

S A G R U S T E N ' S
B R I K K E R ;
I I

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit
April 2017

SAGRUSTENS BRIKKER; II

En slags anmeldelse av Hans Johan Sagrusten: Det store puslespelet II - Mysteriet i mumiemaska; Verbum 2016.

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; april 2017

"Igjen demonstrerer Sagrusten sin fortellerevne og ikke minst fortellerglede... Sagrusten har igjen levert en bok som fortjener å bli lest av mange", skriver Håkon Sunde Pedersen; og anmeldelsen er som kan forventes i Utsyn (17.03.17).

Sagrustens bok bør knapt leses av den som ikke vet bedre enn Sagrusten. Men fortellergleden er upåklagelig. Med henblikk på det 'saklige' innhold vil jeg anslå to tredeler av boken overflødig.

Her er gjentakelser som kan få en til å undres hva som skal passere en forlagsredaksjon: "Og kor sannsynleger det egentleg at eit manuskript ..." "Kva må til for at ..." "Kor stor er sjansen for ... Kva må til for at eit manuskript frå denne tida skal overleva til vår tid?" (s.126-7)

Kapitlene har gjerne lengre avsnitt hvor Sagrusten førestiller seg passasjen av historiske hendelser. I et kapitel om Markion (s.146) blir det til over fem sider. "Kanskje er det slik det går til då Markion blir kasta ut av kyrkja i Roma sommaren 144 e.Kr. Eller kanskje er det ikkje akkurat slik; det er ikkje godt å seia... Men det vi veit, er at han får samla leiaraane i den store kyrkja i Roma til eit møte... Under dette møtet legg han fram synet sitt..." (s.152)

DET ELDESTE N.T.-MANUSKRIFT/FRAGMENT?

På første blad (s.11) av bokens del I forteller Sagrusten at "det eldste funnet vi har av Det nye testamentet" er Papyrus 52, et Johannes-ev.fragment på 6x9 cm. offentliggjort i 1935 og datert til ca. år 125. "Ingen tekstfunn frå før år 100 e.Kr. er nokon gong offentleggjort" og "Hittil har ingen tekstforskarar våga å datere eit einaste nyttestamentleg manuskript til tida før år 100." (s.215.191)

Teologismen har sine forestillinger om NTs teksthistorie, herunder Markus som eldste evangelium. Sagrusten kan ha rett i at "Forskarane har lenge ønskt seg fleire tidlege funn at dette evangeliet, som skal vera det første som blir skrive", og i flg. prof. Craig Evans (2014), som Sagrusten siterer, "oppdaga vi eit fragment av Markusevangeliet som kan daterast til 80-talet e.Kr. For første gong har vi eit fragment av Markus frå det første hundreåret." (s.189.188) Men enn så lenge ikke publisert.

I 1972 identifiserte Jose O'Callaghan S.J. et fragment av Mark.6,52-53. 'Haken' ved dette, sett fra noens synspunkt: fragmentet var fra 7Q, Qumran hule 7. Datering nødvendigvis en del tid før år 68.

"O'Callaghan went on to compound his offence by identifying other fragments from cave 7 as parts of the New testament, especially fragment 7Q4 which contains 1 Timothy 3:16-4:3. Scholarly apoplexies followed in abundance, for with the identification of just these two fragments the world of liberal theology began an inexorable slide towards extinction. Predictably, the inevitable storm soon burst upon Callaghan's head, and eventually three of the critic's biggest heavyweights were lined up against him, namely Benoit, Baillet, and the affronted Aland.

In all, O'Callaghan had identified nine fragments from cave 7 as being

portions of Mark, 1 Timothy, James, Acts, Romans and 2 Peter. I'm surprised they didn't have him shot. But the storm very quickly died away. Its rumblings were beginning to reach the public, after all, and that would never do, which is why a deafening silence - they called it a moratorium (it sounds more scholarly) - soon descended upon the scene. It should really be called damage limitation. The critics have since been licking their wounds and wondering what to do next. Meanwhile, no mention is to be made of the New Testament fragments of Qumran." (Bill Cooper(1))

I 2001 publiserte Emanuel Tov "a 'complete' list of all the Biblical texts discovered in the Qumran caves. It is indeed a prodigious and comprehensive list, except that when it comes to Cave 7 he omits all reference to the New Testament fragments which were discovered there. ... In note 23 of his paper, he calmly dismisses fragments 7Q3-7Q18 as possibly being from Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible - the Old Testament in other words. Strange then that none of them can be identified as to which portion of the Greek Old Testament they belong to. When O'Callaghan identified none of them, they belonged to the New Testament, not the Old." (Cooper 2013 p.26)

"It is a great shame, and to the lasting hurt of New Testament scholarship, that our more conservative scholars have deliberately steered clear of the Qumran fragments. One wonders why. Fear of ridicule has undoubtedly played its part in this, as well as the inexorable slide of once-believing Christian colleges and their staffs away from their founders' Biblical constitutions and articles of faith. Everything must be modern, tradition must be discarded. The New Testament must be understood only in its 'post-modern' context in line with all the baseless notions of 'higher criticism'. The world has gone mad.

The New Testament fragments from Qumran Cave 7 were first identified in 1972, and our conservative scholars have thus had more than forty years in which to make good use of them. But silence - nothing but silence - is all that has been heard from them. Save for the lone voices of O'Callaghan and Thiede, virtually nothing has been heard from the conservative camp in all these years. That is shameful, utterly shameful. In that time, thousands - if not millions - who have been turned away from the Word of God by the lies of the critics, might have been saved if only the conservatives had done what they have always been required to do and contend earnestly for that Word. Better evidence than the Qumran fragments could hardly be asked for, but a more negative response could hardly have been given or imagined." (Cooper 2014 (2))

HVEM SKREV CODEX SINAITICUS?

Jeg vet ikke.

"Den 3. september 1862 står eit langt brev på trykk i det britiske magasinet The Guardian." (S. s.15) "I det lange brevet kan Konstantin Simonides avsløre at det er han som har ført Codex Sinaiticus i pennen... i 1840". Han kan "ikkje la vera å undre seg over at ein så velrenomert manuskriptforskar som Konstantin von Tischendorf har late seg lure". Sgrusten skriver bl.a. at "Mange har ... reagert på at manuskriptet ser så nytt ut. Det fine pergamentet er så lyst i farga at det er vanskeleg å tru at det skal vera over femten hundre år gammalt."

"Snart kjem fagfolk på bana for å forsvare manuskriptet. Den kjende manuskripteksperten Samuel P. Tregeilles skriv: "etter å ha undersøkt

manuskriptet i fleire dagar kan eg ikkje finne nokon grunn til at det skal vera frå nyare tid enn 300-talet."

"Korleis kan Simonides, som i 1840 er ein ung mann, bruke ein formue på så mykje førsteklases pergament? ... Og er det sannsynleg at han har brukt så store ressursar på prosjektet, når han sjølv seier at skrivninga var noko han gjorde for moro skuld?"

"Ein har analysert absolutt alt som tenkjast kan, frå kvaliteten på skinnet til samansettinga av blekket... alle sår og arr som skinnet fekk medan dyret enno levde, og korleis seinare generasjonar har lappa og reparert småskader i pergamentet." (s.15-22)

Men. Den offentlige historien begynner ikke med Simonides 3. sept. 13. august 1862 skriver nevnte Tregelles i The Guardian (med adr. Fenton John Anthony Hort) at "I believe I need hardly say that the story of Simonides that he wrote the MS is as false and absurd as possible."

Bill Cooper(3) skriver at "Simonides' claim had remained unknown outside a small circle of scholars. Tregelles' remark now brought it out into the public arena. Tischendorf was thunderstruck.

Simonides, writing to the newspaper in answer, said this: "As what Dr Tregelles calls my 'story' has never been published, and as that gentleman can only have heard it through an indirect medium, it may interest both Dr Tregelles and your readers to have the 'story' direct from myself."

He then proceeds to give a fulsome account of where, how and why he came to write out C. Sinaiticus. He then tells how he saw his manuscript - which he lovingly refers to as Codex Simonides - at Mount Sinai in 1852, and was surprised at its altered appearance. The dedication to Nicholas I had been removed, and the whole codex had been made artificially to look much older than it was. On the circumstances of its writing, and its journey from Mount Athos to Sinai, he lists many still-living witnesses; and he then gives the following account of the corrections and markings which adorn the text:"

I flg. Simonides er manuskriptet utarbeidet ved Mount Athos-klosteret som en gave til tsar Nikolai I; i en ubrukt, flere hundre år gammel kodeks. Når han siden (1844 og 1852) sier å se den igjen ved Mt. Sinai, "the MS was defective in part."

Sagrusten forteller at man i 1975, i et jordskjelvskadet, avstengt rom i Mount Sinai-klosteret, bl.a. finner tolv ark fra Cod.Sin. Rommet inneholder intet nyere enn 1700-talls, og Sagrusten slutter at rommet må være "fylt att ein eller annan gong før år 1800" (s.29) med implikasjon for Simonides' versjon. Tja.

Cooper igjen: "In its April 1863 edition, The Christian Remembrancer editorial asks a question which Elliott considers a "telling and amusing point" against Simonides. The question is this: "Are the worm-eaten holes through the letters, or do the letters avoid the holes?" ... if the letters were recently written upon an already ancient velum which had naturally suffered wormholing over previous centuries, then the scribe would tend to space his letters around the damaged areas."

"... the most clear and blatant avoidance of a wormhole that I have met with so far is to be found in quire 42: folio 6v: column 2: line 10, where in the word 'pegon' the pi is separated from the rest of the word by a very large space, only for the rest of the word to appear on the other side of the wormhole". "Now it is important to state

clearly that these three examples were discovered during a very brief online examination of random pages of Codex Sinaiticus... Simonides' claim to have written out the text of Codex Sinaiticus in the mid-19th century on already very ancient vellum suddenly looks to be viable and true." 4

Cooper avslutter noen avsnitt senere: "A number of questions are raised by this evidence. Firstly, why did Constantius send Simonides' work to Sinai when it was supposed to be bound for the Tsar of Russia? For what purpose did he send it to Sinai? Who altered and aged it at Sinai? Why was Dionysius, Sinai's calligrapher, so reluctant to take charge of the work when asked to do so? Why did the librarian at Sinai and his assistant feign ignorance of how it had arrived at the monastery? Tischendorf claimed that in 1859 he was sent to Sinai to search for such a manuscript by Tsar Nicholas I. How did it become known, and through whom, that such a manuscript was now available? Codex Vaticanus was published in 1857 by the Vatican, just two years before Tischendorf's fortuitous 'discovery' of Sinaiticus. The timing is remarkable, to say the least. Much was to be published in that fateful year of 1859 which was to cast doubt upon the Bible, and with hindsight the entire scenario bears all the hallmarks of careful preparation, planning and timing. To bring it all about would require the genius and power of an international organisation of immense wealth and reach which had been dedicated for centuries to overthrowing the Bible and to casting grave doubts in the public mind as to its authenticity and accuracy. That organisation did its work thoroughly, for we are still picking up the pieces today. But it is not without its cure. In the words of Charles Foster:

"Now, as the rejection of the Textus Receptus is the sole cause of the evil, so the restoration of the textus Receptus is its only remedy.""

Fra Cooper 2014 til Cooper 2013 (pp.48-9): "Tischendorf was a Lutheran in the days when denominations actually meant something, and Lutherans in the Vatican's eyes were the very worst of heretics. They were, after all, the spawn of that perfidious Martin Luther whose 95 Theses had almost brought down the Papacy back in 1517. So, what on earth was the Pope thinking of when he invited this perfidious Lutheran to a private audience? And what on earth was Tischendorf thinking of when he accepted the invitation? Tischendorf, surprisingly, is uncharacteristically reticent about it:

"I here pass over in silence the interesting details of my travels - my audience with the pope, Gregory XVI., in May, 1843 - my intercourse with Cardinal Mezzofanti, that surprising and celebrated linguist - and I come to the result of my journey to the East."

Private audiences with any pope are only ever granted when their desired outcome is directly advantageous to the Papacy or the Vatican. They are never granted to those who can be of no material or political benefit. Try asking for one and see. Clearly, Gregory XVI had been given reason to hope that this Tischendorf, Lutheran though he be, could be of great use to the Papal cause, and this had been brought about by the oft-publicised desires of Tischendorf to 'improve' the text of the New Testament by finding one other than the Textus Receptus. What exactly was spoken between them must remain a Vatican secret, though the immediate upshot was that Tischendorf was allowed - against all precedent and the feigned histrionic objections of one of the Cardinals present - to examine Codex Vaticanus. Again, given the Vatican's feelings towards the Reformation and its Textus Receptus Bible, along with their consistent effort over so many centuries to

either destroy, corrupt or somehow undermine the Bible, we are left merely to wonder what this very strange episode was all about, and what the Papacy hoped to gain by it. For be assured, that private audience was not granted for Tischendorf's benefit, nor for the Bible's, but for the Pope's."

Se ellers D.J.H.: Epoch-making Books.

F35

Sagrusten elsker å fortelle oss at "Mange elsker å peike på at Codex Sinaiticus og Codex Vaticanus er innbyrdes forskjellige mange stader. Dette er sant. Men det same gjeld for alle manuskript av Det nye testamentet. Same kva for manuskript ein legg ved sida av kvarandre, finst det hundrevis, ofte tusenvis av små forskjellar mellom dei." (s.36-7)

Hertil skal kort innvendes at Sagrustens "typical 'Alexandrian' MS will have over a dozen variants per page of printed Greek text. A typical 'Byzantine' MS will have 3-5 variants per page. MSS 1761 and 1876 have about one per page, and one of the better f35 MSS will go for pages without a variant. There is an obvious difference in the mentality that the monks brought to their task. A monk copying an 'Alexandrian' MS evidently did not consider that he was handling Scripture, in stark contrast to one copying an f35 MS."

"Family 35 is an objectively/empirically defined entity throughout the NT; it has a demonstrable, diagnostic profile from Matthew 1:1 to Revelation 22:21."

"Family 35 representatives come from all over the Mediterranean area; the geographical distribution is all but total." (Wilbur N. Pickering (4))

Se ellers D.J.H.: Sagrustens brikker.

'PRICOPE DE ADULTERA'; IGJEN ...

"Ho står verken i Codex Sinaiticus eller Codex Vaticanus. Ho finst heller ikkje i eit einaste manuskript som er eldre enn desse to. Slik ser vi at dei gamle manuskripta fra 100- og 200-talet berre stadfester det biletet vi kjenner frå dei to gamle skinnbiblane: Teksta om kvinna som blir gripen i ekteskapsbrøt, er ikkje å finne i den greske bibelteksta før ca. år 400 e.Kr." (s.38) Joh.7-8.

Vidnesbyrdene om avsnittets forekomst i eldre greske Johannes-manuskript, f.eks. fra Hieronimus, lar Sagrusten vente.

Men "Mellom kapittel sju og åtte er det eit avbrot i handlinga der teksta passar perfekt inn". (s.66)

Har Sagrustenforestilt seg hvordan overgangen kap. 7-8 ville fremtre uten denne "teksta" som "passar perfekt inn"?

"That I shall be able to satisfy those persons who profess themselves unconvinced by what was offered concerning St. Mark's last twelve verses, I am not so simple as to expect. But I trust that I shall have with me all candid readers who are capable of weighing evidence impartially and understanding the nature of logical proof when it is fully drawn out before them, which indeed is the very qualification I require of them." John William Burgon(5)

"Note, that in the oracular Codexes B and Aleph ((Vaticanus og Sinaiticus)) immediate transition is made from the words "out of Galilee ariseth no prophet," in chapter 7:52, to the words "Again therefore Jesus spake unto them, saying," in chapter 8:12. And we are invited by all the adverse critics alike to believe that so the place stood in the inspired autograph of the Evangelist."

Vi hopper ca. 7 sider: "Now I begin by establishing as my first proposition that, these twelveverses occupied precisely the same position which they now occupy from the earliest period to which evidence concerning the Gospels reaches.

And this, because it is a mere matter of fact, is sufficiently established by reference to the ancient Latin version of St. John's Gospel. We are thus carried back to the second century of our era, beyond which testimony does not reach. The Pericope is observed to stand in situ in Codices b c e ff g h j. Jerome (A.D. 385), after a careful survey of older Greek copies, did not hesitate to retain it in the Vulgate. It is freely referred to and commented on by himself in Palestine; whereas Ambrose at Milan (374) quotes it at least nine times, as well as Augustine in North Africa (396) about twice as often. It is quoted besides by Pacian in the north of Spain (370), by Faustus the African (400), by Rufinus at Aquileia (400), by Chrysologus at Ravenna (433), and by Sedulius, a Scot (434)."

"To this it is idle to object that the cited authors all wrote in Latin. For the purpose in hand their evidence is every bit as conclusive as if they had been written in Greek - from which language no one doubts that they derived their knowledge, through a translation."

Burgen lister siden henved ti oversettelser. "Add that it is found in Codex D, and it will be seen that in all parts of ancient Christendom this portion of Scripture was familiarly known.

But even this is not all. Jerome, who was familiar with Greek MSS (and who handled none of later date than B and Aleph), expressly related that the Pericope de Adultera "is found in many copies both Greek and Latin."

Whence is it - let me ask in passing - that so many critics fail to see that positive testimony like the foregoing far outweighs the adverse negative testimony of Aleph B T, yes, and of A C to boot, if they were producible on this point?. How comes it to pass that the two codices, Aleph and B, have obtained such a mastery - rather exercise such a tyranny - over the imagination of many critics as quite to overpower their practical judgment?"

Sagrusten igjen: "I dag er det ikkje bevart eit einaste gresk manuskript som inneheld forteljinga, før vi kjem til 400-talet e.Kr. Av dei nesten to tusen greske manuskripta som inneheld kapittel sju og åtte i Evangeliet etter Johannes, er det 267 som ikkje tek med forteljinga som kvinna som er gripen i ekteskapsbrot. Men blant desse finn vi alle dei tidlegaste manuskripta. Frå vår synsvinkel ser det difor ikkje ut som om teksta dukkar opp før på 400-talet. Men gjennom ei rekkje med gamle kyrkjefedrar, frå Hieronimus og Didymus, heilt attende til Papias frå Hierapolis, ser vi fleire spor og avtrykk etter denne brikka som no er borte. Ho er der svært tidleg i historia. Og ho høyrer definitivt heime i dette biletet - ho er ikkje lagd i feil øskje." (s.76)

Lagt i eske?

O.S.V.

Vi blar vidare, passerer Sagrustens "Vestbreidda" (s.143.145.146), hjemstedet til Justin Martyr; konstaterer at Sagrusten holder for at i Roma, det "er her stolen etter apostelen Peter står" (s.147), og lesar (s.169) at "Berre i det første kapittelet av Markusevangeliet startar trettifem av dei førtifem versa med ordet "og"." Det siste stemmer vel heller.

"It should be added that the Society expects its translators and re-

visers 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 be 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." The Society" er forstås ikke Sagrustens (Norw.) Bible Society, men the Trinitarian Bible Society(6).

"... når omsetjinga hoppar over ei heil rad med greske småord: I dei greske setningane myldrar det av innskotne "og" og "men". Dette er ord som ikkje tyder all verda; i ei norsk omsetjing omset vi dei heller ikkje alltid. I den koptiske teksta i Codex Schøyen hoppar omsetjaren over dei så regelmessig at Leonard etter kvart veit på førehand kva han kjem til å gjera"; "dette er ikkje ei omsetjing av ei anna tekst; dette er idiomatisk bibelomsetjing på sitt beste." (s.183) Vi er naturligvis i den aleksandrinske sfære igjen. "... då han prøver å rekonstruere korleis den greske teksta bak den frie omsetjinga kan ha sett ut, finn han at Codex Schøyen har to nære slektningar ... Det er to manuskript som liknar så mykje på teksta bak Codex Schøyen at dei må ha eit felles og nært opphav." "Dei to store pergamentmanuskripta som på 1800-talet blir oppdaga ved Sinai-fjellet og i Vatikanbiblioteket, har altså eit syskenbarn i Noreg. Eller rettare sagt: eit eldgammalt syskenbarn frå Egypt som for tida bur i Noreg." Codex Vaticanus er forøvrig kjent fra 1475.

Vi kan bla til s.202: "Så kjem vi til ei heilt spesiell gruppe: dei som Jesus skal ha reist opp fra døden. Det er ikkje mange av dei; evangelia fortel berre om ein liten handfull." Les omigjen ved behov. S.207: "Boka Didakjé eller Læra til dei tolv apostlane er så gammal at ho godt kunne ha stått i vårt nytestamente."

ET MYSTERIUM

Mot slutten av boken kommer vi altså til "Mysteriet i mumiemaska" (bokens undertittel), et efter sigende Markus-fragment fra 80-tallet som avventer publisering (mulig fremdeles?); "Med manuskriptet frå mumiemaska vil vi endeleg ha eit sikkert bevis for at det tidlegaste av dei fire evangelia er skrive før år 80 e.Kr., slik teologar heilt sidan oldkyrkja alltid har meint. Det vil plassere Markusevangeliet så langt attende som på 60- eller 70-talet e.Kr." (s.216) Da gjenstår vel bl.a. om dette anses være å ønske.

Tilbake til Bill Cooper (2013 s.121-2), Jose O'Callaghan (1972) og 7Q5 (pre 0068): "As for 7Q5, the Spanish mathematician, Albert Dou, has calculated that the chances of the fragment not being that of Mark 6:52-53 is less than 1 in 900,000,000,000."

"Here might be a good place to consider the colossal irony of the fact that it was Jose O'Callaghan of all people who identified 7Q5 as a portion of Mark's Gospel (6:52-53). You see, O'Callaghan was a Spanish Jesuit, and for nigh 500 years past the Jesuit agenda has been constantly to denigrate the Gospels and to show them as late, and hence unreliable, compositions - to fatally undermine the Protestant Bible in other words. They're still at it today! But O'Callaghan had well and truly shot that agenda in the foot, and in doing so found himself isolated in the world of scholarship. Had he fared better in his announcement, he would very likely have paid a higher price. But even so, he would not be budged. He knew 7Q5 for what it truly is, and

it is a monumental tribute to the man - to his integrity and his courage, as well as his expertise - that he was willing to stand by his findings, however much it isolated him from the world of academe which he loved so much, and however much it placed him in danger of his Jesuit superior's displeasure.

It also speaks volumes for the certainty of his identification of the 7Q fragments. Had there been the slightest doubt in his mind - had there been any possibility of him being wrong - he would not have risked all as he did. And because he came from the Jesuit camp - a nest of hostile witnesses if ever there was one - his testimony concerning these fragments is all the more credible. We can therefore rely upon it that the Gospel of Mark, Paul's first letter to Timothy, the letter of James, the Book of Acts, and the second letter of Peter, were all of them written, copied, and distributed throughout the Roman Empire well before AD 68, and that is most satisfying to know."

REFERANSER OG NOTE

1. Cooper,B.; The Authenticity of the New Testament - Part 1: The Gospels; Creation Science Movement 2013; p.21.
2. Cooper,B.; The Authenticity of the New Testament - Part Two: Acts, The Epistles & Revelation; Kindle-ed. 2014; ch.4.
3. Ref.2; Appendix Two: The 19th-Century Origin of Codex Sinaiticus. Cooper forholder seg til "J K Elliot's 1982 monograph, entitled Codex Sinaiticus and the Simonides Affair"; Sagrusten synes (s.16) informert fra foredraget "Tischendorf and the Discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus"; D.B. Wallace 2015.
4. Pickering,W.N.; The Identity of the New Testament Text IV; 2014; pp.196.199.
5. Burgon,J.W.; The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels; arranged, completed and edited by Edw. Miller; George Bell and Sons 1896; utdrag ved Fuller,D.O.; Counterfeit or Genuine? - Mark 16? John 8?; Grand Rapids Int. Publ. 1978; pp.134.137. 145-6.
6. T.B.S.' Quarterly Record; issue 618, Jan.-March 2017; p.21.