

Å FAKE SKRIFTEN

"Hverdagsbibelen"; Bibelforlaget 2018.
"For Guds ord er levende..." (Heb.4,12)

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; september 2018

"For mine tanker er ikke eders tanker, ... som himmelen er høiere enn jorden, således er ... mine tanker høiere enn eders tanker." (Es.55,8-9)

The Trinitarian Bible Society skriver i en artikkel om "The Living Bible":
"In an interview with Mr. J. L. Fear published in "Evangelism Today" in December 1972 the translator, Mr. K.N. Taylor, introduces his work as "a paraphrase - a thought for thought translation", in which "we take the original thought and convert it into the language of today". In this way, he said, "we can be much more accurate than the verbal translation ... Once you get the real meaning of the Scriptures, they are life-transforming ... I felt such a thrill at my own privilege of stripping away some of the verbiage ... being a co-worker with God in that respect ... I flipped open my Bible and began to experiment with this new method of translation."

Bibelforlaget har nettopp lansert sitt bidrag til 'hverdagsbibel'-genren; Hverdagsbibelen; en oversettelsesbasert parafrase med "en forenklet og levendegjort <sic> bibeltekst", i følge forlaget. "En NY norsk bibelutgave med et forenklet og levendegjort språk som vil skape bibelglede! En parafrase i beste "The Living Bible" eller "The Message"-tradisjon."

"Å få dette til, er en drøm jeg har hatt i 45 år, siden jeg som nyfrelst første gang <i 1973> leste i en engelsk Living Bible, og nå går det endelig i oppfyllelse", forteller forlagssjef Svein Andersen. (Norge i Dag 14.09.18)

"Målgruppen ... vil oppleve at skriften blir fornyet", det er med "utgangspunkt i "Bibelen - Guds Ord"-oversettelsen,.. gjort en språkmessig forenkling, en parafrase - men uten å gå på bekostning av grunntekstens grunnprinsipper", sier Sten Sørensen som med Elsbeth K. Sørensen er redaktør for prosjektet.
"-... Vi har alltid hatt dyp respekt og ærbødighet for Bibelen. Dette har ikke minnet med årene, heller tvert om. Vi trodde jo ikke for noen år siden at vi skulle bli bibeloversettere og være hovedredaktører for en ny bibeltekst. Men slik er det nå blitt, og det fyller oss med takknemlighet".

Virkemidlene som er brukt er blant annet å forandre ordstillingene og lage kortere setninger og bytte ut "gammelmodige" ord. Redaktørene har også prøvd å gjøre språket litt mindre "religiøst". Vers er også slått sammen, noe som ga en større frihet til å kombinere innholdet i nye setninger, og det ble lettere å ta bort gjentakelser", skriver avisen (jf. Åp.22,18-19).
Med andre ord: ikke Bibelen. Men den kalles så. Og intet skal gå "på bekostning av grunntekstens grunnprinsipper"?

'GRUNNTEKSTENS GRUNNPRINSIPPER'

"I am asked, What is your view of the Holy Letters? I answer, What thought my Master of them? How did he appeal to them? What use did he make of them. What were their smallest details in his eyes?" (Louis Gaussen; God-Breathed - The Divine Inspiration of the Bible; The Trinity Found.; pp.94-5)
Gaussen (p.250): "We have said, that the question relates to the book, and not to the writers. You believe that God gave them the thoughts always, and not always the words; but the Scripture tells us, on the contrary, that God has given them always the words, and not always the thoughts."

Bibeloversettelse er ikke en oppgave for rasjonalister, men "The version of an accomplished Rationalist who desires to be no more than a translator, I could better trust than that of an orthodox person and a saint who should paraphrase the text and undertake to present it to me more complete or more clear in his

French than he found it in the Greek or in the Hebrew of the original. And let no one be surprised at this assertion; it is justified by facts. Thus, is not De Wette's translation, among the Germans, preferred at the present day to that even of the great Luther? At least, is there not greater confidence felt in having the mind of the Holy Spirit in the lines of the Basel professor than in those of the great Reformer; because the former has always kept very close to the expressions of his text, as a man of learning subject to the rules of philology alone; while the latter seems at times to have momentarily endeavored after something more, and sought to make himself interpreter as well as translator?" (Pp.147-8)

Og enda er det meget, meget langt fra dr. Martin til Sørensen & Sørensen.

Over til Editorial Consultant of the Trinitarian Bible Society, Dr. J. Cammen-ga; (The Lord has preserved His Word: The doctrine of Holy Scripture, its providential preservation and its faithful translation; pp.4-5): "Consider this: if a person wanted to know exactly what someone else had said, particularly something that was important, what would be preferable: a truthful or an untruthful account, an accurate or an inaccurate version of the statement, a literal rendering or a summary of the thoughts conveyed? Suppose your life depended on the information: would you not want the message to be clear, complete, and true in its wording? The Bible claims that its message is a matter of life or death. It might just actually be important, then, that the version of the Bible a person reads is truthful and accurate!"

"Vital as the message of Scripture is, there is something else that is at least as important. This, often overlooked because it is so elementary, is that the message of a text is inalienably linked to the words in which it is expressed. This is all the more important in the case of Scripture, because its very words are, uniquely, the words of God expressing His message. For 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God...' (2 Timothy 3.16), because in the uttering and recording of it, '...prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost' (2 Peter 1.21)."

William Tyndale (d. 1536) er rapportert å ha fortalt en romerprest at "if God spare my life, ere many years, I will cause a boy that driveth the plough shall know more of the Scripture than thou dost".

Tyndales bibeloversettelsesarbeid er, enkelt sagt, stående til denne dag, og kan antas ha nådd lenger enn noe annet.

Sørensen & Sørensen har byttet ut "gammelmodige" ord m.v.

Dr. Johathan D. Moore skriver (The Authorized Version: The Influence of William Tyndale's Translations; se tbsbibles.org): "In his preface to his 1526 Testament, Tyndale recognises that his translation contains 'wordes which are nott commenly used' (and this was a gross understatement for the ones he had just coined!) and acknowledges that 'scripture useth many wordes which are other wyse understoode of the commen people'. It is to be noted that Tyndale's response to this was to append tables to his translation of these 'wordes which are nott commenly used' rather than dilute the translation itself or depart from the strict meaning of the original. The ploughboy was set up for an education: a book that would not leave him where he was, but would elevate him not just spiritually but intellectually.

<Gerald C.> Hammond speaks of 'the English biblical tradition of resonant obscurity': what he means by that is that Tyndale (and the AV translators) 'accepted that fidelity in translation would inevitably mean local ambiguity and obscurity - and, further, that such places should not be disguised, but made attractive and resonant'. Tyndale even took this approach in those places where he did not provide any marginal notes. This stands in marked contrast with most modern day English Bible translators for whom any hint of complex-

ity is an embarrassment and must be ironed out immediately as if God did not have His or our best interests in mind when in His special providence the Hebrew and Greek defy any conclusive analysis. What is clear is that such a situation was no embarrassment to Tyndale, and he and the AV translators are done an injustice when obscurities in their translation are automatically dismissed as failure. Tyndale wanted for the English ploughboy a faithful translation, not a deceptively simple paraphrase based on guesswork. If the ploughboy encountered the words of the Holy Spirit, that same Holy Spirit would continue His great work of illumination. That the ploughboy was not given the illusion of instant comprehension of every verse of Scripture was not a problem for Tyndale, nor for the ploughboy. At the very least it taught the ploughboy to pursue humility even as his knowledge increased." (Pp.7-8)

"The AV <Authorized (King James) Version> was intentionally 'archaic' from the year <1611 when> it was first published. There never was a time when the AV did not sound 'dated' and from another world. But this was primarily because it was following the lead that Tyndale had set as the Father of Biblical English. As we have seen, in Tyndale and the AV the source language is allowed to dominate the receptor language. That is to say, the Hebrew and Greek are allowed to shape and mould and even invigorate the final English form. In doing this they were being consistent with the nature of the sacred texts themselves. After all, Biblical Hebrew was never colloquial even when first written, but already included archaic idioms, obscure allusions and poetic diction designed to provoke prolonged meditation rather than instant comprehension. Similarly, the New Testament was not written in street language and differs significantly from 'secular' Greek, with its Hebraic forms and structures ..." (Pp.11-2)

Pp.13-4: "I would like to close now by offering some lines of thought upon our own approach to Scripture in the light of what the marketing departments of many Bible publishing houses would have us believe today. We have seen repeatedly that in Tyndale and in the AV the original language of Holy Scripture is authoritative over against the receptor language - English - and must be allowed to determine the final English form. The English language and English culture were expected to make room for the source language, to have the courtesy to allow the visitor in the room to enrich the encounter by bringing with him some treasures and insights from distant times and lands, not forcing him to leave anything distinctive in the locker in the corridor. Yet in so many modern English translations this relationship has been reversed, and it is contemporary English that dictates what the Bible now may or may not say to us. If the Holy Spirit inspired a sense that doesn't fit in with modern English today, then He is no longer allowed to say it. If He used an idiom which we don't like, then He is barred from using it again in our superior company. If His language is too shocking, then He must be taught proper manners at the hands of today's new communication gurus. So whereas Tyndale coined a new word, enriched the English language and demanded of his readers to make the mental effort required to enter into the layers of meaning in the inspired Scriptures, the modern translations tend to eradicate nuances in favour of instant ease of comprehension. It should not be too hard to see how this can go hand-in-hand with an insufficient reverence for Scripture as the very words of God."
Så langt Moore.

A.C. Thomson, Editorial Consultant of the Trinitarian Bible Society (Bible Translation Philosophy, Part 2; Quarterly Record 621, Oct.-Dec. 2017; pp. 31.30.23): "The word-for-word, Bible-interpreting-Bible philosophy of these <Early Modern> translators fed through into the confessions of faith of Early Modern Protestant Europe. The Continental Reformed equivalent of the Westminster Catechism, the 1563 Heidelberg Catechism, is peppered with Bible proof texts in every answer just like its British counterpart. The twentieth-century confessions of faith by denominations in the English-speaking world

and continental Europe, by contrast, read like committee-forged compromises, with deliberately vague language to encompass both creationism and evolutionism and various views of the nature of man and of sin, in a single worshipping body."

W"here such is possible, who today will accept Bible translators secluding themselves to concentrate, let alone urge it? This understanding has been lost due to the rise of the idea that one has to be surrounded by the babble of the street to have the right 'ear' for the target language; again, this betrays a very low and mechanistic view of the capability and calling of the translator. The Early Modern Bible translators shunned that approach - even though (for instance) Luther frequently urged the use of natural idiom - and instead concentrated on the words of the original Scripture itself, with the result that their translations are highly similar in outcome."

"The current spate of translations appears to be marked by an acknowledgement that 'dynamic-equivalent' (roughly, phrase-for-phrase or idea-for idea) translation - beloved of the twentieth century - was a mistaken enterprise. But even here the translators lack the conviction to return to the old paths, instead embarking on a new, supposedly middle way, one with a surprising amount of ready-made definition for the translator's self-perceived role."

Avslutningsvis; en påminnelse ved Louis Gaussen (op.cit.pp.96-7):

"Alas! in a few short years both the doctors and the disciples will be laid in the tomb, they shall wither like the grass; but not one jot or tittle of that divine book will then have passed away; and as certainly as the Bible is the truth, and that it has changed the face of the world, as certainly shall we see the Son come in the clouds of Heaven, and judge, by his eternal Word, the secret thoughts of all men! "All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withers, and the flower thereof falls away: but the Word of the Lord endures forever. And this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you;" this is the Word which will judge us."