

E P O C H - M A K I N G

B O O K S

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit
May 2015

EPOCH-MAKING BOOKS

"The dead hand of Fenton John Anthony Hort lies heavy upon us."²¹

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; May 2015

"Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament has been described as an epoch-making book; and quite as correctly as the same phrase has been applied to the work done by Darwin."¹ "... the work of Westcott and Hort ... the overwhelming consensus of scholarly opinion recognizes that their critical edition was truly epoch-making."²

"Hort writes to Rev. John Ellerton, April 3, 1860: "But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin. Whatever may be thought of it, it is a book that one is proud to be contemporary with.... My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable. If so, it opens up a new period."^{3,4}

The 'theory' was answerable;⁵ still it opened "up a new period."

Also Westcott and Hort's 'theory', underlying their Greek NT-text, was answerable; after a discussion of it, Wilbur N. Pickering concludes "the W-H critical theory... is evidently erroneous at every point. Our conclusions concerning the theory of necessity apply also to any Greek text constructed on the basis of it, as well as to those versions based upon such texts (and to commentaries based upon them)"⁶

So what?

"To really understand what is going on today we must have a clear perception of the W-H critical theory and its implications. Its importance is universally recognized. J.H. Greenlee's statement is representative: "The textual theory of W-H underlies virtually all subsequent work in NT textual criticism."⁷

Pickering continues: "Although Brooke Foss Westcott identified himself fully with the project and the results, it is generally understood that it was mainly Fenton John Anthony Hort who developed the theory and composed the Introduction in their two-volume work. In the

following discussion I consider the W-H theory to be Hort's creation.

At the age of 23, in late 1853, Hort wrote to a friend: "I had no idea till the last few weeks of the importance of texts, having read so little Greek Testament, and dragged on with the villainous Textus Receptus... Think of that vile Textus Receptus leaning entirely on late MSS.; it is a blessing there are such early ones."

Scarcely more than a year later, "the plan of a joint ((with B.F. Westcott)) revision of the text of the Greek Testament was first definitely agreed upon"... That it actually took twenty-eight years does not obscure the circumstance that though uninformed, by his own admission, Hort conceived a personal animosity for the Textus Receptus, and only because it was based entirely, so he thought, on late manuscripts. It appears that Hort did not arrive at his theory through unprejudiced intercourse with the facts. Rather, he deliberately set out to construct a theory that would vindicate his preconceived animosity for the Received Text.

Colwell has made the same observation: "Hort organized his entire argument to depose the Textus Receptus". And again, "Westcott and Hort wrote with two things constantly in mind; the Textus Receptus and the Codex Vaticanus. But they did not hold them in mind with that passive objectivity which romanticists ascribe to the scientific mind."⁸

Hort didn't know the stuff in question but had the answer; then needed a theory: "As the years went by, Hort must have seen that to achieve his end he had to have a convincing history of the text - he had to be able to explain why essentially only one type of text was to be found in the mass of later manuscripts and show how this explanation justified the rejection of this type of text."⁹

The story doesn't look quite unique.

Dominic Statham writes that although Darwin did not publish his Origin of species until 1859, we know from his autobiography that he had "clearly conceived" his theory by 1839. This is quite remarkable, because most historians are agreed that, prior to 1837, he was not at all inclined to evolutionary thinking."

"Firstly... (1837-1839), on his own admission, he "gradually came to disbelieve Christianity." Secondly, he wholly rejected the idea of

the miraculous in favour of "laws" which governed the natural world. "Everything in nature is the result of fixed laws" he wrote. "There are many other indications of the ideological nature of Darwin's thinking. In his autobiography we read, "As soon as I had become, in the year 1837 or 1838, convinced that species were mutable productions, I could not avoid the belief that man must come under the same law." And, commenting on his observations of the facial expressions of his first born child in 1839, he wrote, "I felt convinced, even at this early period, that the most complex and fine shades of expressions must all have had a gradual and natural origin." That he "felt convinced" of this so early in his thinking, and without any data, is very strong evidence that this conviction arose much more from his growing deistic beliefs than from scientific enquiry."¹⁰

Two men; with two implausible ideas (that should reshape the Western world and beyond); in need of a theory.

Hort's case against the Traditional Text of the NT, "the vile Textus Receptus" (Hort), was not very original.

"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. A pupil of Semler's at Halle..."¹¹ "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."¹²

"The first recognized scholar to break totally with the Textus Receptus was the celebrated classical and Germanic philologist of Berlin, Karl Lachmann (1793-1851)". "In editing the New Testament Lachmann's aim was not to reproduce the original text, which he believed to be an impossible task, but to present on purely documentary evidence, apart from any previously printed editions, the text current in Eastern Christendom at the end of the fourth century (about A.D. 380)."¹³

"The man to whom modern textual critics of the New Testament owe most is without doubt Lobegott Friedrich Constantin Tischendorf (1815-74)". "Of Tischendorf's several editions of the Greek Testament the most

important is the eighth". "The text of his eighth edition differs (according to Eberhard Nestle) from the seventh edition in 3,572 places, and he has been accused of giving excessive weight to the evidence of codex Sinaiticus, which he had discovered between issuing the two editions."¹⁴

"In England the scholar who, at the middle of the nineteenth century, was most successful in drawing British preference away from the Textus Receptus was Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (1813-75)."¹⁵

"... Henry Alford (1810-71), Dean of Canterbury and author of several well-known hymns ... deserves mention here as an ardent advocate of the critical principles formulated by those who, like Lachmann, had worked for the 'demolition of the unworthy and pedantic reverence for the received text, which stood in the way of all chance of discovering the genuine word of God'. ((Metzger quotes Alford))"¹⁶

Neither was Charles Darwin much original in what he came up with; "most (if not all) of the major ideas credited to Darwin were actually discussed in print by others before him." "A study of the history of evolution shows that, in fact, Darwin "borrowed" all of his major ideas - some conclude plagiarized is a more accurate word - without giving proper credit to these people until he was forced by complaints from his fellow scientists to do so."

"The modern theory of biological evolution was probably first put in print by Charles De Secondat Montesquieu (1689-1755), who concluded that "in the beginning there were very few" kinds of species, and by natural means of gradual evolution the number has "multiplied since." Another important early evolutionist was Benoit de Maillet (1656-1738), whose book on evolution was published posthumously in 1748. In this book, de Maillet suggests that fish were the precursors of birds, mammals, and men. Yet another pre-Darwin scientist, Pierre-Louis Maupertuis (1698-1759), concluded in his 1751 book that new species result from the fortuitous recombining of different parts of living animals.

At about this same time, the French encyclopedist Denis Diderot (1713-1784) taught that all animals evolved from one primeval organism and that this prototype organism was fashioned into all of the animal kinds alive today via natural selection. George Louis Buffon (1707-1788) expounded this idea at length..."

"De Vries noted that evolution, which he defined as the "origin of

new species by variation from ancestor species," as an explanation for the variety of life in "the living world, had been proclaimed before Darwin by several biologist thinkers, including the poet Johann Wolfgang Goethe, in 1795, Jean-Baptiste de Lamarck in 1809, Darwin's grandfather, the ebullient physician-naturalist-poet-philosopher Erasmus Darwin, and in Darwin's time anonymously by Robert Chambers in 1844."

Even Darwin's commonly alleged major contribution to evolution, natural selection, had been developed, or at least discussed, by others before Darwin published, including William Charles Wells in 1813, Edward Blyth in 1835, 1836, and 1837, and, later, Alfred Russel Wallace (1823-1913)."¹⁷

So what's new then; with Darwin of 1859 and Hort of 1881? They became catalysts for old antibiblical ideas which with their works became public 'property'.¹⁸

Biblical basic-doctrines, as creation & salvation, pass away with the evolutionary thinking; let Darwin himself be an example: "So far as most evidence goes, Charles Darwin started his professional career as a creationist and professing Christian, soon changed to uniformitarianism and progressive creationism, then to theistic evolutionism, and eventually to materialistic evolutionism and probably atheism, in which unhappy condition he died. This tragic sequence has since been repeated in the lives of countless individuals."¹⁹

What about the biblical basic-doctrines" with the Bible according to Hort et al.?

Wilbur Pickering again: "It has been commonly argued, for at least 200 years ("John Bengel, a textual critic who died in 1752, has been credited with being the first one to advance this argument")), that no matter what Greek text one may use no doctrine will be affected. In my own experience, for over fifty years, when I have raised the question of what is the correct Greek text of the New Testament, regardless of the audience, the usual response has been: "What difference does it make?" The purpose of this article is to answer that question, at least in part.

The eclectic Greek text presently in vogue, N-A²⁶/UBS³ ((hereafter

NU)) represents the type of text upon which most modern versions are based. The KJV and NKJV follow a rather different type of text, a close cousin of the Majority Text. The discrepancy between NU and the Majority Text is around 8% (involving 8% of the words). In a Greek text with 600 pages that represents 48 solid pages' worth of discrepancies! About a fifth of that reflects omissions in the eclectic text, so it is some ten pages shorter than the Majority Text. Even if we grant, for the sake of the argument, that up to half of the differences between the Majority and eclectic texts could be termed 'inconsequential', that leaves some 25 pages' worth of differences that are significant (in varying degrees). In spite of these differences it is usually assumed that no cardinal Christian doctrine is at risk (though some, such as eternal judgement, the ascension and the deity of Jesus, are weakened). However, the most basic one of all, the divine inspiration of the text, is indeed under attack.

The eclectic text incorporates errors of fact and contradictions, such that any claim that the New Testament is divinely inspired becomes relative, and the doctrine of inerrancy becomes virtually untenable. If the authority of the New Testament is undermined, all its teachings are likewise affected. For well over a century the credibility of the New Testament text has been eroded, and this credibility crisis has been forced upon the attention of the laity by the modern versions that enclose parts of the text in brackets and have numerous footnotes of a sort that raise doubts about the integrity of the text .²⁰

"The dead hand of Fenton John Anthony 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. After Hort, the late medieval Greek Vulgate was not used by serious students, and the text supported by earlier witnesses became the standard text. This was a sensational achievement, an impressive success."^{21,22}

One could add, also The dead hand of Charles Darwin ..., a sensational achievement, an impressive success ...

"Naturalistic critics have made elaborate efforts to explain how the

monotheism of the Old Testament originated. In the 19th century and on into the 20th these explanations were generally along evolutionary lines. The principles of this evolutionary theory of religion were first laid down in England by the disciples of Charles Darwin. According to E.B. Tylor (1872), religion, as it evolves upward, passes through three stages. The first stage is animism... second ... is polytheism... third ... monotheism". "Strenuous efforts were made to force the religion of the Old Testament into this evolutionary framework. .. According to evolutionistic Old Testament scholars, it was not until the Babylonian captivity that "the Second Isaiah" gave definite formulation to the doctrine that there is no God but one. And such attempts to evolutionize the Scriptures made it necessary to chop them into bits and turn them upside down, so that the first chapter of Genesis was regarded as having been written last of all." Writes Edward F. Hills.²³

Back (or forward) to the Bible-makers:

"Regarding the Hebrew text changes proposed by Rudolf Kittel, it is worth noting that Kittel was a German rationalistic higher critic, rejecting Biblical inerrancy and firmly devoted to evolutionism."

"The two men most responsible for modern alterations in the New Testament were B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, whose Greek New Testament text has largely replaced the traditional Textus Receptus in modern seminaries, especially as revised and updated by the Germans Eberhard Nestle and Kurt Aland. All of these men were evolutionists. Furthermore, Westcott and Hort were Anglican officials and nominally orthodox in theology, but both denied Biblical inerrancy, promoted racism, and even dabbled in spiritism. Nestle and Aland, like Kittel, were German theological liberals.

Westcott and Hort were also the most influential members of the English revision committee that produced the English Revised Version of the Bible, published in 1881 ((NT)). The corresponding American revision committee which developed the American Standard Version of 1901 was headed by another liberal evolutionist, Philip Schaff. Most new versions since that time have favored the same manuscripts and assumptions as did those nineteenth century revisers."²⁴ (H. Morris)

A (central) example; Kurt Aland:

"At present ((2007)), the NIV and the ESV are sweeping evangelical

churches in the United States and Britain. Thus, modern churchgoers are being profoundly influenced by Aland's Greek Text, and also by his peculiar views of the text. This is because the very verses that modern churchgoers are reading in their Bibles reflect the theological and textual views of Dr. Aland, which underlie his choices for readings and variant readings for every verse in the original Greek, from which these new versions are translated."^{25,26}

"We shall discuss what he says in A History of Christianity with regard to two points in particular: 1) the canonicity of the Catholic Epistles, and 2) the apostolic authorship of the Four Gospels, the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles, and even some of the letters of Paul."
 "... we lead into it with his comments on the apostolic authorship of New Testament books in general, and whether he even deems that relevant or not. He says: "We need only observe the course of church history during the last centuries where we will find with clarity the devastating consequences that results from using such inappropriate criteria."((p.105))

Now before we proceed, we must ask what 'inappropriate criteria' are they to which Aland refers? Why, it's the apostolic authorship of the books of the New Testament! We see this in what follows in the next sentences, where he says: "It ((using inappropriate criteria)) began in the time of Orthodoxy, repeated itself in a new way in the nineteenth century, and continues to our own day: the 'genuineness' of the statements - the authority of the New Testament - had as its presupposition the fact that her apostles and eyewitnesses were speaking." ((p.105...))

Aland proceeds in the next sentences openly to sneer at such a suggestion: "As soon as critical scholarship proved that this or that New Testament writing could not have been written by an apostle, the authority of its author collapsed along with it; and with the authority of the author, the authority of the New Testament writing collapsed along with it; and with the authority of the New Testament writing collapsed the authority of the Church... Of course, the genuine foundation of faith was not disturbed, but only a false foundation - nevertheless, a false foundation which the Church had proposed as the genuine one..." ...

Aland goes on to assert what he sees as the folly of assuming the apostolic authorship of the New Testament writings by attempting to prove its absurdity from the Catholic Epistles. Says he: If the catho-

lic epistles were really written by the apostles whose names they bear and by people who were closest to Jesus (by James, the brother of the Lord; by Jude, James's brother; by the prince of the apostles, Peter; by John, the son of Zebedee; if the Gospel of John was really written by the beloved disciple of Jesus), then the real question arises: was there really a Jesus? Can Jesus really have lived, if the writings of his closest companions are filled with so little of his reality? The catholic epistles, for example, have so little in them of the reality of the historical Jesus and his power, that it suffices for James, for example, to mention only Christ's name in passing... When we observe this - assuming that the writings about which we are speaking really come from their alleged authors - it almost then appears as if Jesus were a mere phantom and that the real theological power lay not with him, but with the apostles and with the earthly church...'"((p.106...))

To the writer of this tract, the foolishness of these statements almost equals the wickedness of their blasphemies. The epistles of Peter paint Christ as a mere phantom? The life of Christ expressed in the precepts of James had to have been written by a man who really didn't know Christ at all? These statements are not only wicked; they are downright strange."

"Certainly Aland's entirely subjective condemnation of the Catholic Epistles reveals him for what he is: a German higher critic. He is a higher critic who uses subjective reasoning to adduce, in his opinion, how the text was created and transmitted."^{27,28}

"For many years the thinking of Conservative Christians has been a house divided against itself, orthodox in some respects but rationalistic in others, especially in New Testament textual criticism." Hills²⁹; and let's continue with Jack Moorman:

"When a company of men set out faithfully to translate genuine manuscripts in order to convey what God said, it is one thing. When a committee sets itself to revise or translate with ideas and a "scheme," it is another. But it may be objected that the translators of the King James were biased by their pro-Protestant views. The reader must judge whose bias he will accept - that of the influence of the Protestant Reformation, as heading up in the Authorized Version; or that of the influence of Darwinism, higher criticism, incipient modern religious liberalism, and a reversion to Rome, as heading up in

the Revised Version.

A great deal of space has been given to the revision of the English Bible that took place last century. But when properly weighed and pondered it will be seen to be Satan's most subtle and devastating attack upon the Word in all history. The version itself was not popular but it opened the floodgates to the countless versions dancing before our eyes today. It took away the standard, the benchmark of the English-speaking world. And it placed a new Greek Text in our Bible Institutes and Colleges. It struck at foundations and did more to undermine the authority of God's Word than any other event."^{30,31}

James R. White writes (2009), "While it is not true in every instance that the older a manuscript is the better it is, it generally is true. Surely it is easy to understand that a manuscript that comes from only a century after the writing of the original, such as P⁶⁶ or P⁷⁵, should be given more weight in examining a variant reading than a manuscript from the fourteenth century."³²

Surely, it is easy to misunderstand; a hundred and more years earlier, F.H.A. Scrivener wrote "It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worse corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it was composed: that Irenaeus (A.D. 150), and the African Fathers, and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far more inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephens thirteen centuries later, when moulding the Textus Receptus."^{33, 34}

"The five Old Unicals" (Aleph ABCD) falsify the Lord's Prayer as given by St. Luke in no less than forty-five words. But so little do they agree among themselves, that they throw themselves into six different combinations in their departures from the Traditional Text; and yet they are never able to agree among themselves as to one single various reading; while only once are more than two of them observed to stand together, and their grand point of union is no less than an omission of the article. Such is their eccentric tendency, that in respect of thirty-two out of the whole forty-five words they bear in turn solitary evidence."³⁵

We are back in the 1880s; the quote above is from the man "known in Oxford as "the champion of lost causes"". ³⁶

After the 'Revised' (NT) Version was published in 1881, John William Burgon (1813-1888) wrote the Revision Revised:

"In this department of sacred Science, men have been going on too long inventing their facts and delivering themselves of oracular decrees, on the sole responsibility of their own inner consciousness. There is great convenience in such a method certainly, a charming simplicity which is in a high degree attractive to the flesh and blood. It dispenses with proof. It furnishes no evidence. It asserts when it ought to argue. It reiterates when it is called upon to explain. "I am Sir Oracle."

This, - which I venture to style the unscientific method, reached its culminating point when Professors Westcott and Hort recently put forth their Recension of the Greek Text. Their work is indeed quite a psychological curiosity. Incomprehensible to me is how two able men of disciplined understandings can have seriously put forth the volume which they call "introduction-appendix." It is the very reductio ad absurdum of the uncritical method of the last fifty years. And it is especially in opposition to this new method of theirs that I so strenuously insist that the consentient voice of Catholic Antiquity is to be diligently inquired after and submissively listened to. For this, in the end, will prove our only safe guide.

I find myself in the meantime, met by the scoffs, jeers and misrepresentations of the disciples of this new school, who instead of producing historical facts and intelligible arguments, appeal to the decrees of their teachers; which I disallow, and which they are unable to substantiate. They delight in announcing that Textual Criticism made "a fresh departure" with the edition of Drs. Westcott and Hort, that the work of those scholars "marks an era", and is spoken of in Germany as "epoch-making.(("))" ³⁷

"Let no one at all events obscure the one question at issue by asking 'Whether we consider the Textus Receptus infallible?' The merit or demerit of the Received Text has absolutely nothing whatever to do with the question. We care nothing about it. Any text would equally suit our present purpose. Any Text would show the old unicals perpetually at discord among themselves. To raise an irrelevant discussion, at

the outset, concerning the Textus Receptus, to describe the haste with which Erasmus produced the first published edition of the N.T., to make sport about the copies which he employed, all this kind of thing is the proceeding of one who seeks to mislead his readers, to throw dust into their eyes, to divert their attention from the problem actually before them. It is not, as we confidently expect when we have to do with such writers as these, the method of a sincere lover of Truth."³⁸

"... 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".³⁹

"As for the weak superstition of these last days, which without proof of any kind, would erect two fourth-century copies of the New Testament (demonstrably derived from one and the same utterly deprayed archetype), into an authority from which there shall be no appeal; it cannot be too soon or too unconditionally abandoned. And, perhaps beyond all things, men must be invited to disabuse their minds of the singular imagination that it is in their power, when addressing themselves to that most difficult and delicate of problems, the improvement of the Traditional Text, to do things casually."⁴⁰

"Of course, I am not the first to attempt an answer. Numerous answers have been advanced over the years. They tend to form two clusters, or camps, and these camps differ substantially from each other. In very broad and oversimplified terms, one camp generally follows the large majority of the MSS (seldom less than 80 and usually over 95 percent) which are in essential agreement among themselves but which do not date from before the fifth century A.D., while the other generally follows a small handful (often less than ten) of earlier MSS (from the third, fourth and fifth centuries) which not only disagree with the majority, but also disagree among themselves (which obliges the practitioners to be more or less eclectic). The second camp has been in general control of the scholarly world for the last 130 years, at least."⁴¹

Pickering has "repeatedly stated" his presuppositions, "but here they are again: 1) The Sovereign Creator of the universe exists; 2) He delivered a written revelation to the human race; 3) He has preserved that revelation intact to this day."⁴²

"I consider myself to be a textual scholar, not critic. The Text is above me, not the opposite. In eclecticism the critic is above the text, is above the evidence; instead of faithfully following the evidence, he makes the evidence follow him. The MSS are reduced to the role of 'supplier of readings'. "⁴³

Pickering writes "Hort did not believe in the divine inspiration of the Bible, nor in the divinity of Jesus Christ. Since he embraced the Darwinian theory as soon as it appeared, he presumably did not believe in God. His theory of NT textual criticism, published in 1881, was based squarely on the presuppositions that the NT was not inspired, that no special care was afforded it in the early decades, and that in consequence the original wording was lost - lost beyond recovery, at least by objective means. His theory swept the academic world and continues to dominate the discipline to this day.

Moreover, Hort claimed that as a result of his work only a thousandth part of the NT text could be considered to be in doubt, and this was joyfully received by the rank and file, since it seemed to provide

assurance about the reliability of that text - however, of course, that claim applied only to the W-H text (probably the worst published NT in existence, to this day)."⁴⁴"I would say that their text is mistaken with reference to 10% of the words - the Greek NT has roughly 140,000 words, so the W-H text is mistaken with reference to 14,000 of them. I would say that the so-called 'critical' text currently in vogue is 'only' off with reference to some 12,000, an improvement (small though it be). And just by the way, how wise is it to use a NT prepared by a servant of Satan?"⁴⁵

In a note to Matt.1,25, Pickering writes: "Only 0,5% of the Greek manuscripts, of objectively inferior quality, omit "her" and "the "firstborn" (as in NIV,NASB,LB,TEV, etc.). That's eight manuscripts against 1,454 that have been collated, but there are probably over 300 others yet to be collated that will swell the number against the eight. Why do so-called 'evangelical' scholars insist on damaging the Text based on such ridiculously inferior and inadequate 'evidence'?"
46

Matt.5,18: "The Lord here makes an impressively strong statement about the preservation through time of the precise form of the Sacred Text. Since our only access to the meaning is through the form, any alteration in the form will alter the meaning. One of the most effective ways of annulling a commandment is to corrupt the Text - something Satan understands quite well." (More on this in The Identity p.304.)
Luke 9,10: "Instead of "a deserted place belonging to a town called Bethsaida", 0,5% of the Greek manuscripts, of objectively inferior quality, have "a town called Bethsaida" (to be followed by NIV, NASB, LB, TEV, etc.). Problem: the eclectic text currently in vogue, along with the modern versions that follow it, has Jesus and company going into the town of Bethsaida, but in verse 12 the disciples say they are in a deserted area; thus a contradiction is introduced. The eclectic text here is also in variance with itself in the parallel passages. In Matthew 14:13 all texts have Jesus going to a deserted place, and in verse 15 the disciples say, "the place is deserted... send the crowd away to the towns." In Mark 6:31-32 all texts have Him going to a deserted place, and in verse 35 the disciples say it is a deserted place, etc. So the eclectic text not only makes Luke contradict himself, but set him against Matthew and Mark - and this on the basis of only half a percent of the manuscripts!"

John 7,8: "Perhaps 3% of the Greek manuscripts, of inferior quality, omit "yet" (as in NASB, TEV, RSV, etc.). The reading of the so-called 'critical' text has the effect of ascribing a falsehood to Jesus, since He did in fact go to the feast (and doubtless knew what He was going to do). Among the 97% are P^{66,75} and B - since the UBS editors usually attach the highest value to P⁷⁵ and B, isn't it strange that they reject them in this case?"

Rev. 22,19: ""Words", plural, includes the individual words that make up the whole. Those textual critics who have wantonly removed words from the Text, on the basis of satanically inspired presuppositions, are out. Those who interpret the Text in such a way as to avoid its plain meaning, likewise."

Home.

"The purpose of the Bible societies was to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment. This restriction arose from the varied membership of the societies."⁴⁷ "The original purpose of Bible societies was the distribution of existing translations of the Scriptures. The oldest society is the Cansteinische Bibelgesellschaft, established in 1710; but the British and Foreign Bible Society, formed in London in 1804, became the most influential. This society grew rapidly and helped organize other such societies in other countries."⁴⁸ "That the Bible societies did not have a doctrinal basis was demonstrated in 1831. Even Unitarians who denied the doctrine of the Trinity of the Godhead could belong to the committees of the British and Foreign Society. Evangelical members who wished to exclude the possibility of an anti-Trinitarian influence found it necessary to leave the society. They formed the Trinitarian Bible Society, which had a doctrinal basis. The members of this group consisted of "Protestants, who acknowledge their belief in the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" and "in the whole Bible as the inspired Word of God, the sole, supreme, and infallible rule of faith and practice." It is remarkable even today that most Bible societies do not have any doctrinal basis at all!"⁴⁹

"The original purpose ... was the distribution of existing translations" "without note or comment."

Well, not quite the practice in Norway. No "note or comment", strictly speaking; but brackets. 16

In an 1812 Bible-history textbook by S.B. Hersleb, is found, as heading to the 'creation-accounts' (plural of course, the source is rather new), "Old-Sagn", that is "ancient legends".⁵⁰

Svend Borchmann Hersleb became lecturer (1813), and (1814) theology-professor at the University in Kristiania (Oslo), (est. 1813). Later he participated in establishing the Norwegian Bible Society (1816), and was the main figure in its 1819-revision of the New Testament, whereby the Norwegian Bible Society became a forerunner in the exercise of bringing German (not so low) criticism to the populace.

"As something new ... the 1819- edition has introduced square-brackets, which "make known that those Words there are inside that Sign, are believed not originally to have stood in the Text!"⁵¹ An all 21 of them, of which most are wrong⁵², "in agreement with Griesbach".

"That an ecclesiastical bible-translation took this first step away from the Textus Receptus and appeared with a textcritical apparatus ... was sensational at that time."⁵³

"When the universityteachers Kaurin and Dietrichson together with printer Chr. Grøndahl, all members of the Centralcommittee, in 1847 proposed to cancel all the squarebrackets, this was both symbolical and in real the first sign of an alliance between conservative theology and the new laymansmovement. From and onward 1848, all brackets of textcriticism are removed, with one exeption: ... in ((1.)) John 5, 7.8".⁵⁴

The NT-translation of 1904 followed in part a concensus of Tregelles with Westcott & Hort. In the Gospels, Holter counted around 70 places where words of Jesus were omitted.⁵⁵ The page after Revelation informs that " The following Places, among others, lacks in more or fewer of the older manuscripts", (with a list of 16, including the end of Mark of course;(see Pickering App. E)).

To be followed in 1978 with much more of the kind; by then we're in the age of Eugene Nida as well ...⁵⁶

"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 changed their constitution in 1984, and now have members of all Christian denominations on their board". "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 on the Norwegian Bible Society's committee."⁵⁷

Catholics; in "this perfidious institution""which""violate the traditions of the fathers and the Council of Trent, by circulating the Scriptures in the vernacular tongues of all nations"? (Quote, Pope Leo XII, 1824⁵⁸)

Why?

"At a major conference of Bible societies in 1964 it was agreed that a "common text" should be prepared in the original languages of Greek and Hebrew, and that this text should be translated into other languages so as to provide a "common Bible" acceptable to Protestants and Catholics alike. On the Catholic side, this concept of a "common Bible" was encouraged by a degree ((sic)) of the Second Vatican Council, in 1965, explicitly referring to the possibility of "co-operation with the separated brethren" (i.e. Protestants) in translation projects."⁵⁹

As far as I can see, somewhat "common text" in Greek emerged by the United Bible Societies' edition of 1966, "a tentative revision of the text of Nestle 1927"⁶⁰; for which 2. edition (-68) was added to the committee (of Aland, Black, Metzger and Wikren) Carlo Maria Martini S.J. Add to it "the silent return of the Apocrypha."⁶¹

"The ecumenical movement, and in particular ecumenical activity in the translation and distribution of the Scriptures, has not led to the change of a single Roman Catholic doctrine, but has if anything enabled the Roman Catholic Church to enlarge her sphere of influence and control. Evangelical believers who remind themselves of the true nature of the Roman church will see that there can be no such thing as a joint Protestant-Catholic "common witness", and that joint pro-

jects to translate and distribute the Scriptures can only be a source 18
of confusion and compromise in fundamental matters of the Christian
faith."^{62a,62b}

So, where are we?

One can get reminded of Fenton John Anthony Hort's letter to Brooke
Foss Westcott, October 17, 1865: "I have been persuaded for many
years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus'-worship have very much in common
in their causes and their results."⁶³ A year earlier, September 23,
1864, he wrote to same address of his "belief that 'Protestantism' is
only parenthetical and temporary."⁶⁴

Burgon can sum it up:

"The one great fact, which especially troubles him and his joint edi-
tor, (as well it may) is The traditional Greek Text of the New Testa-
ment Scriptures. Call this Text Erasmian or Complutensian, the Text
of Stephens, or of Beza, or of the Elzevirs; call it the "Received,"
or the "Traditional GreekText," or whatever other name you please.
The fact remains that a text has come down to us which is attested by
a general consensus of ancient copies, ancient Fathers, and ancient
versions. This, at all events, is a point on which, (happily) there
exists entire conformity of opinion between Dr. Hort and ourselves.
Our readers cannot have yet forgotten his virtual admission that, be-
yond all question the Textus Receptus is the dominant Graeco-Syrian
Text of A.D. 350 to A.D. 400.

Obtained from a variety of sources, this Text proves to be essentia-
lly the same in all. That it requires Revision with respect to many
of its lesser details is undeniable. But it is at least as certain
that it is an excellent text as it stands, and that the use of it
will never lead critical students of Scripture seriously astray,
which is what no one will venture to predicate concerning any single
critical edition of the N.T. which has been published since the days
of Griesbach, by the disciples of Griesbach's school."^{65,66}

1. Salmon; Some criticisms; p.7; in Fuller,D.O.(Ed.); Which Bible?; Inst. for Biblical Textual studies, (1970) 15. pr. 1995; p.285.
2. Metzger,B.M.; The Text of the New Testament - Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration; Oxford Univ. Press, 2.ed. 1968; p.137.
3. Hort; Life of Hort, I; p.416; in Fuller (ref.1) p.278.
4. On another occasion "Hort writes to Mr. John Ellerton: I am inclined to think that no such state as 'Eden' (I mean the popular notion) ever existed, and that Adam's fall in no degree differed from the fall of each of his descendants, as Coleridge justly argues." (In Fuller (ref.1); ref. ib. p.78.)
"Westcott writes to the Archbishop of Canterbury on Old Testament criticism, March 4, 1890: "No one now, i suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history - I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did."" (In Fuller (ref.1); ref. Westcott; Life of Westcott, II; p.69.)
5. "... Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed (it) unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, (even) his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse..." (Rom. 1,19-20). See also Sarfati,J.; Refuting Compromise - A Biblical and Scientific Refutation of "Progressive Creationism" (Billions of Years), As Popularized by Astronomer Hugh Ross; Creation Book Publ., 2.ed. 2011.
Batten,D., Sarfati,J.; 15 Reasons to take Genesis as History; Creation Book Publ., 2.ed. 2013; around 30 pages.
Carter,R.(Ed.); Evolution's Achilles' Heels - 9 Ph.D. scientists explain evolution's fatal flaws - in areas claimed to be its greatest strengths; Creation Book Publ. 2014.
6. PICKERING,W.N.; THE IDENTITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT IV; W.N.P. (1977) 2014; p.87.
7. Ib. pp.15-6.
8. Ib. pp. 17-8.
9. Ib. p.18.
10. Creation Ministries International's Prayer News (UK & Europe); July - Sept. 2010.
11. Metzger p.119.
12. Ib. p.121.
13. Ib. pp. 124-5.
14. Ib. pp. 126-7.
15. Ib. p.127.
16. Ib. p.128.
17. Bergman,J.; The Dark side of Charles Darwin - A Critical Analysis of an Icon of Science; Master Books 2011; pp.140-2.
18. Those familiar with evolutionary charts, may find the following

of interest:

Regarding the genealogical method in Hort's 'theory', E.C. Colwell wrote, "That Westcott and Hort did not apply this method to the manuscripts of the New Testament is obvious. Where are the charts which start with the majority of late manuscripts and climb back through diminishing generations of ancestors to the Neutral and Western texts? The answer is that they are nowhere. Look again at the first diagram, and you will see that a, b, c, etc. are not actual manuscripts of the New Testament, but hypothetical manuscripts. The demonstrations or illustrations of the genealogical method as applied to New Testament manuscripts by the followers of Hort, the "Horticulti" as Lake called them, likewise use hypothetical manuscripts, not actual codices. Note, for example, the diagrams and discussions in Kenyon's most popular work on textual criticism, including the most recent edition. All the manuscripts referred to are imaginary manuscripts, and the later of these charts was printed sixty years after Hort." (Colwell, E.C.; Genealogical method; pp.111-2; in Pickering p.32.)

"It is commonplace among the many who are determined to despise the "Byzantine" text to dodge the issue... The postulates of Hort's theory are assumed to be true and the evidence is interpreted on the basis of these presuppositions." (Pickering p.62.)

19. Morris, H.M.; The long War against God - The History and Impact of the Creation/Evolution Conflict; Master Books edition; (2000) 4.pr. 2008; p.95.

20. Pickering pp.317-8.

21. Colwell, E.C.; "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A study in the Corruption of the Text", The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J.P. Hyatt (New York; Abingdon Press, 1965); p.370; in Pickering p.24.

22. "It is strange because the naturalistic critics themselves have shown each of the principles listed above to be defective, and yet in a greater or lesser way they still embrace them. Under no circumstance will they return to the Received Text! We see the same thing regarding the theory of evolution. Science has disproved it at each point but would not dare return to Biblical Creationism. What spirit does the reader see at work here?" (Moorman, J.; Forever Settled - A Survey of the Documents and History of the Bible; The Dean Burgon Society Press 1999; p.263.)

23. Hills, E.F.; Believing Bible Study; Eye Opener Publ., (1967) 3.ed. 1991; pp.19-20.

24. Morris, H.M.; The New Defender's Study Bible; World Publ. Inc. 2006; App.21, A Creationist's Defense of the King James Bible; p.2149.

25. Hembd, A.; What today's Christian needs to know about Dr. Kurt Aland, Textual Critic; Trinitarian Bible Society 2007; p.1.

26. "The most famous modern English versions of the New Testament - the Revised Standard Version, the New American Standard Version, the New International Version, and the English Standard Version - are all grounded on, and, for the most part, translated from, Dr. Aland's work. These translations utilize as their principal text (with its critical apparatus and alternate readings) the United Bible Societies version of the Greek New Testament, a version over which Dr. Aland was principal editor. Indeed, the UBS version third edition ... is virtually the same as Aland's own twenty-sixth edition of the Nestle-Aland text: such was his influence over the UBS text." (Hembd p.1, with a

ref. to Marlowe, M.; Bibliography of Textual Criticism; bible-researcher.com/bib-a.html , (2007)

For clearance here may be added that this "'Nestle-Aland," purports to be the twenty-sixth in the series of "Nestle" editions ... but for this edition the Nestle text was replaced by the text of Aland Black Metzger Wikren Martin 1975 ((UBS 3.ed.)) ... In short, the "26th edition" has almost nothing in common with the editions of Eberhard Nestle." (bible-researcher.com./bib-a.html ; 19. March 2013).)

27. Hembd pp.22-3.

28. Next generation influential critics; Bart Ehrman: "In particular ... I began seeing the New Testament as a very human book. The New Testament as we actually have it, I knew, was the product of human hands, the hands of the scribes who transmitted it. Then I began to see that not just the scribal text but the original text itself was a very human book. This stood very much at odds with how I had regarded the text in my late teens as a newly minted "born-again" Christian, convinced that the Bible was the inerrant Word of God and that the biblical words themselves had come to us by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. As I realized already in graduate school, even if God had inspired the original words, we don't have the original words. So the doctrine of inspiration was in a sense irrelevant to the Bible as we have it, since the words God reputedly inspired had been changed and, in some cases, lost. Moreover I came to think that my earlier views of inspiration were not only irrelevant, they were probably wrong. For the only reason (I came to think) for God to inspire the Bible would be so that his people would have his actual words; but if he really wanted people to have his actual words, surely he would have miraculously preserved those words, just as he had miraculously inspired them in the first place. Given the circumstance that he didn't preserve the words, the conclusion seemed inescapable to me that he hadn't gone to the trouble of inspiring them." (Ehrman, B.; Misquoting Jesus: The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why; HarperCollins 2005; p.211; in White (ref.32) p.304.)

29. Hills p.164.

30. Moorman (ref.22) pp.278-9.

31. And one can ponder Hills: "Substituting their denominational creeds for the Roman Catholic dogmas, they returned to the Roman Catholic separation of faith from reason. In regard to the doctrines mentioned in their creeds they were orthodox in a formal sort of way, but in all other matters their thinking was the same as the thinking of unbelievers. And then in the 18th century, under the guidance of Bishop Butler and Archdeacon Paley, they began to look upon Christianity as a hypothesis and to defend it as a probability on the basis of neutral facts.

During the 19th century these errors were institutionalized and made traditional by being incorporated into the curriculum of scores of conservative theological seminaries. In these seminaries a Roman Catholic separation of faith from reason was maintained. Two entirely different doctrinal systems were taught side by side, namely, a dogmatic system in which Christianity was regarded as true and an apologetic system in which Christianity was regarded as merely probable. When you studied systematic theology or practiced your preaching, you were guided by faith, but when you attended your classes in apologetics or biblical introduction or New Testament textual criticism, you shifted your gears and were guided by reason. There are still some

seminaries like this today, but most of them have eliminated the inconsistency by going over completely to modernism."

"Modernism has come in by degrees, beginning as early as the 17th century. First, the Dutch Arminians ignored the providential preservation of the Scriptures, and then the English deists pronounced the Scriptures unnecessary. Then the German rationalists denied the inspiration of the Scriptures, and ever since infidels of all lands and nations have rejected the biblical doctrine of creation and of Christ and God. And all during this long period conservative scholars have been combatting this monstrous growth of unbelief. Their effectiveness, however, has been greatly impaired by their inconsistency. They have opposed some forms of modernism and favored others. For example, they have fulminated against Old Testament naturalistic higher criticism as satanic, but they have adopted New Testament naturalistic textual criticism as scientific. In short, without at all intending to be such, they have been half-way modernists." (Hills pp.218-9.)

32. White, J.R.; *The King James Only Controversy - Can you trust Modern Translations?*; Bethany House, (1995) 2.ed. 2009; p.198.

33. Scrivener, F.H.A.; *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (four ed.s 1861-1894), "p. 453"; in Burgon, J.W.; *The Revision Revised*; John Murray 1885; 93 pages extract in Fuller, D.O. (Ed.); *True or False? - The Westcott-Hort Textual Theory Examined*; Grand Rapids Int. Publ., (1973) 3.pr. 1978; p.207.

34. "The majority of the variant readings in the New Testament were created for theological reasons.

Most of the manuals and handbooks now in print (including mine!) will tell you that these variations were the fruit of careless treatment which was possible because the books of the New Testament had not yet attained a strong position as "Bible." The reverse is the case. It was because they were the religious treasure of the church that they were changed." (Colwell, E.C.; *What is the Best New Testament?*; The University of Chicago Press 1952; p.53; in Pickering p.28.)

"Aland states: "Egypt was distinguished from other provinces of the Church, so far as we can judge, by the early dominance of gnosticism." He further informs us that "at the close of the 2nd century" the Egyptian church was "dominantly gnostic" and then goes on to say: "The copies existing in the gnostic communities could not be used, because they were under suspicion of being corrupt". Now this is all very instructive - what Aland is telling us, in other words, is that up to A.D. 200 the textual tradition in Egypt could not be trusted."

"... we need to pause to reflect on the implications of Aland's statements. He was a champion of the Egyptian ("Alexandrian") text-type, and yet he himself informs us that up to A.D. 200 the textual tradition in Egypt could not be trusted and that by 200 the use of Greek had virtually died out there. So on what basis can he argue that the Egyptian text subsequently became the best? Aland also states that in the 2nd century, 3rd century, and into the 4th century Asia Minor continued to be "the heartland of the Church". This means that the superior qualifications of the Aegean area to protect, transmit and attest the N.T. Text carry over into the 4th century! It happens that Hort, Metzger and Aland (along with many others) have linked the "Byzantine" text-type to Lucian of Antioch, who died in 311. Now really, wouldn't a text produced by a leader in "the heartland of the Church" be better than whatever evolved in Egypt? Of course I ask the above question only to point out their inconsistency. The 'Byzantine' text-type existed long before Lucian." (Pickering pp.105-6.)

"As the evolutionist seeks to explain the geological phenomena of this planet without any cataclysmic intervention (i.e. the Flood), so Hort said "there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes." But, it is the constant declaration of the early Church Fathers to the contrary." (Moorman (ref.22) pp.80-1.) By the way, White (ref.32) mentions Papyri 66&75.

"Can we objectively 'weigh' P66 as a witness? (It is the oldest one of any size.) Well, in the space of John's Gospel (not complete) it has over 900 clear, indubitable errors - as a witness to the identity of the text of John it has misled us over 900 times." "It has an average of roughly two mistakes per verse - many being obvious mistakes, stupid mistakes, nonsensical mistakes." (Pickering pp.365.103.)

"E.C. Colwell analyzed P75 and found about 145 itacisms plus 257 other singular readings, 25% of which are nonsensical." (P.104.)

35. Burgon, J.W.; The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established. Arranged, completed, and edited by Edward Miller; George Bell and Sons 1896; p.84; in Pickering p.361.

36. Zwemer, S.M.; in Fuller, D.O. (Ed.); Counterfeit or Genuine - Mark 16? John 8?; Grand Rapids Int. Publ. (1975) 1978 ?pr.; p.169.

37. Burgon (ref.33) pp.127-8.

38. Ib. p.132.

39. Ib. p.213.

40. Ib. p.163.

41. Pickering p.2.

42. Ib. p.362.

43. Ib. p.363.

44. Ib. pp.362-3.

45. Ib. p.363.

46. Pickering, W.N.; The Sovereign Creator Has Spoken - Objective Authority for Living (The New Testament with Commentary); W.N.P. 2013. "The Greek Text of which this is a translation, and articles explaining the preference, may be downloaded free from: www.walkinhiscommandments.com "

47. van Bruggen, J.; The Future of the Bible; Th. Nelson 1978; p.56.

48. Ib. p.55.

49. Ib. pp.56-7.

50. Haraldsø, B.; in Bibelen i Norge; (no editor given); Det Norske Bibelselskap 1991; p.216.

51. Holter, Å.; Det Norske Bibelselskap gjennom 150 år; I, 1816-1904; (probably) Det Norske Bibelselskap 1966; p.124.

52. Holter lists them; free to compare.

53. Holter p.125.

54. Ib. p.140.

55. Ib. p.422.

56. "Formerly the central question was what one translated. Today the central question is for whom is one translating. The attention is shifting from translating into the English language to translating for

English-speaking people." (van Bruggen (ref.47) p.29; van Bruggen quoted at some length in Høgetveit, D.J.; Sagrustens brikker; kommentar-avisa.no (gjestekommentarer); februar 2015 (not "2014"); pp.14-6.

And: Marlowe, M.; Against the Theory of 'Dynamic equivalence'; bible-researcher.com; Rev.&Exp. 2012: "I began this book with the thesis that the Bible belongs to the Church. But a corrupted church will naturally lead to a corrupted Bible, because its leaders will not be faithful in the stewardship of the written Word. Conversely, a corrupted Bible is a sign of a corrupted church." (Ch. 28, Conclusion.) But, Marlowe is no friend of the Traditional NT-Text. Regarding the NKJV-preface he writes, "the reader should be told that nearly all competent scholars agree that the so-called Byzantine manuscript tradition of the middle ages can never be given the same evidential weight as the ancient manuscripts." "In conclusion we will say that the New King James Version is comparable to the NASB in literal accuracy, and sometimes exceeds it. It is equally valuable for detailed study of the Bible. Its English style is superior to the NASB. Its main fault is the use of the Textus Receptus instead of a critically edited text, based upon ancient manuscripts; but the marginal notes will compensate for this, if the student makes a habit of consulting the margin. So we can recommend this version for students who do not ignore the margin." (bible-researcher.com/nkjv.html ; 28. March 2013) (For another (and different) evaluation of the NKJV, see Anderson, G.W. & D.E.; What Today's Christian Needs to Know About The New King James Version; Trinitarian Bible Society 1995.)

57. Trinitarian Bible Society; Ecumenism and the United Bible Societies; (reprint of 1985/-87 articles); pp.9.25.

58. Encyclical epistle; in Gaussen, L.; God-Breathed - The Divine Inspiration of the Bible; The Trinity Foundation, (Geneva 1840) 2001; pp.120-1.

59. Ref. 57. p.7.

60. bible-researcher.com/bib-a.html ; 19. March 2013.

61. van Bruggen p.32.

62a. Ref. 57 p.5.

62b. See the Appendix.

63. Hort; Life of Hort, II; p.50; in Fuller (ref.1) p.279.

64. Hort, Life of Hort, II; p.30; in Fuller (ref.1) p.279.

65. Burgon (ref.33) p. 179.

66. Compare van Bruggen 1978: "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." (van Bruggen p.124.) And Colwell 1958: "After a careful study of all alleged Beta ((Alexandrian)) Text-type witnesses in the first chapter of Mark ... an 'average' or mean text was reconstructed including all the readings supported by the majority of the primary witnesses. Even on this restricted basis the amount of variation recorded in the apparatus was dismayng... results show convincingly that any attempt to reconstruct

an archetype of the Beta Text-type on a quantitative basis is doomed to failure. The text thus reconstructed is not reconstructed but constructed; it is an artificial entity that never existed." (Colwell; "The Significance of Grouping of New Testament Manuscripts", *New Testament Studies*, IV (1957-1958); pp.86-7; In Pickering p.39.) And Colwell 1965: "We need to recognize that the editing of an eclectic text rests upon conjectures." (Colwell; "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text", *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed.J.P. Hyatt (New York: Abingdon Press, 1965), pp. 371-72"; in Pickering p.11.

In contrast to the 'Alexandrian' cloudland, Pickering "claim to have demonstrated the superiority of Family 35 based on size, independence, age, distribution, profile and care."

"If God demonstrably preserved the precise wording of a text throughout two millenia, this implies rather strongly that He inspired it in the first place - otherwise, why bother with it? And if He went to such pains, I rather suspect that He expects us to pay strict attention to it. When we stand before the Just Judge - who is also Creator, Savior and Inspirer - He will require an accounting based on the objective authority of that Text." (P.209-10.)

His biographer (1892), E.M. Goulburn, called him England's "leading religious teacher of his time" (ref. 33 (Fuller) p.216); John William Burgon:

"We must ... expose the inconsistency of those who while pretending to admit the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures still contend that the Scriptures contain faults and inaccuracies. By what authority can one claim that some parts of the Bible are trustworthy and some are not? We know of no list prepared by modern scholarship to guide the reader through this perplexity. One will exclude natural philosophy from the sphere of inspiration; another will exclude historical facts which do not involve points of faith and practice; while another will affirm that the reasoning of the writers was their own. One will contend that there was no inspiration when the writer was dealing with common everyday occurrences, or when writers made slips of memory in matters of no consequence. Another asserts that common history, chronology and genealogy may be removed from the sphere of inspiration - and so on ad infinitum.

But one is entitled to ask - Why? Why should the inspired writer become uninspired when alluding to natural phenomena? Is the Creator not qualified to speak about "natural" or created things and to inspire His servants to write about them? If the history, numbers, chronology and genealogies are all untrustworthy, can we have any confidence in the first seventeen books of the Old Testament and the first five of the New? How much of the Prophets will remain if we eliminate their history and their reasoning and their allusions to the common occurrences of everyday life? We have no warrant for assuming that the Bible contains any mistakes whatever, in matters of science or history or of any other kind. Where does Truth begin and falsehood end in such a record as rationalistic scholarship offers us, and with what measure of honesty could such an imperfect and erring record be called "The Word of God"? The Bible teaches us nothing about "degrees of inspiration" - it tells us that it is all inspired. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

"We gain nothing by speculating how much is to be assigned to the "human element" and how much to the "divine element". It is the Word of God. We must not be impatient of this divine mystery. We cannot thrust ourselves between the Almighty and those whom He inspired and discover just how He accomplished His end. We must be content to be

told by Him that all is "God-breathed"." (In The Divine Inspiration
of the Holy Scriptures; Trinitarian Bible Society 1999; pp.6-7.)

"SEEK YE OUT OF THE BOOK OF THE LORD, AND READ" (Is. 34,16)

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; May 2015

Canada. Springtime 1818.

"Mr. Chiniquy, is it true that you and your son read the Bible?"

"Yes ... my son and I read the Bible, and what is even better, he has learned a great deal by heart ..."

"... but don't you know it became prohibited by the holy Trent-council to read the Bible in French?"

"To me it does little to the case, whether I read the Bible in French, Greek or Latin," my father answered, "because I do equally understand those languages ..."

"But you know that you cannot permit your son to read the Bible?" the priest continued.

"My wife has as yet given him instruction in reading the Bible, and I can't see we're committing some sin in still to continue with that."

"Mr. Chiniquy," the priest answered, "you have gone through a complete cursus in theology; you know what duties there rest with a priest; you know then as well it is my unpleasant duty to come here to get the Bible delivered and to burn it."(2,3)

The priest left without the Book.

THE BIBLE VS THE TRADITIONS OF MEN

"... if confusion on the origin and authenticity of the Scriptures could bespread abroad in the world, the amazing certainty of the Reformers on these points, which had astonished and confounded the Papacy, could be broken down. In time the Reformation would be splintered to pieces, and driven as the chaff before the wind. The leadership in the battle for the Reformation was passing over from Germany to England. Here it advanced mightily, helped greatly by the new version of Tyndale."(4)

"The burning desire to give the common people the Holy Word of God was the reason why Tyndale had translated it into English. No such reason impelled the Jesuits at Rheims. In the preface of their Rheims New Testament, they state that it was not translated into English because it was necessary that the Bible should be in the mother tongue, or that God had appointed the Scriptures to be read by all; but from the special consideration of the state of their mother country. This translation was intended to do on the inside of England what the great navy of Philip II was to do on the outside."(5,6)

In 1562, Philip II established the Catholic university in Douai, France, to counteract the 'heresies' in the Netherlands. In 1568, William Allen formed the English College at Douai, "for the purpose of training priests to convert the English again to Catholicism. And it was here where the Catholic translation of the Bible into English was produced."(7)

The Douai-Rheims Bible was completed with the OT at Douai in 1609-1610, but the NT was published "during a temporary migration of the college to Rheims" (also France) in 1582:

The "NEVV TESTAMENT OF IESVS CHRIST, TRANSLATED FAITHFULLY INTO ENGLISH, out of the authentical Latin ... ANNOTATIONS, and other necessarie heapes, for the betrer vnderstanding of the text, and specially

for the discoverie of the CORRPTIONS of divers late translations, and for clearing the CONTROVERSIES in religion, of these daies IN THE ENGLISH COLLEGE OF RHEMES".

"The purpose of the version, both the text and notes, was to uphold Catholic tradition in the face of the Protestant Reformation which up till then had overwhelmingly dominated Elizabethan religion and academic debate."(8) ("Surprisingly ((or perhaps not so,)) these first New Testament and Old Testament editions followed the Geneva Bible not only in their quarto format but also in the use of Roman type."(8) This is pre-AV/KJV (1611) time.)

"Which translation ((, says the NT-introduction,)) we do not for all that publish, upon erroneous opinion of necessity, that the Holy Scriptures should always be in our mother tongue, or that they ought, or were ordained by God, to be read impartially by all... or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God's Word and honour or edification of the faithful, to have them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in the Ecclesiastical learned languages. Not for these nor for any such like reasons do we translate this sacred book, but upon special consideration of the present time, state, and condition of our country".

"... the indiscrete zeal of the popular, and their leaders... These latter, partly by simplicity, partly by curiosity, and especially by pride and disobedience, have made claim in this case for the common people, with plausible pretences many, but good reasons none at all. The other, to whom Christ hath given charge of our souls... have neither of old nor of late, ever wholly condemned all vulgar versions of Scripture, nor have at any time generally forbidden the faithful to read the same; yet they have not by public authority prescribed, commanded, or authentically ever recommended any such interpretation to be impartially used by all men."

"... neither the Translations set forth before that Heretic's ((Wycliffe's)) time, nor others afterward being approved by the lawful Ordinaries, were ever in our country wholly forbidden, though they were not (to say the truth) in quiet and better times (much less when the people were prone to alteration, heresy, or novelty) either hastily admitted or ordinarily read by the vulgar, but used only or especially by some devout religious and contemplative persons in reverence, secrecy, and silence, for their spiritual comfort.

Now since Luther's revolt also, divers learned Catholics, for the more speedy abolishing of a number of false and impious translations put forth by sundry sects, and for the better preservation or reclamation of many good souls endangered thereby, have published the Bible in several languages of almost all the principal provinces of the Latin Church, no other books in the world being so pernicious as heretical translations of the Scriptures, poisoning the people under the color of Divine authority, and not many other remedies being more sovereign against the same (if it be used in order, discretion, and humility) than the true, faithful, and sincere interpretation opposed thereunto. Which causeth the Holy Church not to forbid utterly any Catholic translation, though she allow not the publishing or reading of any absolutely and without exception or limitation, knowing by her Divine and most sincere wisdom, how, where, when, and to whom these her Master's and Spouse's gifts are to be bestowed to the most good of the faithful, and therefore neither generally permitteth that which must needs do hurt the unworthy, nor absolutely condemneth that which may

do much good to the worthy. Whereupon the order which many a wise man wished for before was taken by the Deputies of the late famous Council of Trent in this behalf, and confirmed by supreme authority that the Holy Scriptures, though truly and Catholically translated into vulgar tongues, yet may not be impartially read by all men, nor by any other than such as have express license thereunto from their lawful Ordinaries, with good testimony from their Curates and Confessors, that they be humble, discrete, and devout persons, and like to take much good, and no harm thereby. Which prescript, though in these days of ours it can not be so precisely observed as in other times and places where there is more due respect of the Church's authority, rule, and discipline, yet, we trust all wise and godly persons will treat the matter in the meanwhile with such moderation, meekness, and subjection of heart, as the handling of so sacred a Book, the sincere senses of God's truth therein, and the holy Canons, Councils, reason, and religion do require."(10)

The Council of Trent closed in 1563; the Bible is de facto indexed by 1564.

But, more NT-introduction from the English College in Rheims:

"... in the primitive Church... in those better times men were neither so ill, nor so curious by themselves, so to abuse the blessed Book of Christ. Neither was there any such means, before printing was invented, to disperse the copies into the hands of every man, as now there is.

They were then in the Libraries, Monasteries, Colleges, Churches, in Bishops', Priests', and some other devout principal Laymens' houses and hands... The poor ploughman could then, in laboring the ground, sing the hymns and psalms, either in known or unknown languages, as they heard them in the Holy Church, though they could neither read nor know the sense, meaning, and mysteries of the same."

"And truly there is no reason why men should be more loath to be ordered and moderated in this point by God's Church and their Pastors, than they are in the use of Holy Sacraments. For which, as Christ hath appointed Priests and ministers at whose hands we must receive them and not take by ourselves, so hath He given us doctors, prophets, expounders, interpreters, teachers and preachers (Ephesians 4), to take the law and our faith at their mouths, because our faith and religion cometh not to us properly or principally by reading of Scriptures, but (as the Apostle saith) by hearing of the preachers lawfully sent (Romans 10.17)."

"The wise will not here regard what some willful people do mutter, that the Scriptures are made for all men, and that it is out of envy that the Priests do keep the Holy Book from them. Which suggestion cometh from the same serpent that seduced our first parents (Genesis 3), who persuaded them that God had forbidden them that Tree of Knowledge, lest they should be as cunning as Himself and like unto the Highest. No, no, the Church doth it to keep them from blind, ignorant presumption, and from that which the Apostle calleth falsi nominis scientiam, knowledge falsely so-called (1 Timothy 6.10), and not to exclude them from the true knowledge of Christ."

"The poor ploughman could ... sing ... though they could neither read nor know the sense ...", we read from Rheims by 1582.

"If God spare my life, ere many years, I will cause a boy that drieveth the plough shall know more of the Scripture than thou dost," William Tyndale told a priest some decades earlier. "I totally dis-

sent from those who are unwilling that the Sacred Scriptures, translated into the vulgar tongue, should be read by private individuals", Tyndale's Greek-teacher at Cambridge, Erasmus, wrote in the preface to his 1516 Greek New Testament; "I wish that the husbandman may sing parts of them at his plough..."(9)

Let's with the Rheims-collegium in mind, continue from the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster Abbey, London, where the Revision/Translation of 1611s final editing took place; and with the work's "Epistle and Dedicatorie To the most high and mightie Prince, James"; which let us read about "Popish persons at home or abroad, who ... will maligne us, because we are poore Instruments to make GODS holy Trueth to be yet more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keepe in ignorance and darknesse".

Miles Smith(11) writes on behalf of his fellows, the Preface from "The Translators to the Reader":

"Now the Church of Rome would seeme at length to beare a motherly affection towards her children, and to allow them the Scriptures in their mother tongue: but indeed it is a gift, not deserving to be called a gift, an unprofitable gift: they must first get a Licence in writing before they may use them, and to get that, they must approve themselves to their Confessor, that is, to be such as are, if not frozen in the dregs, yet soured with the leaven of their superstition. Howbeit, it seemed too much to Clement the 8. ((1592-1605)) that there should be any Licence granted to have them in the vulgar tongue, and therefore he overruleth and frustrateth the grant of Pius the fourth ((1559-1565)). So much are they afraid of the light of the Scripture, (Lucifugæ Scripturarum, as Tertullian speaketh) that they will not trust the people with it, no not as it is set forth by their owne sworne men, no not with the Licence of their owne Bishops and Inquisitors. Yea, so unwilling they are to communicate the Scriptures to the peoples undrestanding in any sort, that they are not ashamed to confesse, that wee forced them to translate it into English against their wills. This seemeth to argue a bad cause, or a bad conscience, or both. Sure we are, that it is not he that hath good gold, that is afraid to bring it to the touch-stone, but he that hath the counterfeit; neither is it the true man that shunneth the light, but the malefactor, lest his deedes should be reprovèd: neither is it the plaine dealing Merchant that is unwilling to have the waights, or the meteyard brought in place, but he that useth deceit. But we will let them alone for this fault, and returne to translation."

"But the difference that appeareth betweene our Translations, and our often correcting of them, is the thing that wee are specially charged with; let us see therefore whether they themselves bee without fault this way, (if it be to be counted a fault, to correct) and whether they bee fit men to throw stones at us: O tandem major parcas insane minori: They that are lesse sound themselves, ought not to object infirmities to others. If we should tell them that Valla, Stapulensis, Erasmus, and Vives found fault with their vulgar Translation, and consequently wished the same to be mended, or a new one to be made, they would answer peradventure, that we produced their enemies for witnesses against them; albeit, they were in no other sort enemies, then as S. Paul was to the Galatians, for telling them the trueth: and it were to be wished, that they had dared to tell it them plainlier and oftner. But what will they say to this, that Pope Leo the tenth allowed Erasmus Translation of the New Testament, so much different from the

vulgar, by his Apostolike Letter & Bull; that the same Leo exhorted Pagnin to translate the whole Bible, and bare whatsoever charges was necessary for the worke? ... more of their chiefe men of all sorts, even their owne Trent-champions Paiva & Vega, and their owne Inquisitors, Hieronimys ab Oleastro, and their own Bishop Isidorus Clarissus, and their owne Cardinall Thomas à Vio Caietan, doe either make new Translations themselves, or follow new ones of other mens making, or note the vulgar Interpreter for halting; none of them feare to dissent from him, nor yet to except against him. ... doth not their Paris-edition differ from the Louaine, and Hentenius his from them both, and yet all of them allowed by authoritie? ... further, did not ... Sixtus ordaine by an inviolable decree, and that with the coucell and consent of his Cardinals, that the Latine edition of the olde and new Testament, which the Councill of Trent would have to be authenticke, is the same without controversie which he then set forth, being diligently corrected and printed in the Printing-house of Vatican? Thus Sixtus in his Preface before his Bible. And yet Clement the eight his immediate successour, publisheth another edition of the Bible, containing in it infinite differences from that of Sixtus, (and many of them waightie and materiall) and yet this must be authenticke by all meanes."

"But it is high time to leave them, and to shew in briefe what wee proposed to our selves".

"Lastly, wee have on the one side avoided the scrupulositie of the Puritanes, who leave the olde Ecclesiasticall words, and betake them to other, as when they put washing for Baptisme, and Congregation in stead of Church: as also on the other side we have shunned the obscuritie of the Papists, in their Azimes, Tunique, Rational, Holocausts, Præpuce, Pasche, and a number of such like, whereof their late Translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sence, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof, it may bee kept from being understood. But we desire that the Scripture may speake like it selfe, as in the language of Canaan, that it may bee understood even of the very vulgar."(12)

In passing; How do you read any book if you can't read?

"During his 1818 visit to America, the English intellectual William Cobbett wrote home: "There are very few really ignorant men in America.... They have all been readers from their youth up"". "... the one doctrine most widely shared among the various dissenting Protestant movements was that everyone must consult scripture for themselves. So when the Pilgrims arrived in America in 1620, one of the first things they did was to concern themselves with educating their children."(13)

"Almost as important as the Service, is, according to Lutheran view, the school. The Lutherdom is arisen by study; it can only be widespread by education. And since it refers every Christian to God's Word, it becomes a case of life for it that every Christian can read and understand the Bible. This, Luther and his friends very clearly realized, and they put much work in arranging good schools."(14,15) In the 1530's Geneva, Calvin insisted on schooling for every child, boys and girls.(16) Calvin "had no faith in education apart from religious training, he drew up a catechism of Christian doctrine which was an obligatory part of the curriculum."(17)

Contrast 'Reformation-landscapes' with the homeland of Philip II; Spain 1913; "The general education (there are around 70 pct. illiterates) is in the hands of the not much enlightened clergy."(18)

A SHORT (OR, REGRETTABLY, NOT SO SHORT) HISTORY

Backwards, not as remote as Bible-burner Pontifex Maximus Diocletian, (284-305), but to the days of Pontifex Maximus Gregory IX.

As time went by and "the Tradition went further and further away from the Scripture and overshadowed it, the ecclesiastical opposition went back to it and showed the glaring contrast between the Apostolic Church in poverty and the Rom. Church in glory."(19)

That, in short, 'resulted' in the (vernacular) Bible-prohibition; Toulouse 1229, Beziers 1233, Tarragona 1234.(20)

"Similar prohibitions were issued in the 15. century due to the Wycliffeism ((Oxford 1408)) and the Husism; yet, from the inventing of the art of bookprinting and until 1500, 24 German Bible-éditions came out."(19)

"In Germany, the Archbishop of Mainz in 1485 prohibited the printing and sale of German Bibles."(21)

21. September 1522. Das newve Testament. Deutzsch. Vuittenberg.

"Luther's bitter adversary Cochläus ... says ... even shoemakers, women, and all kinds of lay persons read it ... after a few months ... they ... argue with priests and monks as well, yes, with magisters and doctors in the theology".(22)

The same autumn, Duke George of Saxony forbade the Book; he is quoted "When only that monk would give us the Bible in German and then go there where he belongs!"(23)

They were in need of Luther's German.

"The Reformation greatly quickened men's interest in the Scriptures, so that notwithstanding the adverse attitude adopted by the Roman Catholic Church at and after the Council of Trent, the translation and circulation of the Bible made rapid progress."(24) (The Bible was printed in America 1663 "which John Eliot, one of the Pilgrim fathers, translated into "the language of the Massachusetts Indians" whom he evangelized."(24) Imagine Philip II getting his troops across the English Channel in 1587/-88 ...)

"The earliest noteworthy organization, formed for the specific purpose of circulating the Scriptures, was the Canstein Bible institute, founded in 1710 at Halle, in Saxony... Baron von Canstein (1667-1719) ... invented a method of printing whereby the institute could produce Bibles and Testaments in Luther's version at low cost and sell them cheaply."(24)

"In Germany it was common to read Catholic bibletranslations"(21); the article goes on to mention a Catholic NT that became indexed in 1821.

In 1804 a Protestant bible society was established in Nürnberg, Bavaria. The next year, a Catholic bible society showed up in Regensburg, also Bavaria. The latter to be abolished in 1817; it was not in favour with the pontiff.

From around this time "the Pope repeatedly condemned the Protestant bible societies".(21) A condemnation of Protestant bible societies and

Bibles that continued. The Osservatore Romano, 1. & 2. June 1923, reports from a churchfestival in Rome where burned "a huge number lecherous books, immoral periodicals and Protestant Bibles", "to the glory of the Madonna".(25)

AND SINCE THEN

1927. "Today", Jacob van Bruggen writes in 1978, "Bible translating is largely in the hands of Bible societies and other para-church groups. This development would not have been possible had not the churches deviated on a large scale from the confessions on which they were founded."(26)

The "antidogmatic and non-church origin" bible societies started out distributing existing Bible-translations and continued with "making missionary translations". "It was a short step from making missionary translations to making new translations for countries where the church had already been established for centuries.

Many believed that the seventeenth century translations used in most European countries urgently needed to be replaced. The churches had been so divided, however, that they found such a cooperative project almost impossible. The Bible societies emerged as a means by which such translations could be accomplished. The Netherlands Bible Society was a pioneer in this new field. The Dutch Reformed Synod completely failed to agree upon a new translation, and what new translations were produced were not accepted beyond a confined circle. These circumstances led the society in 1927 to decide to make its own translation from the original languages and offer it to the churches."(27)

In 1954, the President of the United Bible Societies (est. 1946), Eivind Berggrav, gives a lecture called "Bibelbølgen", ("the Bible-wave")(28), in which he says "the Bible was not formally set on index until 1564, but became prohibited for laymen already at the churchconference in Toulouse in 1229 ... the wave-bottom."

Berggrav goes on to mention the "illegal outbreaks"; Peter Waldo, Wycliffe, Hus, "the line from Hus to Luther", Luther, Tyndale, Olivetan; he short renders the policies of Pius VII (1816), Pius IX (1864), Leo XIII (1897).

And Berggrav describes what he experienced "in Vienna in 1951 when we had a regional conference there for the Worlds United Biblesocieties. Then the board were received by the Roman Cardinal Innitzer. He held a speech and thanked the Protestant biblesocieties for everything what they had done for the translation and spreading of the Bible, and added that the Catholics stand in great debt because of the help the societies had granted.

With the history as background, it was nearly not to believe.

But it had its explanation.

... as time went by, the Biblewave became too strong for the Roman Church."

So; what to do "if you can't beat them...?"

Churchhistory-professor, Dr.theol.(29) Carl Fr. Wisløff wrote:

"In 1960 the Pope founded a secretariat for the promotion of the unity of the Christians, with Cardinal Bea as leader. This secretariat's task should according to the Pope's word, be to make it possible for the separated brethren to attend the work of the ((2. Vatican)) council and thus make their reunion with the one flock of Christ easier. (cit.Berkouwer, The second Vatican Council, p.14)."(30)

"We turn to the decree On ecumenism, - "The Catholic Church and the unity of the Christians". - The first one notices, is the friendly, warm tone the decree sets up during their mention of "our separated brethren" and "our separated churches". Last mentioned expression goes further in recognition than what one earlier has seen instances of. This, of course, has been noticed everywhere, and in many circles the waves of expectation, by the thought that the day of reunion comes nearer, beat high."(31)

"And when then the Roman Church becomes friendly instead of unfriendly, calls us brethren and invites us to by observers attend the council and even promises to go in for that the Protestants in Spain shall get an enduring existence - what on earth then is more to be said? Then the Church's unity must have moved considerable closer. But it has not. Not on a single important point has the Roman Church changed its teachings."(32)

The 2. Vatican Council took place from 1962 to 1965.

"At a major conference of Bible societies in 1964 it was agreed that a "common text" should be prepared in the original languages of Greek and Hebrew, and that this text should be translated into other languages so as to provide a "common Bible" acceptable to Protestants and Catholics alike. On the Catholic side, this concept of a "common Bible" was encouraged by a decree ((sic)) of the Second Vatican Council, in 1965, explicitly referring to the possibility of "co-operation with the separated brethren" (i.e. Protestants) in translation projects. In 1966 the British and Foreign Bible Society amended its constitution so that it could include the Apocrypha in its translations, to make them acceptable among Roman Catholic readers. The same policy was adapted by the United Bible Societies, including most national Bible societies around the world."(33)

Two decades further into the future, and the Trinitarian Bible Society can write, "It is the deliberate policy of the UBS to concentrate on the official national languages, and on languages which have more than one million literate speakers. While evangelicals have been directing their support towards the minor languages, the United Bible Societies have quietly been replacing the older Protestant Bibles in the major languages by new ecumenical translations. It is time for these matters to be seen in the correct perspective."(34)

2. Vårt heimland i myrker lenge låg, Og vankunna ljuset gøymde.
 Men, Gud, du i nåde til oss såg, Din kjærleik oss ikkje gløymde;
 Du sende ditt ord til Noregs fjell, Og ljus yver landet strøymde.
 4. So blømde vårt land i ljus og fred, Det grodde så grønt i lider.
 Men atter seig natt på landet ned Med trældom og tunge tider.
 Og folket det sukka etter ljus, Og du lyste upp um sider.
 5. Og morgonen rann, og myrkret kvarv, Som lenge vår lukka skygde.
 Du atter oss gav vår fridoms arv Og honom i trengsla trygde.
 Du verna vårt folk og gav oss fred, Og landet med lov me bygde.(35,36)
 (Elias Blix, 1890)

1. To D.J.H.; Epoch-making books; May 2015.
2. Chiniquy, Ch.; Katolisismen avsløret (Fifty years in the Church of Rome (?)); Pastor J. Storjohann, shortened ed. (1894) 1930; pp.15-6.
3. More than thirty years later, the boy from 1818, now the priest Charles Chiniquy, was given the task to "establish a community of Catholic emigrants, if possible in such a large scale that we could govern the whole of Illinois" (p.146). Chiniquy handed out Bibles and New Testaments in his new colony; to find it not allowed by his bishop in Chicago. (P.164)
4. Wilkinson, B.C.; Our Authorized Bible Vindicated; in Fuller, D.O. (Ed.); Which Bible?; Inst. for Bibl. Textual Studies, (1970) 15.pr. 1995; p.237.
5. Ib. p.239.
6. The 'Southern Devil's navy failed in 1588 (and ... Britannia rule the waves ...); King James I started the Bible-revision in 1604 ("this whole Church to be bound unto it and none other" (Candwell)); there probably were a couple of reasons to get finished the whole Douay-Bible of which the OT was translated prior to 1582.
7. Wikipedia
8. Ib.
9. Hallihan, C.P.; The Authorized Version - A Wonderful and Unfinished History; Trinitarian Bible Society 2010; p.30.
10. The copy reads K.P. Edgecomb, Aug. 2006.
11. Notice "the delicious irony of all fourteen Scripture quotes in the preface being from the Geneva Bible, Smith's 'study' Bible. But until the Authorized Version was actually published, what else should he use?" (Hallihan p.51)
12. The language was that of "Tyndale's English ("certainly in the New Testament more than nine-tenths can be traced directly to Tyndale" (p.48)) and his goal was that of Wycliffe: a translation of the Bible into English that everyone could understand. He did not want the Bible limited to educated clergymen, using terminology which would have been beyond the average farm labourer. At the same time, however, as ably illustrated by his work, Tyndale was not interested in translating the Scriptures into 'street' language. The Scriptures were special, and deserved more than the flat, unmelodic, often coarse language used in everyday vernacular. Tyndale knew that the ploughboy of his day would not have been educated, but that ploughboy was able to understand (or intelligent enough to learn) more than simple 'farm lingo'; Tyndale's translation reflects this middle ground." (Hallihan p.61)
13. Stark, R.; How the West Won - The Neglected Story of the Triumph of Modernity; ISI Books 2014; p.352.
14. Welle, I.; Kirkens historie, I; Antikkforlaget 1987; p.358.
15. Norwegian readers can see D.J.H.s Norsk frihet og den store kommune-sanningen; gjestekommentar, kommentar-avisa.no ; Jan. 2015.
16. Ref. Cunningham, L.; Verdens viktigste bok - Hvordan Bibelen har forandret verden; Prokla-Media, (2009) 4.pr. 2014; (The Book that Transforms Nations - The Power of the Bible to Change Any Country;

YWAM Publ.).

17. Enc. Brit.

18. Ill.no.konv.leks.; H. Aschehoug 1913.

19. Salmonsens konv.leks.; Bibelforbud.

20. Steinsvik (ref. 25) who lists some of this (with ref. Carl Skog, "Den katolske Kyrkan och Bibeln", p.17), continues, "After this, one very likely better will understand to estimate ... that two Norwegian kings, the one in the 1240-50s, the second in 1310, let bring about bibletranslations in the vernacular". (Pp.389-90)

21. Ill. Religionsleks; Skandinavisk Bogforlag 1949; Bibelforbud.

22. Sverdrup,Edv.; Luther som bibeloversetter; in Guds ord, menneskers språk; Det Norske Bibelselskap 1983; p.36.

23. Ib. p.30.

24. Enc. Brit.

25. Steinsvik,M.; Sankt Peters Himmelnøkler; Eugen Nielsen, 3.pr. 1932; p.129.

26. van Bruggen,J.; The Future of the Bible; Th. Nelson 1978; p.58.

27. Ib. p.57-8.

28. (Re-)printed by the Norwegian Biblesociety 1984.

29. Thesis "Nattverd og Messe", (probably meant "Lord's supper and Mass").

30. Wisløff,C.Fr.; Vaticanum II; Credo Forlag, A.D. ? (probably shortly after the council's closing); p.11.

31. Ib. p.24.

32. Ib. p.27.

33. The Trinitarian Bible Society; Ecumenism and the United Bible Societies; re-printed articles from 1985 and 1987; p.7.

34. Ib. p.26.

35. The Norwegian National Hymn; 'Straightforward':

2. Our homeland in darkness long lay, And the ignorance the light hided. But God, you in mercy to us looked, Your love us not forgot; You sent your word to Norway's mountains, And light over the land flowed.

4. Then flourished our land in light and peace, It grew so green in hillsides. But again drifted night on the land down With bondage and heavy times. And the people it sighed after light, And you lightened up at length.

5. And the morning dawned, and the darkness evaporated, Which long our happiness shadowed. You again us gave our freedom inheritance And him in the adversity secured. You protected our people and gave us peace, And the land with law we builded.

36. The verses cited covers around one thousand years of history for which darkest middle part, when the State of Norway became formally erased, can be consulted C.Fr. Wisløff's Norsk Kirkehistorie, I, pp. 400-4.

By the time of the Reformation the 'Church' owned about 50 pct. of Norwegian landed property (Moseng & more; Norsk Historie, I; p.292); in Denmark 40 pct. (Wisløff p.405).

The last Norwegian Archbishop, Olav Engelbriktsson's "politics was indeed national, but it was first and foremost Catholic, and that became the country's calamity... Olav Engelbriktsson bears a main responsibility for Norway's formal deletion from the number of the nations." (Wisløff)

(By the way; The early "vankunne"/"ignorance" (v. 2) was not complete.

If you search, you'll might for instance find the pre-Roman Molmūtine laws of Britain (see Flinders Petrie's paper Neglected British History (a part printed in Bill Cooper's After the Flood, App.6)).

But "even if we search with magnifying glass, we hardly discover any other place that has created lasting democratic developmentforms of the character as in the North, especially in the Norwegian and the Icelandic sphere. Good examples we do find in Alltinget on Iceland ca. 930 and tinget ((the moot)) on Man, the world's oldest continuous ting-assembly. It was in Norway the Icelanders and the islanders on Man found their models. Gulatinget ((Western Norway)) was the concrete point of departure." (Titlestad, T.; Sagasyn - Norges historiske kraftlinjer; Sagabok 2013; ch.VII, Democratic roots in Norway back to the time of Christ; p.49.)