

Introduction

In order for the Church to have more efficient missions, the specifics of neo-Protestantism must be well known, from the biblical/doctrinal perspective. This is the motive for putting together this thesis, which has an interdisciplinary character; it is a comparative doctrinal investigation between the Romanian Jubilee Bible and Cornilescu's neo-protestant texts of both the Old and New Testaments.

The thesis has four chapters: 1) a doctrinal parallel between the Church's and the neo-protestants' conception of the Holy Scriptures (revelation compared to the anaginoscomena books, their value and importance); 2) a historical perspective concerning the mode in which the Church dealt with the Septuagint text in the first five centuries – the reference text used for translating the Holy Scriptures into the national languages; 3) the rapport between the Septuagint in the Romanian religious-linguistic milieu; an exposition of the history of the Romanian editions of the Holy Scriptures from the 19th to 21st century with a detailed presentation of the private initiatives for translating the bible including Cornilescu's version; a presentation of Neofit Vamvas' Greek, neo-protestant translation of the Bible; 4) a parallel comparative-doctrinal presentation of the biblical texts used by the Church and that used by neo-Protestantism; a proposal for correcting several biblical and liturgical texts.

In this thesis I have attempted to attain the following objectives: 1) treating a new theme, or at least making a personal contributing to issues that have already been addressed; 2) that information be concise and clear even for the uninitiated 3) using modern means of information (a bibliography downloaded from the internet and the software program Bible Works 5).

The novel aspects of this thesis are the following: 1) the doctrinal parallels between the Church's and the neo-protestant perspective of the Holy Scriptures; 2) a critical perspective over the radioactive Carbon 14 dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls; 3) reference to the way in which the relationship between the Septuagint and the Hebraic text of the Old Testament has been viewed throughout the history of the Church in the first five centuries; 4) a re-evaluation of the particular Romanian versions of the bible printed in the second half of the 19th century; 5) a current critical edition of Dumitru Cornilescu; 6) translation of the Holy Scriptures in modern Greek from the 19th century at the request and under the influence of neo-protestant missionaries; Neofit Vamvas' version; 7) a comparative exposition of the dogmatic parallels between the biblical texts used by the Church and the newer neo-protestant editions; proposals for correcting liturgical texts.

Chapter 1:

A doctrinal parallel between the Orthodox Church's conception of the Holy Scriptures and that of the Romanian neo-Protestant cults'.

Revelation and Inspiration

From the Orthodox point of view, Revelation has the following characteristics: 1) it is God's initiative of His Self-disclosure to the world; 2) it was realized gradually and progressively, qualitatively and quantitatively, through deeds, words and images; 3) it has only been preserved in the Church, which is the primordial and appropriate interpreter of Revelation. Revelation in writing is the Holy Scripture – a theandric work, completely inspired. God inspired the holy writers without annulling their liberty when He sent the Divine message in writing or verbally to people.

Divine Revelation and inspiration are divine actions that are at the basis for transmission of the Truth and composition of the Holy Scriptures. God's written revelation, that is the Holy Scriptures, is a theandric work, wholly inspired writings.

From the neo-Protestant perspective, Revelation has two specific characteristics: 1) subjectivity. Revelation is discovered through personal experience or through the understanding of someone else's experience; 2) instability. Due to a lack of any objective criterion, Revelation depends on the concepts of the one who interprets it. Neo-Protestant conceptions regarding Revelation place human thought above that which God has revealed.

The inspiration of the Holy Scriptures is an axiom. For some neo-protestants, inspiration is linked to the authors, for others, to the writings themselves, and for a third category, it is linked to the readers. Some connect it to the general message of the Bible, others to its ideas, and others to its words.

The Canon of the Holy Scriptures and their Authority.

From the Orthodox perspective, the Holy Scriptures contain 66 inspired, canonical books (39 in the Old Testament and 27 in the New) + 14 books and fragments of non-canonical books (anaginoscomena) [good to read/apocrypha] that have instructive and moral value superior to profane books.

The Holy Scriptures are Christocentric; it is normative for the members of the Church. Scripture has complex authority over the faithful and communities because it communicates supernatural truths to man. The Church has the legitimate right to interpret the Holy

Scriptures. In the Church, the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures is always done through comparative consultation with patristic works, which are for reference.

For the neo-Protestants, the canonical Bible has 66 inspired books, but the books that are good to read (anaginoscomena), called the apocrypha, lack any authority. Theoretically, the Bible has absolute authority; in practice, they put it in equal rank with that of their particular creed, or of their own practices or personal experience or own revelation in disregard of the Scriptures. The canon and authority of the Scriptures is relativized. Human nature becomes the source of religious truth. As a consequence, the Bible is seen as a product of human reason, containing man's thoughts concerning God, himself and the world. Scripture is absolutized, it can interpret itself and thus, no longer needs external support in order for the Word to be understood or penetrated.

Scripture, Tradition, Church and the relationship between them.

From the Orthodox perspective, Scripture and Tradition are operations of the Holy Spirit in the Church through which Revelation is transmitted. There is a triple unity and reciprocal dependency between Scripture and Tradition, in origin, function and content. Tradition has temporal primacy in comparison with Scripture, which it surpasses in extension. The Church and Tradition are equal and dependent on each other. Tradition formed and maintains the Church, and the Church is obligated to preserve the contents of the Holy Scriptures in their authentic meaning in conformity to Apostolic Tradition. Scripture, Tradition and the Church are three inseparable realities that form a whole whose parts are interconnected and complete each other reciprocally. The connection point and source of the three is Divine Revelation.

For neo-Protestants Scripture is above the Church. Tradition is limited and understood at the most as an interesting collection of works by the Fathers from which only information can be extracted. Tradition is no longer considered as a second path for receiving Revelation. Between the three aspects enumerated above, there is the following classification in order of importance: Scripture, Church, Tradition, yet the understanding of these three terms is different for the neo-Protestant groups compared to that of the Orthodox Church.

Though the Church and the neo-Protestant groups are in accordance that Jesus Christ is the key for interpreting the Scriptures, nevertheless, the doctrinal conclusions to which the two groups arrive at are different. Contrary to the neo-Protestant conception that Scripture does not need to be interpreted since it interprets itself (*Scriptura Scripturae interpres*), the Church teaches us that a certain spiritual disposition on the part of the receiver is necessary for the Scriptures to be understood.

Chapter II:

The historical perspective of how the Church viewed the Septuagint in the first five centuries – a reference text, used by the Orthodox Church for translating the Holy Scriptures into national languages.

The translation of the Torah into Greek, the common language, corresponds to dual concomitant necessities: of the Jewish communities and of the penetrating wisdom specific to Greek culture. Yet the most important reason cannot be forgotten, the will of God.

Today, very few people believe the authenticity of the Aristeas' Epistle.

In the Early Church, many Church Fathers and Writers believed the Septuagint to be inspired. Today opinions are divided.

Alfred Rahlfs' version of the Septuagint, compared to the Old Testament from the latest editions of the Holy Synod's Bible (the Jubilee edition of the Holy Synod's Bible or Holy Scripture EIBMBOR, a version according to the Septuagint edited and with footnotes by Bartolomeu Valeriu Anania the Archbishop of Cluj, supported by many other strivers, Bucharest, 2001), contains a few differences in structure and content. Compared to the Masoretic Text, the Jubilee edition of the Holy Scriptures has in addition: historical supplements for the canonical books of Ester (the Prologue; 3:13-14; 4:17; 5:1-2; 8:13-14; 10:3) and Daniel (the History of Susana, Bel and the Dragon), non-canonical books (Baruch, the epistles of Jeremiah, The Wisdom of Solomon, The Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach) and supplements of lyrical content (Azaria's Prayer and the Song of the Three Youth, Manasa's Prayer and Psalm 151). Regarding contents, the Septuagint and Masoretic texts are different.

At the beginning of the second century A.D., given to polemics with the Church, the Palestinian Rabbis commanded the following three tendentious Greek biblical translations in order to replace the Septuagint: 1) Aquila's – a revision of the Septuagint; presents lexicographical and etymological importance; 2) Theodotion's; in addition to the canonical Jewish and anaginoscomena books it also contains supplements in Daniel and Jeremiah, and the book of Job is larger than in the Septuagint; 3) Symmachus' – a new translation; the language is elegant and cursive. Symmachus strived to depict the meaning, and therefore used paraphrasing.

From the 3rd to 4th centuries, Christians created four versions of the Septuagint: 1) Origen's; 2) Eusebius of Caesarea's and Pamphil's; 3) Lucian's; 4) Hesychia's.

In antiquity, the Septuagint was translated into many national languages: Latin, Syrian, Coptic, Egyptian, Gothic, Arabian, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic.

The 16th century A.D. is important for the history of the Septuagint text because the manuscript tradition, which had few copies, was replaced by printed editions which assured access to the Septuagint text for many.

In the last decades, to support the dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Carbon 14 dating was used. Though the mathematical and physics equations used in radio-carbon dating are precise, due to its working hypothesis and the criteria for selecting results, the outcome of carbon dating are not relevant for determining the age of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Because the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament was not accessible except for a small group of Jewish scholars, the Septuagint was the normative text for the Church.

For some Christian apologetics, the fact that Jews falsified the sacred text of the Septuagint was evident (the Saints: Justin Martyr the Philosopher and Irenaeus of Lugdunum; Tertullian and Origen). In the patristic period there was also suspicion that, due to polemics with the Church, Jews modified the holy texts (Saint John Chrysostom, Ruffin).

Some Church Fathers researched the Hebrew text of their contemporaries through intermediate means (Saints Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nyssa).

The existence of differences in the texts between the Septuagint and the Hebrew text used in the synagogue was incontestable (Origen, Augustine, Jerome).

Chapter III:

The history of the Holy Scriptures in the Romanian and Modern Greek languages from the 19th to 21st century

The more important Church editions of the Holy Scriptures (the New and Old Testament) printed in the 20th – 21st century are the following: 1) *Biblia adic Dumnezeasca Scriptura a Legii Vechi si a celei Noua* [the Bible] printed during the days of his Majesty Carol I, King of Romania, the Holy Synod's Edition, printed by Church Books Press, Bucharest, 1914; 2) *Sfânta Scriptur* [The Holy Scripture], translated from the Greek Septuagint, confronted with the Hebrew, during the time of the his Highness Carol II, with the approval of the Holy Synod, Bucharest, Church Book Press, 1936; 3) *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptur* [the Bible or Holy Scripture], printed under the care of his Holiness Father Justinian, Patriarch of the Romanian Orthodox Church, with the approval of the Holy Synod, EIBMBOR, Bucharest, 1968; 4) *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptur* [the Bible or Holy Scripture], printed under the guidance and care of his All Holiness Father Justin, Patriarch of the Romanian Orthodox Church, with the approval of the Holy Synod, EIBMBOR, Bucharest,

1982; 5) *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptur* [the Bible or the Holy Scripture], the Holy Synod's Jubilee edition, EIBMBOR, the re-worked version according to the Septuagint, edited with footnotes from Bartolomeu Valeriu Anania, the Archbishop of Cluj, assisted by numerous other strivers, Bucharest, 2001.

The Synodical Biblical editions of 1968, 1975, 1979, and 1982 were used the 1936 text as a reference text with small revisions and word corrections. The Synodical edition from 2005 was a re-editing of the one from 1988.

In the second half of the 19th century the following scriptures were printed as private translations or for the neo-Protestant cults: 1) *Biblia Sacra que coprinde Vechiul i Noul Testament tradusa din hellenesce dupo a quellor septedeci* by I. Heliade R., Paris in Preve and Comp.'s press, via J. J. Rousseau, 15, 1858. It is a Biblical text partially translated from the Septuagint; 2-4) *Biblia Sacra. Genesis* from the latest Greek edition corrected from the Hebrew, translated by K. Aristias. Bucharest. Through the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society for propagating the holy word in Britannia and other nations, 1859; *Biblia Sacra. Isaia*. In the last edition of the re-corrected Greek from Hebrew Archetypes, translated by C. Aristia. Bucharest. At the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society for propagating the holy word in Britannia and other nations, 1859; *Biblia Sacra. Psalmii*. The three books of the Old Testament are translations from the neo-protestant Modern Greek version of Neofit Vamvas; 5) *S nta Scriptur a Vechiului i a Noului Testament* . The New Edition, re-edited according to the original text and published by the Foreign British Biblical Society, Iasi, lithographed, H. Goldner, 1874. It is a biblical version of the neo-Protestant group, with the OT faithful to the MT and a tendentious NT; 6) *Sfânta Scriptura a Vechiului i Noului Testament*, new edition, revised according to the original texts and published by the British and Foreign Biblical Society, Bucharest, 1909. The text of these neo-Protestant versions is a re-working of the proceeding texts, especially that from Buz u.

In the first half of the 20th century a few neo-Protestant editions and one private biblical edition were printed.

Gala Galaction and Vasile Radu printed their own versions of the bible: *Biblia adic Dumnezeiasca Scriptur a Vechiului i a Noului Testament*, translated according to the original Hebrew and Greek texts by the priests and professors Vasile Radu and Gala Galaction from the high initiative of His Royal Highness King Carol II, Bucharest, the Foundation for literature and art "King Carol II" Blvd. L scar Catagi, 1938. It does not have a scientific character since it combines the Masoretic and Septuagint texts.

Dumitru Cornilescu (1891-1975) contaminated himself with neo-protestant ideas while he was a pupil at the Orthodox Theological Seminary in Bucharest. In order to escape from military duty, he entered into monasticism. The priest Tudor Popescu from Saint Steven's Nest with a Stork Church in Bucharest inoculated him with neo-protestant ideas, Tudor was defrocked in 1924. With financial support received from Raluca Calimachi, he printed his own Bible. Dumitru Cornilescu printed the following neo-protestant versions of the Bible: 1) *Cartea Psalmilor sau Psaltirea împ ratului David* translated by D. Cornilescu, St nce ti-Boto ani , Bucharest, the Romanian Evangelical Society, 1920; 2) *Biblia sau Sfinta Scriptura a Vechiului i Noului Testament*, translated by D. Cornilescu with parallel locations, the Romanian Evangelical Society, printed at Gutenberg S.A. Bucharest, 1921; 3) *Biblia sau Sfinta Scriptur a Vechiului i Noului Testament cu trimeteri*, "The New Romanian Translation" of Cornilescu, the Bible Society for spreading the Bible in England and abroad, Bucharest, Robert de Flers Street, 18, 1924.

In the 20th century A.D., all of the neo-protestant groups, indifferent of confession, used a single biblical text, Cornilescu's, with an anti-ecclesiastical character from 1924, re-edited many times with small and insignificant textual interventions.

At the beginning of the 21st century, more extra-ecclesial versions were printed than in the proceeding century.

Due to the text and schools, three neo-protestant versions have a pronounced confessional character: 1) *Biblia de Studiu pentru o via deplin* [Study Bible for a Full Life], D. Cornilescu's version, with Cristian Vasile Roske as Coordinator of the Romanian Edition, Bucharest, 2000. It is the Bible for Pentecostals; 2) *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptur* , Dumitru Cornilescu's translation, Thompson's study edition, with editor and coordinator Paul Negru Ed. University Emanuel, Oradea, 2002. Is for the Baptists; 3) *Sfintele Scripturi. Traducerea Lumii Noi*, [the New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures], English version revised in 1984, Printed in Italy, Stampata in Italia nel novembre 2006 da: Congregazione Cristiana dei Testimoni di Genova, Via della Bufalotta 1281, Roma. It is the biblical version used by the Jehovah's Witnesses.

Another neo-protestant biblical version, whose editor is unknown, proposed a literal text: *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptur a Vechiului i Noului Testament*, new and complete literal translation, revised and updated, Bucharest, 2001.

The Interconfessional Bible Society of Romania (SBIR) initiated an "interconfessional (ecumenical) translation of the Bible." This initiative for an interconfessional translation of the Bible, like the French version TOB, was fated to failure since it did not please anyone.

Another private initiative for a biblical edition is that of the New Europe College, which proposed to create a new translation of the Septuagint according to the French model. Currently they have edited 5 volumes: 1) *Septuaginta. Geneza. Exodul. Leviticul. Numerii. Deuteronomul*, vol. 1 coordinated by C. B dili , F. B It ceanu, M. Bro teanu, D. Slu anschi, in collaboration with fr. Ioan-Florin Florescu, the New Europe College, printed by Polirom, 2004; 2) *Septuaginta. Iisus Nave. Judec torii. Ruth. 1-4 Regi*, vol. 2 coordinated by C. B dili , F. B It ceanu, M. Bro teanu, D. Slu anschi, in collaboration with fr. Ioan-Florin Florescu, New Europe College, printed by Polirom, 2004; 3) *Septuaginta. 1-2 Paralipomene. 1-2 Ezdra. Ester. Iudit. Tobit. 1-4 Macabei*, vol. 3 coordinated by C. B dili , F. B It ceanu, M. Bro teanu, D. Slu anschi, in collaboration with fr. Ioan-Florin Florescu, New Europe College, printed by Polirom, 2005; 4) *Septuaginta. Psalmii. Odele. Proverbele. Ecclziastul. Cântarea Cânt rilor*, vol. 4/I coordinated by C. B dili , F. B It ceanu, M. Bro teanu, D. Slu anschi, in collaboration with fr. Ioan-Florin Florescu, New Europe College, printed by Polirom, 2006; 5) *Septuaginta. Iezechiel. Suzana. Daniel. Bel i Balaurul*, vol. 6/II coordinated by C. B dili , F. B It ceanu, M. Bro teanu, in colaboration with Ioan-Florin Florescu, translation and notes by Florica Bechet and Ioana Costa, New Europe College, Ed. Polirom, Bucharest, Ia i, 2008. The Biblical initiative of the New Europe College is like that of the collective SBIR. A group of mostly extra–ecclesial, only with aplomb of academic qualifications and a declarative faith desired to impose their work, which the Church did not solicit, onto an Orthodox public.

The historical context and the phenomenon of the appearance of Cornilescu’s neo–protestant versions in Romanian are very similar to what happened in Greece in the 19th c., when at the request and influence of neo–protestant missionaries printed a neo–protestant biblical version in Modern Greek. The British and Foreign Bible Society printed in 1850, without the Church’s endorsement, printed a neo–protestant style bible known as Archimandrite Neofit Vamvas’ translation. In Greece, this Bible was re–edited many times.

Chapter IV:

A comparative exposition of dogmatic parallels between the Bibles used by the Church and the newer biblical editions of the neo-protestants.

Proposed corrections for liturgical texts.

There are situations where a word in the original language in the same biblical text was correctly translated in the Holy Synod's Jubilee Biblical edition, and in Cornilescu's version it was tendentiously translated anti-clerically. In what follows, without pretension for being exhaustive, 17 words are presented whose translation into Romanian are different in the two biblical texts (the Holy Synod's and Cornilescu's) and in the liturgical and missions fields have direct doctrinal implications. To each Greek word its most frequent translation in the Jubilee Biblical edition of the Holy Synod is associated with that of the neo-protestant version of Cornilescu from 1924, or from the *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptură a Vechiului și Noului Testament*, the newly complemented literal translation, revised and updated, Bucharest, 2001 (Blit): 1) ἀβύσσος, οὐ, ὄ (iad/locuin a mor ilor) [hell/place of the dead]; 2) αἰρέσις, εἰσῆξις, ἡ (eres, erezie/partid) [heterodoxy, heresy/party]; 3) αἰρετικός, ἡ, ὄν (eretic/cel ce aduce dezbinări) [heretic/the one that brings dispute]; 4) ἀπαράβατος, ὄν (netrec toare/nu poate trece de la unul la altul) [unsurpassable/impossible to cross from one to another]; 5) ἀρχιερεύς, ἐπίσκοπος, ὁ (arhiepiscop/mare preot) [hierarch/great priest]; 6) γυναῖκα, αἰκόνη, ἡ (femeie/nevastă) [woman/wife]; 7) δίκαιος, αἰμα, ὄν (drept/neprihănit) [just/immaculate] / δίκαιος, ἡ, ὄν (dreptate/neprihănită) [righteous/virginity]; 8) εἰκών, ὄν, ἡ (chip/icoană) [image/ikon]; 9) εἷς, μία, εἷς, (ἕνας, ἕνα, ἕνα) (unu, una/un singur, una singură) [one/only one]; 10) ἐκκλησία, αἵ, ἡ (Biserică /adunare) [Church/gathering]; 11) ἐξουσία, αἵ, ἡ (putere/Blit autoritate) [power/Blit authority]; 12) παράδοσις, ἐπί, ἡ (predanie, datină /Blit tradiție) [custom /tradition]; 13) πρεσβύτερος, τέρας, ὄν (bătrân, preot/presbiter, bătrân la Blit) [old man, priest/presbyter, old man Blit]; 14) σημεῖον, οὐ, τό (2005 cruce, semn/semn) [cross, sign/sign]; 15) σωθῆναι (the general rule for translating the verb σωθῆναι, which has the meaning to be saved, in the passive voice in Greek, was translated the verb in the active voice in the Synodical Biblical editions, but in the neo-protestant biblical editions it is translated in the passive voice; 16) χειροτονεῖν (Acts 14:23 a hirotonia/a

rîndui, a alege) [to tonsure/to order, to choose]; 17) (ta) cilia eth (o mie de ani, miile de ani/o mie de ani) [a thousand years, thousands of years/a thousand years].

Some of the differences have especial doctrinal consequences, even divergences. The foundational dogmatic implications between the two versions are of a Christological, ecclesiological, anthropological, soteriological, Mariological and eschatological order.

There are many biblical expressions and words that have been translated with a similar or even exact meaning in both the synodical and neo-Protestant versions – but which Cornilescu interpreted completely differently: (1) dogma, atoj, to, 2) kanwn, onoj, o, 3) koinwnia, aj, h; 4) musthron, ou, to; 5) eucaristia, aj, h; 6) energeia, aj, h; 7) swma tou/Cristou/ /tou/ Kuriou, etc.). A separate doctrinal analysis of these words brings the discrepancy between the Church and neo-Protestant confessions into even greater relief.

In order to better serve the interests of proselytism, Cornilescu voluntarily avoided certain words that could have somewhat reminded people of the vocabulary specific to the Church (e.g. tradition, hierarch, bishop, priest, tonsure, etc.) and which would have somewhat supported the teaching of its faith. In some situations he forced the translation of certain words or expressions, and even introduced words that seemed to him better sustained the doctrine that he professed in counterpoint against the Church (e.g. ikon, single). Cornilescu's biblical text is salted with footnotes that do not correspond to the critical text. There are also situations where he most likely did not have any intentions of proselytism, but created an erroneous translation compared to the original text.

A greater accent is placed on Christ's divinity in detriment to his humanity. The union of the natures is understood in a heretical Nestorian sense. The human nature is completely helpless. Salvation is a mental action with out the presupposition of effort on man's part. Though the Son restored human nature through Himself, which He assumed ontologically, for neo-Protestants human nature does not benefit from any kind of renewal.

In neo-Protestantism, though love is spoken of, communication and even intercessory prayer does not accept the reality of the fact that those that are still in the body can intercede for those that do not rejoice in the Kingdom of God (those condemned), nor is it accepted that those that obtained salvation can intercede for those still in this life. The only intercessory prayer accepted by neo-Protestantism is that of those in this life for one another, and of course of Christ's to God the Father for people. Hence, death is an unsurpassable barrier between those that are in the body and those that have passed into eternal life. A consequence of this fact is the existence of two churches in which there is no communication, or love. A conclusion could be drawn that there are two Kingdoms of God, separated by the threshold of

death. But in Holy Scripture a distinction is not made between the members of the Kingdom of God in this life from those in life beyond death. How then could the words of the Savior be understood, “the kingdom of God is inside of you” (Luke 17:21), here in this life; and the sayings of the Holy Apostle Paul about Christians that are “fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God” (Eph: 2:19)?

The greatest share of the words tendentiously translated by Cornilescu is found in the text of the New Testament. The Old Testament has been affected less. The convergence of meaning for the erroneously translated text is about the person of the Son. It can be affirmed that he has brought in an especially grave deformation of Revelation, of God’s message to man. The distortion of the understanding of the act of the Son’s Incarnation has negative consequences regarding the restoration of God’s image in man.

A number of 14 words and expressions from the Synodical Biblical editions and liturgical texts are proposed for correction: 1) αὐτοῖς in Genesis 3:15 should be translated as *el* [*he*]; 2) διαρκῆς, ἡ, ἡ at the institution of the Holy Eucharist in the Liturgy of Saint Basil the Great, at the offertory prayers, in the Anaphora of the Holy Liturgy at the (exclamation: *Be i dintru acesta to i...[Drink ye all of it]*) should be translated *leg mânt* [*covenant/testament*]; 3) in Genesis 1:27 the word *chip* (*dup chipul kat’ eikona*) [*after the image*], according to the Septuagint, should be mentioned only a single time; 4) in James 3:9, the omission of the article τοῦ which accompanies ἀνθρώπων implicates a contradiction to the Scriptures. Should be translated as *oamenii* [*people*]; 5) ἡμέρα μιὰ in Genesis 1:5 should be translated *zi una* [*first day*]; 6) εἴσεσθε ὡς θεοί. in Genesis 3:5, according to the Septuagint, should be translated *ve i fi ca ni te dumnezei* [*you shall be as gods*]; 7) (τα) χίλια ἐτη in Psalm 89:4; 2 Ptr. 3:8; Acts 20:2-7 must be translated *mii de ani* [*thousands of years*]; 8) Revelation 13:8 the correct translation is: *nu-s scrie numele în cartea vie ii, a Mielului celui jungheat, de la izvodirea lumii* [*whose names have not been written in the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*]; 9) the word *Pa tile* and the phrases that accompany it in their plural form, should be in the singular; 10) a contradiction between Scripture and the liturgical text “...din iubire de oameni, ca un Dumnezeu al p rin ilor no tri, ai poruncit.... ca sufletul s mearg acolo de unde fiin i-a luat, pân la ob teasca înviere...” [*out of love for man, as the God of our Fathers, You commanded... that the soul should return to where it obtained its being until the universal resurrection*]; 11) τὴν ἐνοχθὰ τῆς πίστewj (Eph. 4:13) is mistakenly translated in the Romanian Liturgy as the union of faith: *unirea credin ei*. Should be translated the *Unity in faith* [*unitatea în credin*]; 12) ζῆλος, οὐ, ὀ in

Exodus 20:5; 34:14; Deut. 4:24; 5:9; 6:15; Nahum 1:2, in the Jubilee edition it is erroneously translated *jealous* (q  j zhl wthj *Dumnezeu gelos* [*Jealous God*]). Should be translated *zelos* [*zealous*]; 13) in the Liturgy there is a lack of correspondence when the verse from Luke 23:42 is quoted (*Pomene te-m Doamne c nd vei veni  ntru  mp r ia Ta* [*Remember me o Lord when You come into Your Kingdom*]); 14) “*suirea*” [*climbing up*] should be modified to *ascension* [to the heavens of Jesus Christ] with “* n l area*”.

Final Conclusions

In the Early Church the Septuagint was undoubtedly the consecrated text for the Old Testament. The Holy Fathers quoted and commented in Latin and in Greek from the Septuagint. In the first centuries of the Christian era, the Hebrew text, different from the current Masoretic text, was known through the intermediacy of the Septuagint. The first translations of the Old Testament into Latin, Syrian, Ethiopian, Coptic, Arabian, Georgian and Gothic were made from the Septuagint.

In Romanian, the extra-ecclesial biblical editions from the 19th century of the British and Foreign Bible Society (SBBS) and that of C. Aristia (Genesis, the Psalter, and Isaiah), used the Masoretic text for the Old Testament. I. Heliade R. dulescu's biblical attempt in the 19th century, though from the Septuagint, was rejected by the Church because of its atypical language.

Regarding Holy Scripture, in the Romanian Orthodox Church during the first half of the 20th century, two allogeneous currents virulently manifested themselves against the ecclesiastical spirit, which produced consequences with negative doctrinal effects that have lasted up to the present. The two currents set out from the dilemma: should the Septuagint or MT be considered the original text for translating the Old Testament into Romanian.

The current polemic between those that hold to the Septuagint and those that uphold the MT, from the viewpoint of scientific accuracy generated a compromised Romanian Old Testament text for the Church because the two were mixed subjectively. From 1688 to 1914, the Church's biblical editions used only the Septuagint. From 1936 to the present, as was shown above, the Synod's texts have been corrupted. In the Church, the methodological error of mixing the Septuagint with the MT was desired and was somewhat corrected only at the debut of the 21st century (see the Jubilee biblical edition). There is also a laudable, recent, private initiative for returning to the Septuagint by the New Europe College, which proposes a critical text, but which has a great disadvantage, the collective does not hold to the Church, not in the formal sense, but it is foreign to the Spirit of the Church, though it affirms that it does belong to it.

The second current had a pronounced centrifugal tendency for the Church. The unmeasured ambition for editing a biblical version that bore their name determined Gala Galaction and Dumitru Cornilescu to appeal to private printing presses to satisfy their grievance. The consequences of the biblical initiatives of those two individuals did not have the same doctrinal impact in the life of the Church. Galaction did not abandon the Church and

printed his Bible at Carol II's printing press, resulting in the *Biblia Funda iilor* [the Foundations' Bible].

Niulescu's Bible was used by neo-protestants in Romania up to the appearance of Cornilescu's versions. Through the support of Princess Calimachi and of SBBS, abandoning the Church, Cornilescu printed his own version of the bible. Given to the tendentious and flagrantly anti-clerical nature of Cornilescu's bible, ever since its publication (1921) up to the present, it has been a precious instrument for the neo protestant proselytizing missionaries throughout the members of the Church.

The doctrinal divergences between the churches and neo-Protestantism have a complex causality because not only exegesis of a similar text in the two traditions is different, but even the texts themselves differ because the texts from which they were translated differ, and also because Cornilescu's version is evidently tendentious. There are expressions and words, which in the same biblical passages differ in Cornilescu's version from that of the Church. Some of the fundamental differences have especial doctrinal consequences, even divergent. The dogmatic implications of the fundamental differences between the two versions are on the order of Christological, ecclesiological, anthropological, soteriological, Mariological, and Eschatological.

For the study of the Old Testament messianic texts, contemporary Romanians use the comparative MT. For the Church, Septuagint must remain as the primary reference, but the statute of the MT must be a consultative-comparative compared to that of the Septuagint.

In the end, I would only add one more remark, the Synodical text of the Holy Scriptures as well as that of the liturgy, both need to be re-worked.

Key Words:

1. Septuagint (LXX)
2. Bible, Holy Scriptures
3. Old, New Testament
4. Church
5. Cornilescu
6. neo-protestant
7. Masoretic Text (MT)
8. Edition/ biblical version
9. translation
10. Jubilee edition / Synodical
11. Revelation
12. Edition / neo-protestant version
13. tradition, Holy Tradition
14. Romanian
15. Greek
16. Hebrew

Cuprins

Introduction.....	1
Chapter I: A doctrinal parallel between the Orthodox Church’s conception of the Holy Scriptures and that of the Romanian neo–Protestant cults’	2
Chapter II: The historical perspective of how the Church viewed the Septuagint in the first five centuries – a reference text, used by the Orthodox Church for translating the Holy Scriptures into national languages.....	4
Chapter III: The history of the Holy Scriptures in the Romanian and Modern Greek languages from the 19 th to 21 st century.....	5
Chapter IV: A comparative exposition of dogmatic parallels between the bibles used by the Church and the newer biblical editions of the neo–protestants. Proposed corrections for liturgical texts.....	9
Final Conclusions.....	13
Key Words.....	15
Contents.....	16