

WHICH BIBLE-VERSION DOES A 'CREATIONIST' READ?

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit
October 2017

WHICH BIBLE-VERSION DOES A 'CREATIONIST' READ?

"The reader must judge whose bias he will accept — that 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." (Jack Moorman: *Forever Settled*; p.278)

"In short, a true Gospel and a false Bible text do not go together. Eventually you must choose the one and reject the other." (Edward F. Hills: *Believing Bible Study*; 3.ed,p.225)

"... thy word is truth." (John 17,17)

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; October 2017

There is a matter which for many creationists seems obvious; for others it just seems out of sight: The basis and startpoint is not our understanding of Genesis / the Bible; the basis and startingpoint is Genesis and the Bible itself; the factual wording of the Bible; God's Word.

In 1859 came Charles Darwin's 'epoch-making' "On the Origin of Species ..."; the same year that Konstantin Tischendorf brought the Sinaiticus-codex from, yes, Sinai. A couple of years earlier, (1857, according to Bill Cooper), the Vatican had published the Vaticanus-codex. And at this time, B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort composed a New Testament text to replace the traditional NT text, "that vile Textus Receptus". (Hort, 1851). Their text, (1870, publ. 1881), was largely a Vaticanus-text.

"But the book which has most engaged me is Darwin", Hort writes to Rev. John Ellerton, Apr. 3, 1860; "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."

Unanswerable? No. A new period? Certainly.

Concerning things that took place in those days, B.C. Wilkinson writes (D.O. Fuller (Ed.): *Which Bible?*; -95pr.,p.285): "The public would not have accepted the extreme, or, as some called it, "progressive" conclusions of these three <Lachmann etc.>. The names of Westcott and Hort were not prominently familiar at this time although they were Cambridge professors. Nevertheless, what was known of them was not such as to arouse distrust and apprehension. It was not until the work of revision was all over, that the world awoke to realize that Westcott and Hort had outdistanced Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. As Salmon says, "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." " Indeed.

Fenton John Anthony Hort found "'Protestantism' ... only parenthetical and temporary." (He writes to Westcott, 1864) In 1848 he wrote to Ellerton that "The pure Romish view seems to me nearer, and more likely to lead to, the truth than the Evangelical." (See Fuller, Chron.Index)

Under the heading "The Society's Protestant Reformation principles of Bible translation (Trinitarian Bible Society's Quarterly Record Jul.-Sept. 2017). Senior Editorial Consultant Larry Brigden writes: "The Bibles of the Reformation era dispelled the darkness and brought spiritual life and liberty, The common people had the Word of God in their hands, and by an infallible standard could now examine the religion they had been taught. This inevitably led to the downfall of Popery. The people saw the falsehood of that system which up until then had kept them in bondage to vain superstitions having no warrant in the Scriptures. Where the Word of God came, there came also liberty."

"Given that the Church of Rome has historically been fiercely opposed to the

free circulation of the Scriptures and that not so long ago it even openly condemned Bible Societies, it may come as a surprise to some to learn that these days the Vatican has a close involvement with the United Bible Societies. This change of attitude must be either because Rome has changed its view of Scripture or because the Bible societies have changed theirs. Regrettably, the latter is more probable. It must be recalled that the United Bible Societies (and for that matter Wycliffe Bible Translators) do not use the Received Text, the text underlying all Reformation-era Bibles, but instead use the corrupt Critical Text. Thus Rome's willingness to be involved with the United Bible Societies is understandable after all. Whenever in the past Rome could not 'altogether prevent the Holy Scriptures from being translated and circulated, she has made no scruple of falsifying the text' <T.H. Horne & W.E. Painter: *Pope-ry, the Enemy and Falsifier of Scripture*; 1844, p.4>. Hence, the use of the corrupt Critical Text by the United Bible Societies is consistent with Rome's purposes, and she will consequently lend support to such work. On the other hand, if the Received Text were to be used, Rome would doubtless take quite a different view. It is noteworthy that the Vatican has never published the Traditional Text of the Holy Scriptures - the Hebrew Masoretic Text or the Greek Received Text - nor has it ever published a Bible in any language translated from that textual base."

Writes C.P. Hallihan (*The Authorized Version; The Trinitarian Bible Society* 2010, p.58): "The speed with which the late 19th- and 20th-century English-speaking world, Christians very much included, deserted the Authorized Version and its textual foundations is quite startling. This was especially so in the second half of the 20th century, when 'new', 'improved', and, always, 'better' versions, undergirded with strong commercial salesmanship, appeared regularly and found a ready market. A wholly deficient yardstick became accepted - that 'easy-to-read' is the same as 'easy-to-understand' - a frighteningly deceptive approach to any serious reading, and much more so in connection with the Scriptures. So much has this become the rule that the very nature of the Scriptures is mostly ignored, or even held against them. We have the Word of God in a wealth of manuscript testimony; honest use of that testimony and rigorous translation of the text are of greater importance than 'marked needs'. The year 2009 saw great celebration of Darwin's theories; those mistaken theories one hundred and fifty years earlier had a thoroughly debilitating effect on both scholarly and popular views of the Bible. The Reformers had accepted the simple integrity of the Bible witness, but by the 19th century the Bible had come to be regarded as just another literary text, without inherent authority or meaning. Darwin's theories led 19th-century 'experts' to apply evolutionary methodology to the Bible, at every level. The picture of Scripture as an imperfect record of the religious seeking of primitive mentality, moving through to more highly evolved views, gave a way of reading the Bible which completely destroys its authority. This was not accomplished without a 'scholarly' manipulation and reinterpretation of textual and translation issues, and many of the modern Bible versions are built upon these sandy foundations."

Henry M. Morris gives in his Study Bible a closing eight pages appendix called A Creationist's Defense of the King James Bible, (in U.K. more often called the Authorized Version, A.V.), wherein Morris among other writes: "The whole subject of New Testament criticism is too complex to discuss here, but it is significant that almost all of the new versions of the New Testament are based mainly on what is known as the Westcott-Hort Greek text, or some later modification thereof (such as the Nestle-Aland text), whereas the King James is based largely on what is known as the Received Text (also called the Textus Receptus or the Majority text or the Byzantine Greek text). As far as the Hebrew text of the Old Testament is concerned, the King James is based on the Masoretic text, while the modern versions rely somewhat on the Masoretic but also on the Septuagint, the Latin Vulgate, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and various others. This is especially the case with the Kittel Hebrew reference text, *Biblia Hebraica*, and

the footnotes in the "Stuttgart" edition."

"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 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."

The case of Kurt Aland. Bill Cooper (The Authenticity of the New Testament - Part 1; Creation Science Movement (est. 1932), p.118): Aland "is a well known figure in the critic's world. He is the authority behind several modern translations, not of the Bible, but of Gnostic corruptions of the Bible, all of them sprung directly from Westcott and Hort and the Alexandrian Gnostic texts. They only pose as the Word of God. Whether his professional involvement over so many years arose from any malice within him toward the Scriptures, we cannot say. But we can say, by his own candid admission, that he did not believe in the slightest that the Bible was the Word of God. He wrote and spoke against that notion many times, claiming that virtually none of the New Testament Books were authentic, even the Gospels being all forgeries. With two of his earliest books, he pushed hard to have Hebrews, 2 Peter, 2 & 3 John, Jude and Revelation dropped from the New Testament Canon, and claimed that certain apocryphal books had a better claim to canonicity than they did. It was as if Marcion had come back from the dead. So the next time you open your ESV, or your NIV, or any other 'modern' version from Alan's stable, take a moment to think on the man who did more than any of his colleagues to bring them before the world. They are not the pure Word of God that they pretend to be, and are certainly not the fruit of a man who loved the Word of God. On the contrary, like the apostates Westcott and Hort before him, he openly despised that Word, and devoted his entire life to its perversion and ultimate destruction."

Evolution criticism did not show up with Henry Morris in the 1950s; as an example, the lawyer Philip Mauro in 1922 supplied the book Evolution at the Bar: "Notwithstanding the fact that Darwinism is no longer believed in the circles in which it originated, its influence for harm was never so great as now. The reason is that the theory has found its way into the theological seminaries, and into the school-books of the children, where it is doing the deadly and truly devilish work of discrediting, in the eyes of many, the statements of the Word of God." "Parents, who would be careful to keep their little ones from the dangers of the streets, recklessly expose them every day to the more serious dangers of the schools, and give themselves little concern as to what they learn there from teachers and companions." (Pp.71-2)

1922. But Mauro (p.69) cites Lord Kelvin, from "an address delivered in 1903": "Forty years ago I asked Liebig, walking somewhere in the country, if he believed that the grass and flowers which we saw around us grew by mere chance force. He answered, 'No; no more than I believe that a book of botany could grow by mere che-

mical force ... It is not in dead matter that men live and move, and have their being; but in a creative and directive Power, which science compels us to accept as an article of faith. Is there anything so absurd as to believe that a number of atoms, by falling together of their own accord, could make a crystal, a microbe, or a living animal?" (P.70:) "The same Lord Kelvin, whom we have just quoted, is on record as declaring that, there is not a single ascertained fact of science which conflicts with any statement of the Bible."

Kelvin, who established thermodynamics as a scientific discipline, and formulated it's first and second laws, says "With regard to the origin of life, science ... positively affirms creative power." (H. Morris: Men of Science, Men of God)

Mauro and "the Word of God" again: In Which Version? - Authorized or Revised?, 1924 (L. Garret (Ed.): Which Bible can we Trust; -98pr.,pp.151-2): "As a sufficient illustration of the many differences between these two Codices and the great body of other Mss. we note that, in the Gospels alone, Codex Vaticanus differs from the Received Text in the following particulars: It omits at least 2,877 words; it adds 536 words; it substitutes 935 words; it transposes 2,098 words; and it modifies 1,132; making a total of 7,578 verbal divergences. But the Sinaitic Ms. is even worse, for its total divergences in the particulars stated above amount to nearly nine thousand.

Summing up the case against these two fourth century Codices (with which he includes the Beza, supposedly of the sixth) Dean Burgon solemnly assures us, and "without a particle of hesitation, that they are three of the most scandalously corrupt copies extant;" That they "exhibit the most shamefully mutilated texts which are anywhere to be met with;" that they "have become (by whatever process, for their history is wholly unknown) the depositories of the largest amount of fabricated readings, ancient blunders, and intentional perversion of truth, which are discoverable in any known copies of the Word of God"."

"... the most formidable defense of the priority of the Byzantine text yet published in our day." Jack Moorman (p.88) quotes D.A. Carson about Wilbur N. Pickering's The Identity of the New Testament Text. Carson, by the way, no friend of the 'Byzantine' NT text.

Pickering ThM, PhD (linguistics); Pickering's NT translation with commentary, is "based on his edition of the Greek New Testament, according to the only significant line of transmission, both ancient and independent, that has a demonstrable archetypal form in all 27 books. The Greek Text of which this is a translation, and articles explaining the preference, may be downloaded free from: www.walkinhiscommandments.com"

A comment on 1.Tim.6,21 reads, "For many generations the theory of evolution has been foisted on the populace at large as 'science'. It dominates the schools, the media, the marketplace, the government. The spiritual damage has been incalculable - multiplied millions will spend eternity in the Lake because of it."

"And that completes our review of the W-H <Westcott-Hort> critical theory. It 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)." (Identity ... ver. IV, 2014,p.87)

But, as Moorman (p.263) observes: "... the naturalistic critics themselves have shown each of the principles <W.H.-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?"

Pickering (p.24) quotes E.C. Colwell: "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." It could be added "the dead hand of Charles Robert Darwin ... a sensational achievement, an impressive success."

Nor did Edward F. Hills believe in Darwin & Hort: "Why were Westcott and Hort given such an enthusiastic welcome? Because they claimed to have done for New Testament textual criticism what Isaac Newton did for astronomy, namely, reduce it to an exact science. This claim was vigorously seconded by their followers, and conservative Christians everywhere were led to believe that it was as hopeless and foolish to reject Westcott and Hort's theories and retain the Textus Receptus as it would be to reject the law of gravity and step off the Sears Building, or whatever structure was the highest in those days."

"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." (Pp.89,219)

In the appendix Is NT Textual Criticism a Science? (p.363), Pickering writes: "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'."

"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." (Michael Marlowe: Against the Theory of 'Dynamic Equivalence'; ch.28 Conclusion)

"There is something deeply inappropriate about changing every twenty years the words of "the Father of lights, with whom there is no variation or shadow of change," or of the One who is "the same yesterday, today, and forever."" (Ch.11)

"Christians must stop listening to the siren song of "experts" who, with seductive promises and misrepresentations, have lured us into this confusion. "New and improved" Bible versions should be viewed with suspicion, especially when they promise to make things easier. None of the modern versions mentioned in the previous paragraph are as difficult for us as the King James Version was for our ancestors. Yet it seems that our forefathers were better off a hundred years ago, before all these new versions came along. Explaining an obscure expression here and there in the KJV was a small thing, compared to all the trouble and uncertainty that the new versions have brought upon us. It also seems that our forefathers were better people than we are. They did not expect everything to be so easy; but we, being lazy, have corrupted our way through love of ease and pleasure. If that does not change, there is no hope for us." (Ch.28)

{It is to be mentioned that Marlowe is far from 'King James Only-ism' or being a promoter of the 'Byzantine' NT text.)

6

Marlowe's primary matter is bible-translation and 'dynamic equivalence' à la Eugene Nida, (Nida, from 1946 - 1980 the Executive Secretary of the Translations Department of the American Bible Society).

"Our observation that the Bible is a difficult book to those who are outside the church does not sit well with many people these days. "On the contrary," they say, "the Bible is really quite simple: it is all a matter of translation. The old literal method of translation, which makes for such hard reading, is to blame. But if we only put the Bible in simpler and more idiomatic English it will need no explanation. People who are unfamiliar with 'church jargon' might then read and understand it with ease." This is the basic presupposition of the method of translation called "dynamic equivalence."" (Ch.2)

"... the inspired authors of the New Testament favored literal translation, with Hebrew idioms and all carried straight over into Greek. And why? Undoubtedly they believed that there was something significant in every word of the Scripture, as do some of us today. In any case, the Bible was certainly not written in idiomatic and colloquial Greek, as some defenders of dynamic equivalence have claimed." (Ch.3)

"The whole ethos of dynamic equivalence frowns at the kind of carefulness that would supply details and alternatives in the margin, while encouraging translators to take unprecedented liberties with the text."

"These versions have got the relationship of text to margin backwards. The text should try to present to the reader what the original writer actually wrote, with as little interpretation as possible; and the margin should provide the interpretations that the translator thinks are necessary for a right understanding of the text." (Ch.10)

"... we would maintain that the entire purpose of a translation is to present accurately in another language what was said in the original. If this requires words and expressions that the reader does not use every day, then so be it." (Ch.11)

Back to C.P. Hallihan's book from the year before KJV's 400-years anniversary: "... the Bible is not 'divinity for dummies', it is not a novel or a fictionalised documentary. Rather 'all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness' (2 Timothy 3.16).

Scripture is profitable - useful, of great reward and benefit - and it expects a level of effort in realising that profit. Quoting the Bible again, consider Acts 17.11: 'These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, wheter those things were so'. These noble Bereans 'received the word' - we might almost say 'they went to meet it', and accepting the obligations of the Word of God they did so 'with all readiness of mind'. It was tho be thought about. And then they searched, examined, sifted, questioned (and remember that this was no 'modern' version - they did not have the 'Berean Searcher's Study Bible in Easy Macedonian')."

Writes Marlowe: "Obviously the Bible is very old, from "a previous age," and in fact ancient. There is not much hope of understanding it if we come to it with a hatred of things that seem old. And I do not think ordinary people have this attitude." (Ch.11)

BRIEFLY ON NORWEGIAN BIBLE-VERSIONS;

("versions", since some (BS78 & BS11) fall totally outside the translation-tradition of the Reformation era).

Bibelselskapet; BS11 (most write N011, i.e. Norw. Transl.; I prefer Bible Society): "The Roman Catholic Church was ... represented on every level in the translation." (D. Kullerud: Bibelen; s.460)

Based on -76/-77 ed. of Bibl.Hebr. Stuttgartsensia, Bibl. Hebr. Quinta, 27th ed. of Nestle-Aland; All Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart. (Ref. A. Aschim: Bibelen 3.0; s.271.)

Which for instance introduces to Luke 3,33 the fantasy figures Admin and Arni, "following the eclectic text that has been in vogue for several generations (UBS/N-A). As is their habit, the editors of that text follow the so-called 'Alexandrian' witnesses, but at this point those witnesses are scattered all over the back side of the desert - almost no two agree. One would have thought that this would give the UBS editors pause, but not at all. They were so intent on doing despite to Christ's genealogy that they acutally concocted a 'patch-work quilt' and intruded the fictitious Admin and Arni into that genealogy. UBS has presented the evidence in their apparatus in such a way as to obscure the fact that no Greek MS has the precise text they have printed (the same holds for N-A). In Bruce Metzger's presentation of the UBS Committee's reasoning in this case he wrote, "the Committee adopted what seems to be the least unsatisfactory form of text". Is this not a good candidate for 'chutzpah' of the year? The UBS editors concoct their own reading and proclaim it "the least unsatisfactory"! And just what might be "unsatisfactory" about the reading of 95% of the Greek manuscripts except that it doesn't introduce any difficulties?" (Pickering's NT with Comment.)

BS11 "... must ... fundamentally seen be characterized as an idiomatic translation". ((S. Bøe) & G.O. Holmås : Når Ordet blir norsk; s.46) That is, a 'dynamic equivalent translation'.

Bibelforlaget, Bibelen Guds Ord; BF97/07: The publisher states repeatedly that the editon "builds on translation from the original texts." We better take them by their word, and a "straight comparison makes it ... adjacent to think that the NKJV <New King James Version> in many places has played the role as the leading text in the work with the translation." (Holmås s.190)

Text-basis is the Masoretic OT and for NT "a Greek passed down text" used in Danish-Norwegian translation until 1904, the Luther and KJV-editions; (Scriver 1881?) , , ,

By the revision in 2017 it is stated Qumran-texts have been considered from the first edition of -97.

A concordant translation in principle.

"If one compares with NB88, it is striking how much more unevenly and casual the principle of concordance is carried out in BF97. It is often hard to see what motivates ..." "... there are many examples of that one drops conjunctions and smallwords in the original text or replace them with others". (Holmås s.192) "Perhaps the most conspicuous alteration is that the 2007-revision takes after marked linguistically choices in the Bible society's 2005-translation (NT 05): "Brothers" many places are replaced with the gender neutral "søsken" (S.196)

With the revision of 2017 we are informed that there are done "more than 15000 <their emphasis> improvements in language and spelling <"skrivemåte">. Old words which are not used in everyday speech are replaced and sentences are done more readable."

Marlowe springs to mind: If an accurate translation "requires words and expressions that the reader does not use everyday, then so be it"; the Reformation-bibles became 'language-makers'; one remembers the Reformer's Foreword to the Short Catechism in which he stresses the same form, always the same textform in the instruction of the young.

Norsk Bibel; NB88/07: "Regarding the textbasis for NT, is taken into account both the traditional, passed down text ... and the old parchment-majuscles. In the essentials we have held to <"lagt oss på"> the same cautious line as the 1904-bible (1930)."

"But Filip was from Betsaida", writes N030 from the original. But NB88 has no "But".

8

"... we see that NB88 very often removes the many opening "and" in Hebrew narrative; the first chapter of Judges has in N030 15 such, while NB88 only has 3. In comparison, N078bm and BF97 have none. (Bøe s.168)

"... the Society expects its translators and revisers to believe in both the verbal and plenary inspiration of Scripture, and thus we expect every word of the original Hebrew and Greek to be taken into account and represented as far as possible in the receptor language. This means that the Society requires even the small Greek word kai (primarily meaning 'and', but also translated as 'then', 'but', and 'nevertheless') to be included in the receptor language, even if it is unusual for sentences to begin with 'and' in the receptor language." (Editorial Director Philip J.D. Hopkins, Trinitarian Bible Society; Quarterly Record Jan - March 2017, p.21)

In the Pauline sentence of Eph. 1,3-14, N030 sets period after v. 14. By then NB88/07 (as BF97/07) already has sprinkled out 5 dots.

Det norske bibelselskap, (later to be Bibelselskapet); BS78/85: Where the 1904 NT started the departure from the trad. text, the 1978 continued. (Admin & Arni are present by -78.)

The quality of God's love (John 3,16) became the quantity: "For so highly God loved ..."

"In future N078 often is emphasized as a rather pure idiomatic translation". (Bøe s.147-8) "Several from the Bible Society were present in a seminar in Arnoldshain in Germany in 1968 where Nida was the main lecturer, and they became strongly influenced from his principles" (s.151); "likewise there were some in a corresponding seminar in Halle in 1971." (Kullerud s.454)

And I do not wonder: "... as late as" 1998, it was "discovered that a member of a sentence was fallen out both in 1 Chron 21,3 and 2 Chron 6,5." (H. Hage- lia in: Bibel og vekkelse - Festskrift til Ingulf Diesen; s.62)

Det norske bibelselskap; (OT 1891) N004/30: "... had taken into account the new text editions of Tischendorf, Tregelles and Westcott-Hort, after the rule: to deviate from textus receptus in those instances where these stood together in the choice of alternative readings." (Å. Holter: Det norske bibelselskap gjennom 150 år; s.421) As a result, Holter (s.422) in the Gospels could count around 70 places where words of Jesus were left out. Following Revelation, there is a list informing that "The following places, among others, lack in more or fewer of the older manuscripts", of course including the end of Mark. "For well over a hundred years, there has been an ongoing campaign to discredit the last twelve verses of Mark (16:9-20). I wonder where people get the motivation to expend so much time and energy on such an enterprise. Only three known Greek manuscripts omit the verses, and one of them is a falsification at this point." (Pickering; NT with comm.; Pickering's Identity has a 16 pages appendix on the case.)

TOWARD CLOSING

Svend Borchmann Hersleb (1784-1836), lecturer (1813, from 1814) theology-professor at the University of Christiania (Oslo), could hardly become a 'Darwinist', Darwin is in the future. But in an 1812-textbook Hersleb is heading the creation-account with "Old-Sagn", that is, "ancient legend <or "legends">". Hersleb became a main figure in the Norwegian Bible Society (est. 1816); in the 1819 NT-ed. he, in agreement with Griesbach, introduces square-brackets around words "believed not originally to have stood in the Text".

"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." (Holter s.125) A later alliance of conservative theology and the new laymans-movement, removed from and onwards 1848 all textcritical brackets; except for 1.John 5,7-8. (Holter s.140) (It can be added that the some more than 20 square-brackets in N030 OT, (see Ps.75,3) indicate added words (as

P.S.

The topic of the Bible and creation, versus quasi-versions (includes 'theistic evolution'), is the topic of Heaven or Hell, the topic of freedom in every respect. Hills (p.223) states: "As patriotic Americans... it is clearly our duty to do everything we can to rouse our fellow citizens and rally them to the defense of our common country. But as true believers it is much more our duty to summon our fellow Christians to the defense of the Word of God, in which alone the principles of true liberty can be found."

RECOMMENDED READING

1. Wilbur Norman Pickering: The Identity of the New Testament Text IV;
walkinhiscommandments.com

2. Michael Marlowe: Against the Theory of 'Dynamic Equivalence';
bible-researcher.com

3. Carl Wieland: Stones and Bones;
creation.com

"This little book overthrew 40 years of evolutionary indoctrination for me."
(Miles Cooper, PhD, MSc (immunology, molecular biology))