word of God. Whether his professional involvement over so many years arose from any malice within him toward the Scriptures, we cannot say. But we can say, by his own candid admission, that he did not believe in the slightest that the Bible was the Word of God. He wrote and spoke against that notion many times, claiming that virtually none of the New Testament Books were authentic, even the Gospels being all forgeries. With two of his earliest books, he pushed hard to have Hebrews, 2 Peter, 2 & 3 John, Jude and Revelation dropped from the New Testament Canon, and claimed that certain apocryphal books had a better claim to canonicity than they did. It was as if Marcion had come back from the dead. So the next time you open your ESV, or your NIV, or any other 'modern' version from Aland's stable, take a moment to think on the man who did more than any of his colleagues to bring them before the world. They are not the pure Word of God that they pretend to be, and are certainly not the fruit of a man who loved the Word of God. On the contrary, like the apostates Westcott and Hort before him, he openly despised that Word, and devoted his entire life to its perversion and ultimate destruction."

Bruce M. Metzger (The Text of the New Testament; 2.ed (1968) pp.119.121.144. 127.138): "During the latter part of the eighteenth century the German scholar Johann Jakob Griesbach (1745-1812) laid foundations for all subsequent work on the Greek text of the New Testament." "The importance of Griesbach for New Testament textual criticism can scarcely be overestimated. For the first time in Germany a scholar ventured to abandon the Textus Receptus at many places and to print the text of the New Testament in the form to which his investigations had brought him."

"The most widely used pocket edition of the Greek Testament is that prepared by Eberhard Nestle (1851-1913) for the Württembergische Bibelanstalt (Stuttgart, 1898; 24th ed., by Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland, 1960). Its text (since 3rd ed., 1901) is based on a comparison of the texts edited by Tischendorf (1869-72) <his 8th ed., "accused of giving excessive weight to the evidence of codex Sinaiticus">, by Westcott and Hort (1881), and by Bernhard Weiss (1894-1900) <"In assessing the degree of freedom of Greek manuscripts from ... errors, Weiss decided that codex Vaticanus was the best. It is not surprising, therefore, that the general complexion of Weiss's edition is remarkably similar to that of Westcott and Hort, who relied so largely on codex Vaticanus.">, where two of these three editions agree, this reading is printed by Nestle. Thus the text of Nestle represents the state of nineteenth-century scholarship".  
Skriver Metzger; selv medlem av UBS' editorial committee.

J.D. Arnold, Editorial Director, Trinitarian Bible Society; Quarterly Record Oct.-Dec. 2019: "As far back as 1906 we were seeking to warn people about the dangers of rejecting the Textus Receptus as the Greek text underlying Bible translations. Our Quarterly Record reported in October 1906 that Dr Eberhard Nestle had recently announced, 'After long deliberation, the British and Foreign Bible Society has resolved to give up the Received Text, not only for its Greek editions, but also, which is still more important, for the Translations into Foreign Languages'.

Nestle was to prepare this new Greek edition but he adds, 'We must not think that the critical work of the Text is going to be finished'. This is still the view of the majority of textual critics today, as they continue working on what for them is in essence a perpetually unsettled and therefore constantly changing Greek text."

"The Bible is foundational to the Christian. We are often reminded that if Genesis 1 and the creation account are denied, it undermines the whole Scripture. Indeed, there are atheistic scientists - and even some 'Christians' - who interpret the evidence through presuppositions that deny not only the authority of Scripture but the very existence of God. We must not be duped by theories of textual criticism that follow the approach of those who do not accept the authority of Scripture. And yet these theories are often the very ones given a free pass to influence the actual text that pastors will eventually preach from and which faithful Christians receive as the Word of God."

"Since New Testament times there has been no temple in which to preserve the inspired writings; therefore it fell to the church to preserve the words inspired by God. However, in the last couple of centuries, as seen from our QR 187 above, this task has been turned over to those deemed to be scholars - some of whom deny the authority of the Scriptures. However interesting some may find the principles of manuscript comparison that Dr. Nestle and his scholastic descendants have employed, so that the Greek New Testament named after him is on its twenty-eighth edition <2012>, their underlying approach should be troubling to anyone who holds to the inspiration, preservation and reliability of Scripture."

"Recently the rather repetitive question has arisen again by those who misunderstand the Textus Receptus position: What TR do you hold to? The answer is clearly set out in our article on the Validity of the Textus Receptus: "What has been called the Received Text since the middle 17th century is actually a group of printed texts produced beginning in 1516 with the first edition of the text of Erasmus. These texts, produced by Reformation and Renaissance scholars, bear their names: Erasmus, Stephens, Beza, Elzevir. The latest, and currently most used, edition of the Textus Receptus, is that produced by Scrivener in 1894, which is still published by the Society. These texts are based upon varying numbers of manuscripts which were available at the time, but all of these manuscripts have something in common: they were all of the Byzantine text-type. Thus, these texts are nearly consistent, not only with one another, but also with the vast majority of manuscripts of the Greek New Testament which were available to scholars of the Reformation and which are available to scholars today."

As already stated, the pervading Critical Greek Text is in its twenty-eighth edition - and this count only of the Nestle-Aland editions and does not include Westcott and Hort's or its predecessors. As our article goes on to state regarding the Critical Text: "Each of these texts is also built on only a handful of manuscripts which do not represent the majority of available manuscripts but instead are the only representatives of a group of manuscripts which differ from the majority and amongst themselves. Therefore, regardless of which edition of the Textus Receptus one chooses, he is getting a New Testament which represents the majority of manuscripts available then and now. His Critical Greek Text does not."

Lang parentes slutt.)

'Apokryf-bibelen' igjen:

Østereng - "tenker at Bibelselskapet som økumenisk foretak godt kan bidra til at en slik bibel blir utgitt." (Og det skulle være mulig å finne støtte for i Bibelselskapet: "-Først med utgivelsen av apokryfene er arbeidet med Bibel 2011 egentlig fullført, sier Hans-Olav Mørk, leder for Bibelselskapets oversettelsesarbeid. -Nå har vi endelig en økumenisk bibeltekst!" (Bibelgaven 4/-18) Økumenikk ...

"The introduction to the 1984 Annual Report of the United Bible Societies (p.5) refers to "the generally interconfessional character" of the national Bible societies, and states that "in order to allow for the participation of Christians from all traditions that exist in their country, several Bible Societies chan-

ged their constitution in 1984, and now have members of all Christian denominations on their board". This discreetly worded statement can be spelled out more clearly, as meaning that several formerly Protestant Bible societies have altered their rules so as to allow Roman Catholics to be elected to their governing committee, hence promoting increased Catholic influence and control over Bible translation and distribution." A "prominent name is the Very Reverend Gunnar Stalsett, who is a member of the UBS executive committee and is at the same time on the executive committee of the World Council of Churches and is the general secretary of the Lutheran World Federation <fra 1985; pr 1984 generalsekretær i Det norske bibelselskap>.

It can also be mentioned here that one of the joint editors of the widely-used UBS Greek New Testament is a Roman Catholic cardinal, namely Carlo M. Martini <S.J.>, the bishop of Milan." Skriver the Trinitarian Bible Society's artikkel Ecumenism and the United Bible Societies. Den skriver "In 1984 "a new constitution was adopted which makes the <Norwegian> Bible Society fully ecumenical" (UBS Report 1984. 158). An example of the result of this change of approach is found in the inclusion of a female Catholic journalist in the Norwegian Bible Society's committee."

Årene vedblir gå, og "Den katolske kirke i Norge har røst bibeloversettelsen som kalles Bibel 2011 ..."

Hvem som først var ute med nyvinningen, Vatikanet eller Bibelselskapet, vet jeg ikke (det kunne nå synes mer og mer som samme sak); iallefall har Bibelselskapet forlenget presentert den, og "Recently the Pope of the Roman Catholic Church altered the English translation of the Lord's Prayer from 'and lead us not into temptation' to 'and do not let us fall into temptation'. The reason given for the change is that the traditional translation 'is not a good translation because it speaks of a God who induces temptation' whereas 'it's Satan who leads us into temptation - that's his department'." Skriver Senior Editorial Consultant, the Trinitarian Bible Society, Larry Brigden (Quarterly Record, Jan.-March 2020; m.ref. Harriet Sherwood, 'Led not into temptation: pope approves change to Lord's Prayer', The Guardian 6 June 2019, [www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jun/06/led-not-into-temptation-pope-approves-change-to-lords-prayer](http://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/jun/06/led-not-into-temptation-pope-approves-change-to-lords-prayer), accessed 22 October 2019.)

Lingvistiker Brigden forklarer over flere sider både det språklige og "The Meaning of the Petition", og finner at "the Pope's alteration of the translation of the Lord's Prayer is linguistically indefensible. In making the alteration the Pope has evidently not had any regard to what the Word of God actually says, but instead only to his own notions of God. And when the literal meaning of the text does not agree with those notions, the latter prevails over the former and the Word of God is effectively set aside.

But such a setting aside of the Word of God ought not to surprise any, for thus has the Roman Catholic Church done for many centuries now, and especially since the Reformation. She has established her own notions of God in opposition to the truths which God Himself infallibly reveals in His Word. This setting aside of the Word of God is, of course, a departure from God Himself, and in just recompense the Roman Catholic Church has been given up to walk in a darkness of her own choosing. This altering of a verse in the Lord's Prayer is only a further evidence of that darkness. It is as Isaiah said: 'To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them' (Isaiah 8.20)."

(Se forøvrig D.J.H.; Det fjerde rike; kommentar-avisa.no)