

Reasons For Necessity of
Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible (KTK)
~ ORGANIC translating
an appeal for pure and undefiled translating
of the divinely-inspired Old Covenant and New Covenant writings
that is fit for the Sanctuary of God



“the Scripture cannot be broken” ~ John 10\35

1. *English Translations*

Nothing we can ever experience in this flesh is so brilliantly transforming as bringing ourselves, as it were, face-to-face with the pure word of God that was delivered by angels to His chosen prophets.

When Moses came down from the mountain with two tablets in his hand, his face so shone that the Israelites were afraid to go near him. Yet now with the spirit of Jesus, all believers in him, with faces uncovered, have an inner radiance surpassing that of Moses: “For if that being done away with was with radiance, then how much more that *which is* remaining in radiance!” (2 Corinthians 3\11). The Sons and Daughters of God are “reflecting the radiance of *the* Lord”, and they are “being transformed into the same image, from radiance to radiance”. For it is God “Who shone in our hearts, for *the* brightness of the knowledge of the radiance of God in *the* face of Jesus Christ” (2 Corinthians 4\6, 3\18). And “even if our outward man is being brought to decay, still day by day the inward man is being renewed” (2 Corinthians 4\16). With the book in your hand, you have now the word of God translated into English in pearls of reliability and truth.

The ways of the living God are not the ways of mankind. All the teachings and cultural activities of the world system have to be confronted and made to conform to the words of the prophets: agriculture; anthropology; archaeology; architecture; art forms; assemblies; astronomy; Bible teaching; Bible translation; biology; chemistry; chronologies; cosmology; counselling; courtesy and manners; courtship; dance; drama; eating and drinking; education; employment; entertainment; environment; finance; fishing and fish management; forestry; friendship; geography; geology; health; history and the writing of history; horticulture; housing; hygiene and sanitation; industry; international relations; journalism; language; land management; law; law enforcement and retribution; literature; marriage; mathematics; medicine; music; natural history; news broadcasting; origins; painting; personal conduct and behaviour; philosophy; physics; poetry; politics; production; property; psychiatry; psychology; publishing; science; sculpture; speech; theatre; theology; the truth about the one God and Christ; thought; trading; warfare; waste; water management; zoology ... All these and everything else have been crippled and made rebellious by the satanic and hostile systems of this world that is governed by greed and corruption. All these have to bow the knee to the words of God in the books of His prophets, from Genesis to Revelation. In the kingdom of God and Christ it will be so.

The translation of the Books of God into English – now the most powerful language in the world – has been long and slow. Its pages are engraved in blood and fire and gold.

We know that God wants the writings of His prophets and apostles translated into other languages, for Jesus spoke concerning a righteous woman, “Wherever this gospel will be

proclaimed in all the world, this also that she has done will be recounted in memory of her” (Matthew 26\13, John 12\3).

The Anglo-Saxons, including the magnificent King Alfred, were the first to take it upon themselves to make translations of the God-authorized writings into the Anglo tongue. Around 1380 John Wycliffe, declaring the word of God to be above the so-called “sacraments” of the worldly religious system, completed the first full translation of the Bible, but was able to work only from the faulty Latin *Vulgate*, making a translation of a translation: “helle” (Hell) from Latin “inferno”, instead of “grave” from Greek ᾗδης (*hades*) (Acts 2\27); “weren maad” (were made) from Latin “facta sunt”, instead of “arose” from Greek ἐγένετο (*egeneto*) (John 1\3); “euerlastynge” (everlasting) from Latin “aeternam”, instead of “eonian”, “age-enduring”, or “eon-enduring” from Greek αἰώνιος (*aiionios*) (John 3\16); “the fier of helle” from Latin “*gehennae ignis*”, instead of “the fire of the Valley of Hinnom” from Greek τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός (*teen gehennan tou puros*) (Matthew 5\22); and “thou shalt not leave my soul in hell” (Acts 2\27) also from the *Vulgate*’s errant Latin “non derelinques animam meam in inferno”, instead of “... in sepulcrum”, a schoolboy error. And so on. Wycliffe died on 31 December 1384. In 1401 a law was passed ordering that heretics should be burned at the stake. Archbishop Arundel declared it illegal to read the English Bible. In 1428, as a threat, Wycliffe’s corpse was dug up by the Church and burned, under the reign of Henry VI.

All that had been available to those translators was the undependable *Vulgate* (of c.390 AD). Then, in 1522, the Dutch humanist scholar, Desiderius Erasmus, compiled a Greek New Testament. This enabled the genius William Tyndale¹ (? – 1536) to translate, for the first time ever, the New Testament into English directly from the Greek. Tyndale also made translations into English of some of the Hebrew of the Old Testament. He found that Greek is better suited to English translation than it is to the less flexible Latin, and that the Hebrew finds agreement with English “a thousand times more”. However, before Tyndale could complete his work, he was strangled and burned in Vilvorde by the religious sheriffs of this world, under the reign of Henry VIII. Of the perpetual violence and vicious persecution of the righteous, Tyndale asked simply “Why?” But another fire was raging, in an unquenchable blaze, in William Tyndale’s heart: that he might make available the Books of God to everybody, and in a language and style which was clear and comprehensible. His every intention was pure and noble. The work was imperfect, but he had to work alone; with little for reference; against the law; in a rush; hunted by the religious authorities; then he was cut short: they killed him. His style has an extraordinary clarity that rings even now, and, as David Daniell demonstrates, is unequalled in English translations.

An enemy of Tyndale’s, George Joye, altered some of Tyndale’s translation, deliberately omitting at John 5, for example, the word “resurrection” because Joye preferred the ancient and anti-biblical myth of eternal and undying man that Tyndale knew to be a hoax. Tyndale knew that the natural body only becomes a spiritual body when it is raised in resurrection (1 Corinthians 15\44).

These were the days when you were burned alive for having an English Bible. In 1519 in Coventry six Christian men and a Christian widow were burned alive for having the ten commandments and the Lord’s Prayer in English and teaching them to their children. The fire was a slow death. The children were threatened with death for repeating what they’d learned. In 1530 it was made illegal to own or buy any copy of the Bible. The official “Bible” was the Latin *Vulgate*. For the Establishment held that the (errant) Latin translation was the only true Bible.

Soon after the torture and assassination of Tyndale, his Bibles were being distributed throughout England. Tyndale’s translation became the inspiration and base for further translations, as the passion for translating spread across the land, despite Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of London, burning all he could of Tyndale’s books in a large bonfire outside St Paul’s;

1. For a deep appreciation of Tyndale’s work see Daniell’s introductions to his modern-spelling editions.

Tunstall's purchases enabled Tyndale to make a revised edition. In 1535 Miles Coverdale (in frequent exile; possibly ally to Tyndale in Antwerp) issued the first complete *printed* Bible. In 1537 and 1549 John Rogers published a complete English Bible – and he was burned in 1555, under the reign of Queen Mary. Rogers went to his death “as if he had been led to a wedding” and died “washing his hands in the flame as he was in burning” (John Foxe).

In order to halt public access to the Books of God, Rome reacted and issued a statement in its Council of Trent (1545-1563) concerning the Latin *Vulgate* that “no one is to dare or presume to reject it under any pretext whatever”. Feeling the force and pressure of change, in 1582 Rome issued its own English translation of the New Testament, the *Douai-Rheims New Testament*, and in 1609 its own translation of the Old Testament. This *Douai-Rheims* was, purposely, almost unreadable in places. Its Ephesians 3\6 reads: “The Gentils to be coheires and concorporat and comparticant of his promiss in Christ Jesus by the Gospel.” (That “Gentils” is error: it should be “nations”). And: “Let the charity of the fraternity abide in you” (Hebrews 13\1). As if to say, see, we told you the Bible is not for silly ploughboys.

In 1611 the *King James Version* (KJV) was published. King James ordered: “The Bishops’ Bible to be followed, and altered as little as the Original will permit.” Other English versions may be looked at to compare, it was permitted, but according to the words of Benjamin Wilson, if he is correct (there is evidence), “None of these were made from the Original Greek, but *only compare with it* – being all translated from the *Vulgate Latin*. Hence it follows that the authorised version is simply a revision of the Vulgate” (Wilson, *The Emphatic Diaglott*, p. 7). The *Douai-Rheims* and its notes were also a minor influence. The KJV’s fifty or more men ensured a restoration of inappropriate Latinity where they could drive it in: its style was painted with textures of grammatical complexity in order to keep the Bible at a safe distance from the public and locked in the hands of the clergy, the opposite of Tyndale’s intention. For example: “fidelity” for Tyndale’s “faithfulness” (Titus 2\10); and the gibberish of “he made for the altar a brasen gate of network under the compass thereof beneath unto the midst of it” (Exodus 38\4); the curious and intriguing grammar of “Let destruction come upon him at unawares” (Numbers 35\11, Joshua 20\19, Psalm 35\8); and, purposely strangled, “So will not we go back from thee” (Psalm 80\18). David Daniell commented: “the Authorised Version panel, Latin-inspired, spoke for the mandarin classes in the unforgettable ‘Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.’ But Tyndale spoke for all humanity in his more memorable ‘for the day present hath ever enough of his own trouble’” (Daniell, p. xxviii). The KJV’s Matthew 23\1 says, “Then spake Jesus”. That does not reflect the Greek order. It should read “Then Jesus spoke” (and “spoke”, not “spake”). The KJV translators broke the Greek syntax in order to sound impenetrable, such a register of language keeping the word of God locked in the hands of the clergy. For, should the common people have access to the word of God and be able to understand it, what then would happen?

Wilson again: “the authorised version is simply a revision of the Vulgate”. I have tabulated 93 pages on how the King James translators mostly followed the Latin *Vulgate* in matters concerning Jesus, and added their own errors, and how in doing so concealed the true Jesus.

At 2 Chronicles 4\16 the KJV translators wrote, comically, “all their instruments, did Hiram his father make to Solomon for the house of the LORD of bright brass”. Why “make to Solomon”, and not “make for Solomon”? But who is “the LORD of bright brass”? The translators’ desire to be difficult overspilled into comedy. The sentence should read “all their instruments of bright brass his master craftsman Hiram made for king Solomon for the House of Yahweh.” In KTK, to safeguard the sense, the phrase “of bright brass” is separated by dashes from all that comes before it. The KJV’s comma after “instruments” is also wrong.

Accordingly, the King James Bible’s title page reads, in capitals, “APPOINTED TO BE READ IN CHURCHES”. In other words, not at home; not for the hands of “the boy that driveth the plough” after all; the same spirit of the *Douai-Rheims*.

In great contrast, William Tyndale’s translation rings with spirit and clarity. He had wanted the

purest sense and clarity so that everybody could understand. He famously said to a bickering cleric, “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.” And he wrote of it that it is “to open our eyes” to God and should be “plainly laid before their eyes in their mother tongue, that they might see the ... meaning of the text”, away from “juggling with the text”. Juggling. And: “For ... whoever read it or hear it reasoned ... it will begin immediately to make him every day better and better.” And of himself: “my part be not in Christ, if mine heart be not to follow and live ... as I teach.”

Since the King James Bible of 1611 there has been a contest of English versions (well over 150) and a contest of manuscripts (the multiple Byzantine type Greek texts against a few mutilated and corrupt Alexandrian), many new translations (if you can call them that) promoting themselves with some gimmick or nuance, but stale with regurgitated cliché (though a fraction of these works justified and useful). Of course language constantly changes, but this in no way excuses the egregious and multitudinous blunders, inherited and new. And truly, I say to you this day, as belief has given way to considerations of profit and increasing levels of paraphrase and colloquialism (over-reactions to archaic pre-Jacobean?), some versions have degenerated into chatty irreverence and even more wild invention. (There are exceptions.) For certain, none of those popular translations would translate back into the same Hebrew and Greek meanings of the prophets and apostles.

This means that for any reader or teacher of the Bible the information they are receiving might be unreliable – and unsafe doctrines surge on and on, unchecked. Still shining through are the themes of God’s creation of the universe, Jesus’ birth and death and resurrection, the forgiveness of sins, the prophecies of Jesus’ return to the Earth and of the eventual renewed Earth. But the untold constant faults in the translations have upheld the long traditions of the natural religion of man so that the whole truth has been concealed. The truth of the Creator of the heavens and Earth, of Christ, of man’s mortality through disobedience, of his salvation and inheritance, of his enemy, and of the story of the restoration of the twelve tribes of the sons of Israel, have all been shipwrecked and, from the detritus of the wreckage, wayward and lukewarm man has produced other, quite different narratives.

The root of this scandal is that even in the days of the apostles “a furious storm of wind arose”. By the end of the second and third centuries men had concocted brews of ancient Babylonian polytheistic religious forms, mixing them up with the writings of the prophets and apostles. They produced creeds and arguments and allegories and twisted translations and mixtures. Ever since, there have followed further writings, creeds, confessions, statements, articles, upholding one way or another echoes of the ancient religious mystical forms. All the versions have been overshadowed and haunted by those dark forces of traditions of Babylonian myths, handed down via creeds and the *Vulgate*. These have ensured that the truth has remained safely wrapped in mythical polytheistic Babylonian idolatry, priestcraft, ritual performance, echoes of designating men to impossible regions of gods and devils, gods in the fat of men’s bellies, and every form of tradition. They have, in a borrowed phrase from Tyndale at 2 Samuel 7\14, quenched the sparkle of the prophets and apostles.

Every popular translation I have looked at, whatever the language, rages with many of the same perpetuated errors, with translators apparently under the same intoxicating influences. In all these haunted versions the chief means of upholding ancient tradition has been by mistranslations of words and phrases and cunning falsifications of grammar.

This translation, *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible*, has disregarded all tradition’s error and corrected them. Some of these are discussed over the next few pages; some in the appendices; some are highlighted in subject headings and footnotes; many others are explained in detail in *The Earth-Shaking Truth*; and more still, God willing, in forthcoming works. The most abundant mistranslations have been over the Hebrew word עולם (*olam*), “eon” (438 occurrences) – 181

occurrences of which are the phrase לעולם (*le olam*), “throughout the eon”; the Greek words αἰών (*aion*), “eon” (126 occurrences) and αἰώνιος (*aionios*), “eonian” (enduring for, relating to, an eon) (71 occurrences); and the Greek phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (*eis ton aiona*), “throughout the eon” (27 times). That, allowing for some idiomatic uses, accounts for well over 600 corrections with just these parts alone.²

It is not difficult Greek: αἰών (*aion*) means “eon” and is where our word “eon” comes from. And αἰώνιος (*aionios*) means “eonian”, “age-enduring”, “eon-enduring”, “eon-lasting”. There is no difficulty with these two Greek words. An “eon” is a long age, and “eonian” and “age-enduring” mean enduring for or relating to an eon. And the Hebrew equivalent עולם (*olam*) means “eon”, the same as αἰών (*aion*). These words “eon” and “eonian” ought to be on every believer’s lips, because it concerns our gospel promise from Jesus: life throughout the coming eon when Jesus is reigning on Earth as King of the Earth. Some translators, though, rejecting the prophets’ visions of the eons, often, perversely, want the word αἰών as “world”. (The Greek for “world” is κόσμος (*kosmos*), not αἰών.) Then, inconsistently, they have its adjective form, αἰώνιος, as “eternal”, as in their phrase “eternal life”. Very well then, if they want αἰών as “world”, to be consistent they ought to have its adjective form, αἰώνιος (*aionios*), as “worldly”, and they should be proclaiming a message of “worldly life”.

The constant mistranslation of those Hebrew and Greek words and phrases has meant the concealing of the coming Messianic eon, and therefore also of the true gospel promise of “eonian life”, which is life throughout the prophesied coming Messianic age. Gesenius suggests that the Hebrew word עולם (*olam*) is properly “what is hidden; specially *hidden time*” (Gesenius, p. 612). How appropriate and what irony that the eons and the gospel promise of “eonian life” have themselves been so hidden by mistranslations of that very Hebrew word (a divine joke, perhaps). Paul says also, “our gospel is hidden” (2 Corinthians 4\3). The mistranslations of the abstract noun αἰών (*aion*), “eon”, by the KJV and others, as a concrete noun “world”, as an adjective “eternal”, and as an adverb “ever”, have held the world back. The full gospel promise has been withheld. The pronouncement of the coming eon has been delayed.

In contrast, the correct translation of these two frequently occurring words, עולם (*olam*) and αἰών (*aion*), uncovers the Earth-shaking discovery of the prophets’ and apostles’ visions of the eons past (Isaiah 63\16), of the eons coming (Ephesians 2\7), of the imminent Messianic eon – and of the gospel promise of “eonian life”, which means having an indestructible and incorruptible body and mind in the coming Kingdom of Jesus. For whoever believes in Jesus “will most certainly not die throughout the eon [age]” (John 11\26). For, after the resurrection, “they do not have the capacity to die any more, for they are equal to the angels” (Luke 20\35-36). Jesus promised this: “in the eon [age] which is coming, eonian life” (Mark 10\30, Luke 18\30).

For there is “one God, the Father ... and one Lord, Jesus Christ” (1 Corinthians 8\6); “one Lord” and “one God and Father” (Ephesians 4\5-6). And Jesus was “raised from *the* dead by the magnificent power of the Father” (Romans 6\4); “... through Jesus Christ and God *the* Father, Who raised him from *the* dead” (Galatians 1\1): “God *is* one. And *there is* one mediator between God and men, *the* man Christ Jesus” (1 Timothy 2\5). The resurrection of Jesus was through the agency of the Angel of God: “a mighty earthquake broke out, for *the* Angel of *the* Lord, descended from Heaven, came *and* rolled back the stone, away from the door, and he was sitting on it. His appearance was like lightning, and his garment as white as snow” (Matthew 28\2-3); and, “having been put to death by flesh, [Jesus was], though, made alive by *the* Spirit” (1 Peter 3\18). And the prophets and apostles have declared that a Messianic eon is coming on the Earth, “the Kingdom [or, Sovereign Rulership] of God” (Daniel 9\24-7, Matthew 3\2): first the Kingdom of God on Earth and Jesus returning to Earth, then follows an eon of 1,000 years.

2. Every occurrence of these words and phrases is tabulated in my study *The Eon*.

And in Jerusalem, at the opening of the Kingdom, the prophets and apostles will be raised from the dust of the ground (Luke 13\33-34, Matthew 23\37). And there will be a resurrection of the righteous from the dust of the ground (Genesis 3\19, 1 Corinthians 15). And those in the graves will hear the voice of Jesus and, like Lazarus, they will come out (John 5\25), praising and rejoicing in an indestructible body and renewed mind, for we “trust in God Who raises the dead” (2 Corinthians 1\9). And all these righteous people will live throughout the coming thousand year eon, until the destruction of all this Earth’s systems and the renewed Earth, then they will inhabit the New Jerusalem with God and Jesus, the twelve tribes of Israel inside the city, the saved peoples of the nations walking outside by its light in its outer court and their monarchs bringing their gifts into the city (Revelation 21\12-14 & 21\24-26, Matthew 19\28, Ephesians 2\6, 2\21-22, 2 Corinthians 6\16). For Jesus said, “where I am, there also my servant will be” (John 12\26). And “The heavens, *yes* the heavens, *belong* to Yahweh, but the Earth He has given to the sons of Adam” (Psalm 115\16); and “Blessed *are* the submissive, for they will inherit the land” (Psalm 37\3-34, Matthew 5\5). Until his return, Jesus must remain in the heavens (Acts 3\21).

Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible has grammatical integrity and is internally harmonious. I am confident that it presents how the writers of Matthew to Revelation – Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Jacob (James), Peter and Jude – would like their writings to be translated and understood: that is, all free from the chains of “juggling with the text”.

So frozen and degenerate has become the heart of the world in “this eon of darkness” and “evil” (Galatians 1\4, Ephesians 6\12) that nothing could be more welcome than the restoration of the pure and bold proclamations of the prophets and apostles. For the holy scrolls of God are “given by inspiration of God ... in order that the man of God can be complete” (2 Timothy 3\16-17).

Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible is the first English translation to be free of the stranglehold of *all* ancient religious tradition, and the first in English to bring out the full light of Jesus and the prophets and apostles. The golden keys to unlock the whole truth are Grammar and Internal Harmony. Grammatical purity means, where possible, word for word, grammar for grammar, phrase by phrase translation from the Greek, each word true to its form and meaning, not bent to fit orthodoxy or translators’ hasty or vain ideas. The honest method of Grammatical purity and Internal Harmony ensure that the Greek is reproduced accurately, and the truth is unlocked. This has not been done before in English. This is the hour for correction. This is a declaration of the original truth and light of the prophets and apostles. This is a declaration of the approaching new eon and the gospel of eonian life. The old voices of the prophets and apostles of God are restored.

2. *The labour*

Translating the word of God is the most difficult academic and intellectual – and spiritual – task in the world. It is not a work that can be carried out by the flesh-natured man; nor by the slugabed. Not all the qualifications in the world can equip you for the spiritual labour without which you cannot complete the translation of the word of God. Just as understanding the word of God is a lifetime study, so, by obvious consequence, is translating the word of God a lifetime study. It is a lifetime commitment of learning, revision, and correction. Genesis to Revelation contains over three quarters of a million words, written in three languages, often elliptical, with grammatical idiosyncrasies, figures of speech, idioms, alliterative effects, rare words and phrases, syntactic devices, acrostics, composed by numerous writers at different times to different audiences in different epochs of prophetic history, with overlapping themes and parallel narratives, all from the mind of an unseen God from Whom we are somewhat remote. Not until the New Jerusalem, when He will be seated with His son Jesus Christ, will He be seen.

It is written that nothing impure may enter that city, New Jerusalem. Any translation of the

word of God, in that case, must be pure or it cannot be taken into the city.

On Sunday, 9 December 1979, in a tin shack I heard something read from the Bible. I left the shack in ecstasy. I was never the same again. I became instantly obsessed with the Bible and in time mine fell to bits. Around 1990 (for whatever dreams are worth) I dreamed I was standing on a table in the large front room of my house, and I was calling out to a crowd jammed into that room, "I've found the Scriptures! I've found the Scriptures!" In the mid-1990s I turned to reading Tyndale and Bullinger. I had always been much dissatisfied by the Bible versions I read. Then it came to August 1997. In the private library of a Berwick-on-Tweed guest-house, I crossed the room and interrupted a conversation with two elderly gentlemen. That moment was to change my life for ever. I'd overheard them discussing something about "immortality of the soul", so I asked what they were implying. "Well it's not right, is it?" said one of them, Rowland Wickes. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (from Ezekiel 18\4 and 18\20). So the "soul" dies ... is mortal ... He gave me a copy of a book he had published, *The Path to Immortality*. It cited Moses: "the man Adam became a living soul" (Genesis 2\7). Ah, so the soul is the *person*, the person dies, and returns to dust (Genesis 3\19). Man does not *have* a soul: he *is* a soul. So if a man is burned up, there remains nothing, nothing ... It was back home a few days later while sitting on a bench in the sun beside a lake that I had the vision of making a translation. It burst through, like a leaping trout bursting into the air. It arose in me and filled me. It lifted me, so to speak, from the bench and I walked home and began, and have never ceased since.

The translator is trapped in a paradox (a form of irony): you cannot translate the words until you understand the context, but you cannot understand the context until you translate the words. This is the conundrum the translator has to resolve. The translator has to put on the white garments of integrity: not loading anything with personal bias; be able to admit error; be diligent to re-investigate; count no labour too arduous; learn to hold some things with tentativeness and await further light; keep records to ensure consistency; be ever enquiring; check and check and check a hundred times and then check a hundred times again; have the work edited many times as it progresses; write studies about themes discovered and put the conclusions to the test; use it; wait and wait and have the patience, as the saying goes, of the prophet Job. Show me an error, I'll change it; suggest an enhancement, I'll consider it.

God declares He hates mixture. The twelve tribes of the sons of Israel were, by the statutes of God, forbidden from crossbreeding cattle, sewing their fields with mixed seed, and wearing garments mixed of linen and wool (Leviticus 19\19, 20\12, Deuteronomy 22\11). They were forbidden from marrying outside their people, so as not to mix the patriarchal seed (Genesis 28\1, 28\6, Deuteronomy 7\3-4, Joshua 23\12, 1 Kings 8\53 et cetera). Mixtures were, by the statute of God, detestable to Him. So, impurity and mixture are detested. He demands from us that which is pure and undefiled. Only a sacrificial lamb or goat "without blemish" was acceptable (Exodus 12\5, Leviticus 22\19). By these standards, we have enough cause to test the spirits of what are promoted as translations of the word of God. We should be driven to wanting our translation pure and undefiled, not mixtures of truth and error. We must examine it closely, not blindly accepting the impure mixtures of truth and error, the works of religious orthodoxy by flesh-natured men: translating is a spiritual exercise.

What a burden the translator of the word of God puts himself under! He is, as it were, making himself a messenger of the divine truths of the prophets and apostles. The writer of Hebrews (Paul) says that "the oracle spoken through messengers became unbreakable" (Hebrews 2\2). How, then, dare a translator treat his task with anything but utmost gravity? Indeed, those who add, those who take away, and those who make perversions of the word of God will be called liars and be destroyed (Proverbs 30\6, 2 Peter 3\16, Revelation 22\18-19). If the works of religious orthodoxy, the adversary of the truth of the prophets and apostles, take away "the key of knowledge" (Luke 11\32), then the truth of God sounds foreign and ridiculous. And, in that case, those works have to be left behind and abandoned, fit only for museums.

I came into this work through the enlightening enhancements and corrections that Dr EW Bullinger and Otis Q Sellers made of traditional renderings of manifold words and phrases. They alone of commentators have applied themselves seriously to the labour of translation truth. Their works revolutionized my attitude to Biblical reading and study, compelling me to question the translation and not accept it as necessarily right. It soon became obvious, then, that a proper English translation was, after all these centuries, still needed.

3. Impregnable Translation Laws

Since I began this work long ago on a burning day in August 1997, yearning only to retrieve the truth of the prophets and apostles, it is not surprising that I have formulated strict and defined targets and translating laws. As it is written, “If anybody speaks, *let it be* in harmony with the oracles of God” (1 Peter 4\11). These targets and principles, for shorthand, I describe in two acronyms.

ACL. The first of the acronyms is **ACL**: *Accuracy*, *Clarity*, and *Literariness*. Precision in verbal *Accuracy* so that the exact truths of God and Christ are recovered; *Clarity* so that everybody can understand every part and nothing is obscured by clumsy or difficult or archaic English writing; and *Literariness* so that the God-given literary styles and devices of the prophets and apostles are honoured and reproduced as closely as is reasonably possible. *Literariness* includes devices and poetical figures such as “eyelids of the dawn”, “lords of the wing”, and “daughters of music” for, respectively, sunrise and birds (Job 3\9, Ecclesiastes 10\20, 12\4, Proverbs 1\17). There are language devices such as fronting; for example “Me” and “Against me” in Jacob’s “Me you have bereaved ... Against me have turned all these things” (Genesis 42\36), drawing attention to his self-focus and self-pity. For another of countless examples, at Isaiah 14\11 the style of the original is “Down goes to the grave your pomp”, so that the phrase “your pomp” is at the end of the sentence (not at the beginning as in the KJV), and the verb at the front. To open with “Down goes” creates vengeful drama with the excitement of the descent of the evil king of Babylon into death and his grave, his tyranny at last avenged. The prophets used these devices purposely. What a shame they have been lost to us in commercial bibles. I have written before (in my New Testament) about recovering the literary styles of the prophets and apostles. Not until Dr. Robert Alter published *The Art of Bible Translation* in 2019 had I heard a single person make mention of retrieving anything of underlying styles. I was excited to read Dr. Alter making the same complaint. He describes many examples. Also integral to *Literariness* is the labour towards refreshing language. Part of achieving a literary style demands fresh language and the avoidance of clichéd vocabulary, regurgitated words and phrases.³ Dissatisfying repetitions offend concepts of *Literariness*.

It was over fifteen years of trials and deliberating on how best to represent the Greek word ἐκκλησία (*ekklesia*), at Matthew 16\18 et cetera, before I settled on transliterating it. It signifies “those who are called out”. Tyndale had “congregation”. I thought of “outcalling”. In the end I realised the best and perhaps only way is the transliteration “Ekklesia”, with “Ekklesia groups” (or “Ekklesias”) for its plural, capitalizing it because it represents a future ruling body of

3. The words “great”, “greater”, “greatest”, “greatness” and “greatly” occur, in all, a staggering 1,072 times (my count) in the KJV, representing 25 forms of Greek words and numerous Hebrew words. Since there are 783,137 words in the KJV (with 3,116,480 characters; wordcounter.net), those 1,072 “great” words constitute 0.136% (my count) of the entire KJV. According to an online lexicon, “behold” occurs 1,326 times in the KJV. That 1,326 number constitutes 0.71% of the entire KJV. Together with the “great” words, that means 0.306% of the KJV consists of “great” and “behold”. That is just over 1/300th part of the whole book, one in every 300 words. The King James translators wrote “way” and its derivatives over 750 times, to represent 32 Hebrew and Greek words (taking up 7 columns in my small-print Young’s Concordance). The word “cast” occurs 510 times (my count) to represent 112 forms of Hebrew words and 33 Greek words. The word “ever” and its derivative phrases total 850 words, representing 13 Hebrew and Greek words. Add these: 1072+1326+750+510+851 = 4,508 words, out of 783,137 words; this is 0.5757% of the KJV, one in every 174 words (all my counts).

authority (2 Timothy 2\12 et cetera).

GIHRLT. My second acronym for translation principles is **GIHRLT**: *Grammar, Internal Harmony, Research, Logic and Text*. Under the code of **Grammar** I labour to reproduce, as much as is reasonable from one language to another, the grammatical forms of words and phrases, the cases and number of nouns, the tenses and voices and moods of verbs; and to follow grammatical structures and syntactic style (word order). The objective is to produce a translation which would translate back into the original language; that is the test. If a verb is perfect active singular, I do not translate it as imperfect passive plural (compare John 1\3 in the KJV; see section 5). If a word is a plural noun I do not translate it as a singular adjective (compare Daniel 9\24, 1 Timothy 1\17; see section 5). **Internal Harmony** concerns consistency thematically, and consistency in parallel passages, so that nothing is contradictory, inconsistent, or reckless. Another feature of **Internal Harmony** is my cross-referencing by footnotes when people are known by alternative names; for example “Zephi” in 1 Chronicles 1\36 is also known as “Zepho” at Genesis 36\11. **Internal Harmony** also involves consistency in parallel passages. **Research** speaks for itself; this has been from multiple sources, with no allegiances by this translator (member or affiliate to no group); a portion of this is reflected in the bibliography. **Logic** often overlaps with Internal Harmony. At Matthew 23\3 and Romans 9\3 (see section 5) the KJV choices are against all logic and sense. The KJV is wrong at 1 Timothy 6\10, saying money is “the root” of all evils; that is just not true (Genesis 3, for example. Were Adam and Eve after money?), and it is illogical. There is no article in the Greek: it should read “a root”. The KJV’s bad logic is a discredit to the word of God. **Logic** dictates interpretation and understanding so that if, say, God has declared through His prophets that He has set one people apart to be “high above all nations of the Earth” (Exodus 19\5-6, Deuteronomy 7\6 et cetera), He cannot then also set any other peoples apart into the same high position unless His promise to the first people is broken – which it is not; He made a new and “better Covenant” with the first people (Jeremiah 31\31-31, Matthew 26\26-28, Romans 9\6, Hebrews 7\22, 8\6-13, 9\15, 9\20, 10\16-17, 12\24, 13\20). The coming Kingdom is the “Kingdom of the Exalted” (Matthew 3\2). This incontestable **Logic** determines the understanding of such passages as Ephesians 1\3, 2 Timothy 2\12, Revelation 21\12-13, 21\24-26. The KTK provides footnotes resolving **Text** issues, such as at Genesis 5\3-22 concerning ages of the descendants of Adam and Seth, and the generations of Shem at Genesis 11\12-26. The translation principle of **Text** is discussed in Section 4.

ORGANIC translating against PROCESSED translating. These targets and principles, **ACL** and **GIHRLT**, are all ordered (subsumed) under the heading of **ORGANIC** translating. Only with these principles can a reliable translation be made, an **ORGANIC** translation. This **ORGANIC** principle is the righteous method, honouring to the original writers, to the texts, and honouring to God. For only the solid foundations of reproducing the original grammatical forms as closely as possible are of any use – the impregnable foundations of the Science of Deep Grammar, Internal Harmony, Transcendent Logic, Diamond-Mining Research, and Textual sense – so that no false teachings can be formed around it, and the rich and sparkling truths of God are revealed in power once more, as in the days of the prophets and apostles.

The method of **ORGANIC** translating contrasts with **PROCESSED** translating which alters the meaning of words; alters grammatical forms to accommodate orthodoxy; adds and subtracts words; paraphrases wildly and sloppily; makes words up; regurgitates clichés that have gone before; regurgitates errors that have gone before; punctuates erratically and inaccurately; displays lack of understanding and haste; and sometimes uses inadequate and mutilated Greek texts for the New Testament. By such a **PROCESSED** method a translator would only see mistily what is before him, regardless of what is in the pages before and after, and he would not mind altering meanings so that the words say whatever he believes, or whatever he might want them to say, or however he wished they were styled. The wild paraphrases stray far from the underlying

words, adding, taking away and rewriting in whatever way takes his fancy, being already dissatisfied with the divinely inspired styles, wishing they were in his own inferior style.

It is not surprising, given the liberty of religious orthodoxy, that my targets and translation principles have produced different results to everything we have had to endure beforehand in popular (commercial) translations, with various disharmonies, irregularities and error. Nor is it surprising that after over 24 years of intense labour, the fruits of that labour point to different conclusions to those of traditional, orthodox religion, built on foundations of sand. My principles and targets are driven by one thing: integrity to resurrect the truth of the prophets and apostles that I knew were being buried. This also means sometimes gently guiding, sometimes trampling on, false teachings which have misled and divided so many sincere believers. Many false teachings by many groups and sects have been concocted from popular errant translations made on foundations of sand. It means finding the glory of the blaze of light in what has *really* been written for us.

4. Translation principles concerning **Text**

The fifth translation principle behind *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible* is **Text**. The translator has to consider what text he might work from to provide a reliable work. What is he relying on to transmit the full divine revelation of our salvation lifeblood? Really, this question comes before all else. For example, if an Old Testament translation were based solely on the Septuagint, it would have some strengths but it would be riddled with faults and be unreliable. If it were based solely on the Masoretic Text, that would be far safer indeed, but still calling for some correction. If a New Testament translation were based on Alexandrian manuscripts, such as **Ⲡ** or B (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, the former now unsurprisingly said by some scholars to be a fraud), it would be riddled with faults, as many are, and it would have much missing, as many have. If it were based on the Byzantine Textus Receptus (as is the KJV), that would be far superior but, as shown by Robinson-Pierpont, still in need of some improvement.

God has preserved His word, for without it we would be lost and unsaved, left without knowledge of true history and prophecy, without wisdom, and without the lifeblood of salvation. But – rejoice! – that is not the case. God has preserved the complete inspired writings of His prophets and apostles, but not all in one or two texts (as far as we know). Unfortunately, because of the hand of multitudinous copyists and translators, errors have been made, and attacks have been sustained, so that manuscripts have variances, with the result that the whole truth has to be discerned, by principles of sense and harmonisation, from the large body of texts and early letters and commentaries and translations. Regarding the Old Testament, scholars make appeals to the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS), the Masoretic Text (MT), the Septuagint (LXX, a Greek translation of the Old Testament), the Aramaic Targum, Syriac Peshitto, and others. Some words and phrases in certain places might seem more logically and more harmoniously preserved in, say, DSS or LXX than the standard MT. For example, adjustments are sensibly made, in my opinion, at Genesis 5\3-17, 5\21-23, 46\27, Exodus 1\5, 12\40, Deuteronomy 32\8, Isaiah 61\1, Psalm 145\9, 145\13, 145\14 (see the footnotes). In DSS there is no Esther.

The Hebrew and Aramaic basis for *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible* (KTK) Old Testament, Genesis to 2 Chronicles, is principally the standard Masoretic Text (MT). Several sensible adjustments or alternatives are described in footnotes of the KTK.

Robinson-Pierpont Byzantine Textform 2005. The New Testament of the KTK translation is based (with written permission) on the Greek of the Robinson-Pierpont Byzantine Textform 2005, compiled by Maurice A Robinson and William G Pierpont. My use of the Robinson-Pierpont text (RP) means slight variations to the Textus Receptus (TR) text which underlies the New Testament of the KJV. The differences, although numerous, are mostly minor, but they do enhance some passages. The Robinson-Pierpont Textform is a major and welcome advancement in textual authority. It has the most impressive early support and

agreement from early versions and other writers over a large geographical area and over a long period of time. Some translators are recognising this and are using it. *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible* New Testament (New Covenant) writings are, therefore, based on the Robinson-Pierpont Byzantine Textform 2005.

The variations in their Greek text sometimes mean (in translation) no more than “a” or “the”; sometimes “Christ Jesus” instead of “Jesus Christ” (eg 1 Timothy 1\2, making it consistent with Paul’s style at 2 Timothy 1\2; Hebrews 3\1); sometimes different words; sometimes the absences of words which the TR has; sometimes the inclusion of words which the TR does not have. Some differences (in translation) are:–

The sentence “So they went their way” closes Matthew 20\4 in the TR text, but opens Matthew 20\5 in the RP text. The RP’s Matthew 23\13 and 14 are the TR’s Matthew 23\14 and 13. At Matthew 26\26 the TR text has “having exalted”, but the RP text has “having given thanks”, in agreement with the next verse, 26\27. Mark 12\32 does not have θεός (*theos*), which the TR text does have. Mark 15\34 in the RP text has “Eloi, Eloi, lima sabachthani”, whereas the TR text has “Eloi, Eloi, lamma sabachthani”. Where at Luke 1\35 the RP has “that Holy One who will be born”, the TR has “that Holy One who will be born out of you” (adding ἐκ σοῦ, “out of you”). Where at Luke 20\19 the RP has “afraid”, the TR has “afraid of the people” (adding τὸν λαόν, “the people”). Where at Acts 13\23 the RP text has “brought salvation”, the TR text has “raised a Saviour”. Also at Acts 13\23 the RP text does not have the word “Jesus” at the end which the TR does have. At Acts 21\11 the RP text has “feet and hands” instead of the TR’s “hands and feet”. The RP’s Romans 14\24-26 is found in the TR at Romans 16\25-27. The RP’s 2 Corinthians 1\6-7 is slightly different to the TR’s, both in text arrangement and verse division (the clause “and our gladly-held expectation for you *is* certain” is in verse 6 in the RP text, but it opens verse 7 in the TR text). So also is the RP’s 2 Corinthians 12\21 slightly different, the RP text giving the assurance of “will not humble” (ταπεινώσει, future indicative), but the TR having the more tentative “may not humble” (ταπεινώσῃ, subjunctive). At Ephesians 5\21 the RP text has “in reverence of Christ”, whereas the TR text has “in reverence of God”. At the end of Hebrews 2\7 the TR text has the clause “and You set him over the works of Your hands”, but the RP text does not have this. At Jude 24 the TR text has “Now to Him being able to care for you”, whereas the RP text has “Now to Him being able to care for them”. At Revelation 9\16 the RP text has “a hundred million [or, myriad of myriads]” instead of the TR’s “two hundred million [or, two myriads of myriads]”. At Revelation 21\16 the RP text has “12,012” instead of the TR’s “12,000”. Revelation 21\24 has minor differences, the RP text not including (surely rightly) the TR text’s addition “of those saved”, and the RP text adds “for him”, and there are other minute differences in the verse. The most numerous differences between the two texts are in Revelation.

The more strident variations are a few omissions. The RP text does not have (in translation): “and in fire” at Matthew 3\11; the TR’s Luke 17\36; the TR’s Acts 8\37; the TR’s sentence at the end of Acts 9\5, “*it is* hard for you to kick against the goads”; the TR’s first two parts of Acts 9\6; the TR’s Acts 15\34; the TR’s latter part of Acts 24\6; the TR’s Acts 24\7; the TR’s first part of Acts 24\8; “before the throne of God” at Revelation 14\5. The RP text happily omits “the foul comma” at 1 John 5\7-8, which should not have been smuggled in.

Often the RP text has more logic to it than does the TR reading, and often the RP text has a more genuine ring to it than the TR text. For example (in translation): at James 5\11 the TR text has “of Job, you have seen [εἶδετε, indicative], then, the outcome”, whereas the RP text, more logically, has “of Job. Understand [ἴδετε, imperative], then, the outcome”, more logical because of the imperative being in agreement with the imperatives surrounding it. At Revelation 1\5 the RP text has the joyful “him loving us”, present participle, whereas the TR text has the less happy “him having loved us”, past tense. At Revelation 1\6 the TR text has “made us kings”, but the

RP text has “made us a kingdom”. At Revelation 22\19 the TR text has the curious “God shall take away his part from *the* Book of Life”, whereas the RP text has the exceedingly more logical “may God take away his share from the Tree of Life”. No Greek manuscript has “book of life” there: the TR is at fault in adopting it, as is the KJV in following it.

The fact is, there is no single Greek manuscript of the New Testament which can be knowingly claimed to represent exactly the prophets’ and apostles’ original manuscripts. Who could say which it is? Only God and the authors know. Also, of all the 5,000+ known manuscripts there are no two manuscripts which are identical. However, Robinson and Pierpont have been able to show, as they say, that: “The Byzantine Textform preserves with a great consistency the type of New Testament text that dominated the Greek-speaking world” (p. v); and: “Byzantine-priority presents as canonical the Greek New Testament text as it has been attested, preserved, and maintained by scribes throughout the centuries” (p. vii); and: “Manuscripts and readings must be evaluated in regard to their antiquity, diversity, and continuity within transmissional [written from copies] history. Individual scribes must be characterized in regard to their degree of care when copying from their exemplars. A proper implementation of each of these factors results in a well-established representation of the traditionally disseminated Byzantine Textform. This Textform dominated textual transmission in the primary Greek-speaking regions for more than a thousand years, and it is this Textform that holds the strongest transmissional claim to represent the canonical autographs” (p. xv).

The claim that the Byzantine Textform was neither dominant nor in the majority until the ninth century Robinson and Pierpont refute by saying: “it simply does not accord with the known facts. Sufficient manuscript and patristic evidence exists from the mid-fourth century onward ... patristic writers beyond the fourth century rarely reflect any text resembling a predominantly *non*-Byzantine document” (pp. 582-83). “Patristic” means “by the church fathers”.

After 27 years of their “intense collaboration (1976-2003)” (p. xxiii), Robinson and Pierpont were able to conclude that their text, in its present edition, “sets forth a text that – within the framework of its underlying theory – is considered to reflect the canonical autographs in a highly accurate manner” (p. xvi); and: “the editors here present the newly edited Byzantine Textform as the strongest representative of the canonical autographs of the Greek New Testament text. It has been toward the fulfillment of this most noble and sacred goal that the editors have labored and now present the completion of their task” (p. xxiii).

Concerning 1 Timothy 3\16. At 1 Timothy 3\16 it is necessary to depart from both the TR text and from the RP text on which my translation is based. These texts have the word θεός (*theos*), “God”, so that the KJV, for example, reads: “God was manifest in the flesh” (the word “the” in that clause is a saucy addition, there being no such article in the Greek). There are also, though, ancient Greek manuscripts which read ὅς (“who”, or “which”, or “he who”, or “he”). This translation follows that latter textual reading, and has “He was brought to light in flesh”.

The manuscript scholar John Burgon, in his *Revision Revised*, 1883, complains of the texts which have ὅς that the neuter noun μυστήριον (*musterion*), “mystery”, is followed by a masculine pronoun ὃς (*hos*) (*Revision Revised*, p. 426). First though, the masculine pronoun does not have to agree with what Burgon saw as its antecedent, μυστήριον. The masculine pronoun acts as the subject of the verb δικαιώω (*dikaioo*), meaning “was declared righteous”, which follows the pronoun and points to Jesus. As antecedent, it can be either an understood reference or a remote reference to Jesus. There is such a remote antecedent in 1 John 3\5: “you know that he was brought to light in order that he might take away our sins” – that “he” we know is Jesus; it’s just understood.

Second, Paul in Colossians 1\27 has the same construction which Burgon objected to at 1 Timothy 3\16, μυστήριον (neuter) followed by ὃς (masculine). Paul writes: “this mystery [μυστήριον] among the nations, which [ὃς] is Christ among you”. That is, a neuter noun

followed by a masculine pronoun, just as in 1 Timothy 3\16. Notice that “to make known ... the mystery among the nations ... expectation of magnificence” at Colossians 1\27 is a quiet echo of 1 Timothy 3\16. Notice too that the mystery relates to “Christ”, not God. At Colossians 4\3 also, Paul speaks of “the mystery of Christ”. So too is the *post-resurrection* Christ the subject of “the mystery” at 1 Timothy 3\16.

My 1895 edition of Westcott’s and Hort’s *Revised Version* (their NT originally 1881) has in the margin at 1 Timothy 3\16: “The word *God* [θεός], in place of *He who* [ὃς], rests on no sufficient ancient evidence”. That was a lie, and they must have known it. (Westcott and Hort’s rendering of 1 Timothy 3\16 is an ungrammatical horror.) Burgon was able to cite 289 manuscripts having θεός. However, Burgon also described 6 manuscripts having ὃς. It is true that there are far more texts having θεός than there are texts having ὃς, but this is a war of truth, not a simple matter of painting by numbers.

Burgon suggested that ΘC, which is a contracted, uncial form of θεός (contracted as “a sacred name”, *nomina sacra*, as some shy men might needlessly write G-d for God), got altered to OC, the contracted form of ὃς (eg, Burgon, pp. 442-3). This would be done, Burgon suggests, by the removal of the line in the theta, Θ, either blurred in time or erased deliberately, creating the appearance of an omicron, O: that would then come to be a reading in favour of ὃς. However, if any changing was done, much more likely is it that a line was later *added* to the O, omicron, of OC, to make it into a theta, Θ, done either accidentally, or pulled off deliberately by post-Nicene scribes who saw their chance. The crafty addition of a line is much easier to pull off than the removal of a line.

There has long been contention over whether or not there is a line in the omicron in Manuscript A. People see what they want to see. Dr. Henry Alford, another great Victorian scholar, and who wrote the lovely song *Come, Ye Thankful People, Come*, speaks of the advantage of microscopic evidence settling the dispute. Writing some two decades before Burgon, Alford had this to say of Manuscript A (his italics): “ος ... *is now [a] matter of certainty*. The black line at present visible in the ο, is a modern retouching of an older but not original fainter one, due apparently to the darkening of the stroke of an ε seen through from the other side. I have examined the page, and find that a portion of the virgula of the ε, seen through, and now corroded through, extends nearly through the Θ, not however quite in, but somewhat above, its centre, as Sir Frederick Madden has observed to me. It was to complete this that Junius made a dot ... Besides which, the mark of abbreviation above the line is modern, not corresponding with those in the MSS. Sir Frederick Madden now informs me that a very powerful microscope has been applied by Professor Maskelyne, at his request, to the passage in the MS, and the result has been that *no trace of either virgula in the ο, or mark of contraction over it, can be discovered*. It is to be hoped, therefore, that A will never again be cited on the side of [the Received Text]” (Alford, *The Greek Testament*, Vol. III, p. 332).

Dr Alford also wrote of the satisfaction of establishing the ὃς reading at 1 Timothy 3\16: “There is hardly a passage in the N.T., in which I feel more deep personal thankfulness for the restoration of the true and wonderful connexion of the original text” (Alford, p. 333).

Textual and grammatical debates aside, the matter is easily decided on internal criteria. On purely internal evidence, the KJV’s “God ... in ... flesh” cannot be correct. It’s all out of joint: there is nothing from Genesis to Revelation to support any notion that God ever appeared in flesh. God, that is, the Father, has not ever appeared in flesh. Jesus said “God *is* spirit” (John 4\24). God is not flesh; God is spirit. In addition, Balaam said “El [God] is not a man ... nor a son of man” (Numbers 23\19). Balaam tells us what God *is not*: a man, or a son of man. Jesus tells us what God *is*: spirit. This is the exact opposite of Jesus who was *not* spirit and *is* a man, and he called himself “the Son of Man”. In that case, the θεός reading at 1 Timothy 3\16 is impossible and a falsification; it disrupts internal harmony. God is not flesh. It also disrupts

sense: there cannot be two who are God.

John says: “every spirit who professes Jesus Christ to have come in flesh is from God” (1 John 4\2-3, 2 John 7). It was not the Father who “came in flesh”. It would make no sense for John to say that the Son came in flesh, but then for Paul to have said that God came in flesh. God is “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” (Ephesians 1\3). The Son cannot be the Father of the Son. The Son was born in flesh, and even after his resurrection he denied being a spirit, saying, “a spirit does not have flesh and bones as you see me having” (Luke 24\39), even though having a spiritual body not subject to death (1 Corinthians 15\44-46). God is spirit and always was spirit, and never was flesh, and never will be flesh. No sluiceway of polytheistic spin-doctoring could ever overpower this ecstatic truth.

John Burgon, otherwise a magnificent and brilliant scholar, has much to say about his textual preference for θεός at 1 Timothy 3\16 and about the phrase “the mystery of godliness” (*Revision Revised*, pp. 497-98). He has little to say, though, about what follows in 1 Timothy 3\16, that it is all so obviously about the resurrected Son, and that it is irrelevant to the Father: “he was declared righteous in spirit; he was seen by angels; he was proclaimed among nations; he was believed in *the* world; he was taken up in magnificence.” Who, then, was “in flesh” but the Son, “the Son of the Father” (2 John 3)? Does God need to be “declared righteous”? Who could declare Him so? Who was “seen by angels” but the Son? The angels had been seeing God ever since the day He created them. Who was “proclaimed among nations” but the Son? Who was “taken up” to be magnified in Heaven by angels of God but the Son (Philippians 2\9-11)? Who could take God up? Just as we “will live with him by *the* power of God”, so is it also written that “Christ ... lives by *the* power of God” (2 Corinthians 13\4), and “the fountainhead of Christ *is* God” (1 Corinthians 11\3). And it is written, “God *is* not a man” (Numbers 23\19) and God Himself says, “I *am* God and not a man” (Hosea 11\9).

It might be said in accusation that I’ve made my doctrine (“God is spirit”) then I’ve picked my text (θεός). However, it would be reasonable to reply, you’ve picked your text (θεός), then you’ve made your doctrine. First, though, my doctrine is internal, and is consistent internally, and it fits the context, whereas the other reading fits only an imported, external (pagan, polytheistic) doctrine. And second, all argument is demolished without any further need of discussion by those simple words spoken by Jesus, “God *is* spirit” (John 4\24). It is honouring to God and to Christ to represent them in truth as the prophets and apostles did. Anything else is apostasy and hated by God. Recall how God spoke to Job’s friend Eliphaz the Temanite: “My anger glows hot against you and against your two friends, for you have not spoken of Me *what is* right” (Job 42\7).

Now this internal solution to 1 Timothy 3\16 has been brought to light, it is time to be gladly shaking the dust of our feet on the troublesome θεός reading.

And there is yet more. Burgon wanted θεός because, dissatisfied that “God is one” (Romans 3\30 et cetera), he took it that the KJV reading of “God was manifest in the flesh” is some mystical statement about a strange incarnation (born in flesh) of God Almighty, like a Greek myth! However, 1 Timothy 3\16 certainly has nothing at all to do with any sort of incarnation of the God Who “is spirit” and Who cannot be tempted and Who cannot die. The statement that Jesus “was brought to light in flesh” signifies his *post-resurrection appearances* to his disciples. The six astounding statements which describe the “mystery of godliness” – all indicated by passive verbs – are a summary of the magnificent events concerning Jesus after his resurrection, nothing at all to do with anybody’s birth:

He was brought to light in flesh;
he was declared righteous in spirit;

~ Mark 16\12, 16\14, John 21\14, 1 John 1\2
~ John 20\17, 1 Corinthians 15\42-46,
Hebrews 9\14

he was seen by angels (or, messengers);	~ Matthew 28\2, John 20\12, Acts 1\10
he was proclaimed among nations;	~ Romans 14\25, Colossians 1\27-28
he was believed in <i>the</i> world;	~ Acts 2\41, Romans 1\8
he was taken up in magnificence.	~ Mark 16\19, Luke 24\51, Acts 1\9-11

The Greek for “he was brought to light” is ἐφανερώθη (*ephanerōthee*). This word ἐφανερώθη has nothing to do with any incarnation of anybody. The word in that exact form occurs in relation to Jesus’ post-resurrection appearances: ⁴ “After these things, he was brought to light [ἐφανερώθη] in a different form” (Mark 16\12); “Later, in their sitting together eating, he was brought to light [ἐφανερώθη] to the eleven” (Mark 16\14); “This *is* the third time now that Jesus was brought to light [ἐφανερώθη] to the disciples” (John 21\14); and, “for the life also was brought to light [ἐφανερώθη] – and *that which* we have seen and given witness to, and proclaim to you, the conian life which was in relation to the Father, and was brought to light [ἐφανερώθη] to us” (1 John 1\2). In the gospels the KJV wrongly has those passive verbs as active verbs, such as “he appeared”, so that the positive link to 1 Timothy 3\16 is less likely to be noticed. The same verb is used in the active form at John 21\1: “After these things, Jesus again brought himself to light [ἐφανερώσεν] to the disciples on the Sea of Tiberias”. Luke says Jesus gave directions to the apostles “to whom, with many certain signs, he presented himself alive after his suffering, being seen by them throughout forty days, and speaking of the things concerning the Kingdom of God” (Acts 1\2-3). These are passages we should have in mind in relation to Jesus “being brought to light” in 1 Timothy 3\16.

These post-resurrection appearances of Jesus are exactly what Paul is referring to at 1 Timothy 3\16 in his saying Jesus “was brought to light [ἐφανερώθη] in flesh”. The phrase “in flesh” is set in apposition to the phrase, “in spirit”. So the resurrection body is flesh, but it is incapable of sin. Jesus was born flesh, capable of temptation and sin (Hebrews 4\15) and also mortal; he was resurrected in flesh and bones (Luke 24\39, Ezekiel 37\4-13); and he received the resurrection “spiritual body” (1 Corinthians 15\42-46) which, like God, cannot die. The “spiritual *was* not first, but the natural. The spiritual *came* afterwards”.

So centuries of debates about some mystical incarnation were an irrelevance.

If – *if* – after all that, it were proven that θεός is the correct textual reading, even then the passage is still about Christ and not about God. For it stands that “God *is* spirit” (John 4\24), never flesh; and everything in 1 Timothy 3\16 tells us that it is about Christ, not God. If – *if* – the reading is θεός, the clause would read “God was brought to light in flesh”. This could only be understood scripturally if aligned with Hebrews 1\3, saying that Jesus is “*the* radiance of *His* glory and the exact expression of [God’s] essence [or, God’s being]”. That is to say, Paul would be telling us not that Jesus is God, in contradiction with everything else he and all Scripture has said about Jesus and God (1 Corinthians 8\6, Galatians 4\4, Ephesians 4\5-6 et cetera), but that Jesus the Son is *exactly like* his Father. This is how Jesus is able to declare, “If you had known me, you would also have known my Father. But from now on you do know Him, and you have seen Him” (John 14\7) and “He who has seen me has seen the Father” (John 14\9); not of course that he, the Son, *is* the Father, which would be ridiculous – was he praying to himself? Is the Son the Father of the Son? Did the Son create himself in Mary? Did he raise himself (therefore not die at all)? – but that he is the *exact likeness* of his Father, and that he has perfect unity with the Father, and “I am in the Father, and the Father is in me” (John 14\10). “If you had known me, you would also have known my Father.” This is what the Greek words θεός ἐφανερώθη would be telling us should the text read θεός and not ὁς. But the ὁς reading must be preferred.

Concerning the Text at Revelation 21\6. There is one other word where I find it

4. The full list of occurrences of this passive verb form ἐφανερώθη is: Mark 16\12, 16\14, John 21\14, Colossians 1\26, 1 Timothy 3\16, 1 John 1\2 (twice), 3\2, 3\5, 3\8, 4\9.

particularly needful to depart from the RP text and prefer the TR text. At Revelation 21\6 the RP text has the word γέγονα (*gegona*), making God say “I have become the Alpha and the Omega”. If Jesus had been the speaker, that would be harmonious with his being newly titled by God on his entry into Heaven (Philippians 2\9). But verse 21\7 (“I will be God to him”) shows that this is God speaking as God and Father to his sons, not Jesus who is “Lord” (Matthew 7\21) and “brother” (Romans 8\29). And consequently, God being the speaker here makes the RP text’s verb form γέγονα disharmonious with the unchangeable nature of God in its suggestion that God became titled. (Who could title *Him!*) The TR and related texts, though, have γέγονε (*gegone*), “it has come / come to pass / come into existence / happened”, that is, the culmination of God’s redemption plan, and this is all harmonious with the context. Those other texts then agreeably have ἐγώ εἰμι (*ego eimi*), “I am”, so that God is saying “I am the Alpha and the Omega”. The RP text, though, omits ἐγώ εἰμι, leaving the title “Alpha and Omega” vulnerable to the disagreeable verb γέγονα. In further support of the argument for γέγονε, Revelation 16\17 sees an angel saying “It has come!” and the verb form in both texts is the agreeable γέγονε. Consequently, I am bound to follow the TR text at Revelation 21\6.

I do not follow the RP text slavishly. In all, I depart from it (and prefer the TR text) at Matthew 19\9, Acts 8\37, Ephesians 3\5, 1 Timothy 3\16, Revelation 11\8, 21\6, 22\18. These are footnoted in KTK. My RP Greek text is, in view of these things, a minutely revised RP Greek text. (Addition, 8/8/2023: TR preferred at Colossians 1\14 with “through his blood”.)

Concerning the Text at John 3\13. There is one other textual contention necessary to discuss here, and that is the clause ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (*hō hōn en tō ouranō*) appearing at the end of John 3\13. The KJV and many other versions have Jesus referring to himself as “the Son of Man who is in Heaven” – and that while Jesus was standing in Jerusalem talking to a priest, yet at the same time saying he was in Heaven! Clearly there is a problem. There might be as many versions which include those words as there are versions which do not have them. Some versions fiddle with the Greek and make a false representation.

The truth is, either the translation “who is in Heaven” is wrong, or the Greek text on which that is based is wrong. The Greek phrase ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (*hō hōn en tō ouranō*), which the KJV’s “who is in Heaven” pretends to represent, is in the RP and TR texts, but it is not found in all manuscripts. Some refer to it as an ancient gloss, an editor’s fancy addition. Despite this, most commentators seem in favour of its retention, and that is for varied reasons. Some comments are comical, suggesting it proves Jesus was in Heaven and not even in Jerusalem (!); others that he was in both Jerusalem and Heaven at the same time! For example, Augustine: “Ecce, hic erat et in caelo erat” (Behold, he was here, and he was in Heaven). In two places. Origen: “Non dixit qui fuit, sed qui est in caelo” (He did not say he was here, but he is in Heaven). In one place. Not in Jerusalem. How extraordinary and out of mind, “He did not say he was here”! If he was not there, well then nor was he there at the cross or the resurrection tomb.

Unlike 1 Timothy 3\16, this passage cannot be settled internally. It can only be settled externally. The best evidence – all of which he cites in detail – comes from Burgon who lays down the facts and tells us that, along with his other manifold data, the clause is “more ancient (by 200 years) than the evidence for omitting [it]” (*Revision Revised*, p. 134).

It is neither sensible nor possible to contest here Burgon’s mass of evidence of its antiquity. On all that evidence, therefore, it is not the clause which has to be omitted but the translation which has to be corrected. This is no difficulty: the phrase ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ occurs elsewhere, so there is also Internal Harmony (unlike with the TR reading of 1 Timothy 3\16). At Luke 15\18 and 15\21 and John 3\27 οὐρανός (*ouranos*), normally “Heaven”, “sky”, stands metonymically (by association) for God as “the Exalted One” or “the Heavenly One”. And so is it with οὐρανός at John 3\13. The sensible translation of the phrase ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ is

“who is in the Exalted One”, or “who is in the Heavenly One”. That aligns harmoniously with John 14\10, “I *am* in the Father”. This blunder of the KJV and others at John 3\13 is akin to the blunder concerning Jesus’ death, where the KJV has him all at once in three places, Hell, Paradise, and Joseph’s tomb (see discussion on Luke 23\43, section 5). Here, at John 3\13, it has him in two places at once while he’s alive.

Two issues concerning the Old Covenant Texts: The Song of Songs and Esther. The King James Bible and others have after Nehemiah Esther, then after Ecclesiastes The Song of Songs. This Song of Songs and Esther have human failings in common. These works cannot be claimed as being θεόπνευστος (*theopneustos*), “God-breathed”, “God-inspired” (2 Timothy 3\16). Neither has a claim to divine inspiration. They are without divine signature and without divine quality. Neither work has the name or title of God. They are not cited anywhere in Scripture, nor do they cite Scripture; in neither is there prophet or law, divine message or command for righteousness, encouragement to walk with God, or conduct of righteousness. Both open with the smell of lust and wine. In both there are unrebuked indulgences in the worst transgressions which come from ignoring the commands of God. It was in the first and second centuries after the apostles that the Old Testament canon, and New also, began to be discussed and collated. Over two works there was particular debate: Esther and The Song of Songs. But they found their way in. The Counter Reformation Council of Trent, 1545-1563 declared Esther as canonical, because it is in the Latin *Vulgate*, and the Council’s canon included also the Apocryphal books, which we also reject as non-canonical, but accept as useful and of interest. The LXX version of Esther is different to the MT version, so the text is unstable.

In terms of a poem and construction, The Song of Songs resembles notes towards an unfinished poem. As polyphonic (many voices) poetry it is undisciplined. It switches subjects and pronouns, so that accurately ascribing identities of the apparent speakers is a matter of debate. Its ending is out of mind (“flee away ...”), peculiar and unsatisfactory, lacking the signature of divine works. It’s a celebration of prostitution, adultery and drinking. It strikes blasphemously at the heart of purity to call the arts of its king’s wine-laced sexual lusts analogous to God and Christ and “the church” and Mary, and theologians’ other hollow attempts to justify it. (How contrary it is to Mary!) It is nothing to do with “Christ and His church”. There is no prophet speaking, no God, no Christ figure, no Christ-like figure of his Ekklesia. It is contrary to the righteous conduct of the patriarchs, and to the righteous works of prophets and apostles. It’s a godless story of a lust-addicted and married Israelite king seducing a (forbidden) non-Israelite (1\5, 5\10) woman of his harem with flatteries, wine, and the ostentation of a thundering car (3\7), contrasting with how the godly Isaac and Jacob met and courted Rebekah and Rachel (from their own stock), and contrasting with the conduct of Mary and Joseph. In the midst of passion he deserts her, leaving her heart-broken and “sick with love”; she goes looking and is beaten up by his city watchmen (3\1, 5\2-8). It expresses enquiry about the pubertal development of a child (8\8). Why? It is not parable or allegory: in those respects it has invited strangled notions devoid of truth. Weak attempts to justify it as typology only expose how blasphemous it is to align its wine-fuelled lust and highly explicit bedroom imagery (4\1-5\1) with God and Christ. In practice it does not incite any righteous conduct towards God; its effect is to incite passion and desire which might have their place elsewhere. In his vanity, the king opens his poem flattering himself by having a woman panting for his kisses and “love”, he a king of lechery (6\8) into whose bedroom she has gone (1\1-3). Why should a king write a vain poem about a woman panting with lust for him? The woman whom the king has composed as panting for him has lazily neglected her work in the family vineyard, making her brothers angry (1\6). She’s one of the king’s harem. He brags of many women praising him (1\4). She’s a bragger also (2\1, 8\10). Solomon’s authorship, if it is Solomon’s, neither sanctifies nor justifies this lusty and unhealthy poem. Even if Solomon’s work, it should be excluded: not every single thing that even the apostle Paul wrote is in Scripture (1 Corinthians 5\9, Colossians 4\16). Apart from those lost

letters referred to, Paul would have written many things, being a scholar, but there would be much that he would withhold from publication. And so it would be with all Christians. Solomon (if the author), as a king of lechery, is no example anyway: “Solomon ... had 700 wives, princesses, and 300 concubines, and his wives turned his heart away.”⁴ For it came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his wives turned his heart away after other gods, and his heart was not at peace with Yahweh his Elohim like the heart of his father David.⁵ For Solomon went after Ashtoreth, the goddess of the Zidonians, and after Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites” (1 Kings 11\2-5; and see Song 6\8). Some commentators say the woman has two lovers, the king figure and a shepherd, although 1\7-14, aligned with 1\1-4, do not easily justify that. She’s boiling with lust and love for the king. Would Jesus speak any of this adulterous harem lust and drinking poem in teaching his disciples? Would he cite 1\1-3, 2\5-7, 4\1-16, 5\1-16, 6\8, 7\10, 8\8, 8\10, 8\14? Would Isaiah, would the apostles, write this as spiritual teaching? If the poem is supposed to be a picture of “Christ and the church”, would you have Jesus behaving like the poem’s king, and “the church” behaving like the king’s harem prostitutes? He would be no spotless saviour. Or if a Christian man today behaved like the king and said, “Oh, it’s not immoral. I’m a living picture of Christ and the church.” ... he would be rightly called hypocrite. Why many Christians are prepared to ditch God’s commands for purity and sobriety in order to justify this unrighteous poem, and then to go so far as even to align its very unrighteousness with Christ, is a mystery, unless, perhaps, lamely to justify their favourite translation. So too is it hypocrisy and offence to try to justify the inclusion in the word of God this unrighteous poem. It would not fit in the New Covenant writings; nor then does it fit in the Old Covenant writings. WHO BENEFITS from its inclusion? Not the Body of Christ. Not the record of the inspired writings of the prophets and apostles. How wayward, then, such circulatory and helpless comments such as “[T]he Song of Solomon has always been part of the canon because what follows from this conviction is the proof for the fact that the Song of Solomon describes in poetry the love between Christ and His church” (from a Reformed theology commentator). In other words, if you believe it’s in because of tradition, that proves what it means. A most extraordinary sentence, founded on sand! Even its reverse is not true (that because it is *not* about “Christ and His church” it should *not* be in). What *does* debar it from being in the word of God is that it is no more than a disorganized and unsatisfactory poem about passion, lust, and drinking, and is of no spiritual significance or benefit but, rather, is entirely disharmonious with righteous teaching (“drink abundantly”: 5\1, et cetera). If, as claimed by some, to attempt lamely to justify its inclusion, it concerns “Christ and the church”, so-called, why did the apostle Paul not use it as an illustration? Solomon followed “other gods” of his many female conquests; the woman is “sick with love” for him. This “song” is a work not of the spirit, but of the flesh. That is what it’s all about; and nothing else. To spiritualize it overthrows the whole of Scripture, for nothing then becomes reliable for meaning what it really means; flesh can be turned to spirit: spirit can be turned to flesh; you can say what you like and nullify everything. What is this upholding of the licentious Song of Songs but an attempt to uphold errant English translations? I suggest it is nothing more than that. Unless, of course, they do not like God’s commands for obedience and purity. To overlook the poem’s impurity is to apply double standards. An early Talmudic rabbi proclaimed the poem “the holy of holies”. In that case, it is probably a Talmudic work. He also said, “Had not the Torah been given, Canticles would have sufficed to guide the world.” Guided in what? Gustave Moreau’s delicious painting *Cantique des Cantiques*, 1893, tells all you need to know of what The Song of Songs is about. Shakespeare’s *Cymbeline*, with its mercy and faith, would have more place among the prophets than this adulterous and unhealthy poem. Or Geoffrey Chaucer’s *Legend of Good Women*. Good women, not adulterous members of harems.

Esther: whoring with the nations As others have observed, the first thing to publish about the Babylonian tale named Esther is that it is not among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Its authorship is uncertain (despite 9\20); it might be fable (1 Timothy 1\4, 4\7, 2 Timothy 4\4, 2 Peter 1\16).

It concerns the Judahites. To understand who that is, we must put into our minds the tribe of Judah, that is, the house of southern Israel who broke away from their brothers in northern Israel and were taken captive by Babylon. Their patriarch Judah is described by his father at Genesis 49\9-12. The southern tribe of Judah were taken captive by Babylon for their defilement and rebellion (2 Kings 25, Isaiah 13\16-18, Ezekiel 16, Amos 5\25-27, Psalm 137, 2 Chronicles 35\11-23). The apostle Peter centuries later visited the very small remnant of their Christ-following descendants who remained there (1 Peter 1\1, 5\13); most returned to Israel or wandered westwards. The narrative of Esther opens with Ahasuerus, a Babylonian king of lawlessness, making displays of pomp for 180 days, then feasting with much wine. His pomp and arrogance are reminiscent of Belshazzar (Daniel 5) and the Edomite king Herod (Matthew 14\6-8, Mark 6\17-23), as, like Herod, Ahasuerus makes grandiloquent offers to Esther of “half my kingdom”. When the adulterous king disposes of his wife – queen Vashti (what happens to her is not said; maybe killed off, Henry VIIIth style) – Esther, a Judahite, of all the women he tries in his new harem prepared for him, wins his favour and she is made his new queen and she defiles herself and marries the adulterous and probably murderous king, the unwise choice of husband in all of Babylon, guilty of the slaughter and capture of her own people, as if Mary were to marry Herod after his massacre. Esther, if a Judahite, for her it was forbidden for any reason to marry outside her people (Genesis 24\3, Deuteronomy 7\3-4, Joshua 23\12, 1 Kings 8\53 et cetera; “you shall make no covenant with them ... You shall make no marriages with them”). Ezra and Nehemiah dissolved such marriages (Ezra 9\1-12, Nehemiah 13\23-30). Expediency is rebellion also. Seduced by royal flatteries, she is disobedient to the God of her patriarchs Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. Godly women like Deborah, Hannah, Anna, Elizabeth, Tryphena and Tryphosa, and the mother of Jesus would not have joined the procession of young women going through “purification” (2\3, 2\9, 2\12) for going into harems of Babylonian king Ahasuerus or child-murderer Edomite king Herod, in order to become their queen. Nor would those righteous women, at the offer of half a kingdom, have asked for – and made – revenge killings of many thousands, and for bodies to be strung up, as Esther does. Mordecai tears his clothes and puts on sackcloth and ashes (4\1-3), but makes no appeal to God, nor can we assume he did, for if he did it would say so; compare Jonah 3\8, Nehemiah 9\2-3, and especially Daniel 9\3: “I set my face towards Adonai Elohim, to search by prayer and requests with fasting and sackcloth and ashes”. There is only “mourning” among the Judahites, fasting and weeping, sackcloth and ashes – no word of prayer. Like the daughter of Herodias, Esther responds to Ahasuerus’s Herod-like offers of “half my kingdom” by wanting killings and bodies strung up and altogether has 75,811 people killed (albeit one of them, Haman, is deserving of justice). There is no seeking Yahweh Elohim before they do this, another sin. Where would the Judahites, in captivity in Babylon, get forces to slaughter many thousands? How would those alleged “enemies” be identified, those “hostile to them” (8\11)? There are many hostile to us, but we do not kill one of them, let alone tens of thousands of them and their sons and their “little ones and women” (8\11). The “ten sons of Haman” whom they kill (9\10) were not said to be involved in their father’s plot against Mordecai and the Judahites. It is said, “many people of the land became Judahites” (8\17). It does not say that they confess their sins and turn to Yahweh Elohim and adopt the religion of the Israelite patriarchs and covenants. It only says they “became Judahites”. There is no testimony of the commands of Yahweh Elohim so that the people might “become Judahites”. If this is a true story, we are supposed to believe that, because thousands are going to be slaughtered, many changed their race. The verb for “became Judahites” is **יָהָד** (*yahad*), which is not found in the word of God, only in Esther. It is not possible to change genealogy, to become a physical member of another race. (Many make the same mistake concerning Galatians 3\7.) The Judahites – in the word of God – were the tribe of Judah, descended from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. There were proselytes, converts, but they could not “become Judahites”. They could only convert to the *religion*, not the *tribe* or the *race*.

People are converted only by hearing the words of God. These “many people of the land” alleged to have “become Judahites” only did so because of the king’s decree that the Judahites might “avenge themselves on their enemies” (8\13) and “for fear of the Judahites” (8\17, 9\2). That is not a testimony towards following Yahweh Elohim. In the authentic Scriptures of God, the phrase “fear of the Judahites” occurs *negatively*, not *positively*, because of persecution (John 7\13, 19\38, 20\19), and is not said to make any turn to God. Who are the 75,800? Before Haman arises against the Judahites there has been no previous mention of hostility from anybody else. How are the slaughtered mass of 75,800 supposed to be identified among other people as “enemies”, especially if, allegedly, “many people of the land became Judahites”? Imagine the condemnation from critics who already dislike the apostle Paul if he had done these things. When there were plots against Paul, a man of righteousness, he did not slouch into political intrigue to have them killed, nor to have their uninvolved and innocent sons killed and strung up, then 75,800 people killed as well, including “little ones and women”. Imagine the justified outrage if, in British justice, a criminal caught conspiring were hanged, and his uninvolved sons also were hanged and strung up publicly, then 75,800 of his people, all uninvolved, were slaughtered. We are better than that. Yet there follows “feasting and gladness” after the evil slaughter of 75,800. The story calls these days “Purim, after the name of pur”, so that “these days of Purim should not fail from among the Judahites” (9\26-28). The word פֹּר (pur) is not a word of the Bible. The word occurs only in Esther (at 3\7, 9\24, 9\26, 9\28, 9\29, 9\31, 9\32). It is not in the books of the word of God. The Israelite practice of casting lots was for positive purposes, not to slaughter people (Leviticus 16\8, Joshua 18\6-10, 1 Samuel 14\42, Jonah 1\7, Nehemiah 10\34, 11\1, 1 Chronicles 24\31, 25\8, 26\13-14, Acts 1\26). By enemies it could be used for evil (Joel 3\3, Obadiah 1\11, Nahum 3\10, Psalm 22\18, Matthew 27\35, Mark 15\24, Luke 23\34, John 19\24). There is no record in the prophets and apostles of any such day of “Purim” being kept by them or anyone. It is not recorded in the Gospels or any New Covenant writings as being kept by Christ and the apostles. Nor, rightly, was it kept by the early Christians in the New Covenant writings. It is ignored, rightly, among Christians now, having no place with us. Esther, who cannot be ascribed as a righteous woman, and who makes no appeal to God, confirms “these matters of Purim” (9\29-32), but the *Biblical* feasts concern not mass slaughter but God’s reconciliation with the house of Jacob, and they are listed in Leviticus 23. Esther has no authority from God to pronounce any feast for Israelites. This, in the word of tradition, is supposed to be a story of God’s protection for His people, but it was for unrighteousness and refusing the prophets that they were taken captive in the first place, and God did not protect them from the Babylonians. There had been no protection for the house of Israel either, when they were taken captive by Assyria. Nor were those of Judea protected from the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70. Divine protection is not unconditional. Divine protection from enemies comes from obedience (Leviticus 26\3-8, Deuteronomy 32\30, Joshua 23\10, Judges 7\7-12, 2 Chronicles 7\14, Hebrews 11\33). Esther is a story not of divine protection for anybody, but of conspiring, just as Haman does, with an evil king, rather than seeking God. Divine protection, being conditional, would not be ready for an unrighteous God-forsaking people. The Judahites in this story obstinately disregard God. That disregard and rebellious whoring with the nations (Ezekiel 16), which is continued by Esther, was the reason for the house of Judah’s captivity into Babylon in the first place. The story of Esther probably came from the ancient Babylonian *Talmud*. Neither Mordecai nor Esther make any lament for their captivity, nor appeal to God in their threats of destruction. This is in contrast to the righteous zeal of the prophet Daniel and the apostle Paul. Those who like and accept this story focus only on the vengeance on Haman, but forget, ignore or excuse the stew of evil, their defence a matter of misguided allegiance to the captive Judahites rather than to internal harmony of the Scriptures and the demands of righteous conduct. There is no name or title “Elohim” in Esther. Some have seen the title “Yahweh” in Esther, buried meaninglessly in dubious codes

(1\20, 5\4, 5\13, 7\5, 7\7), but these are nothing. Anybody can find apparent patterns, acrostics and codes embedded by chance in language. For example, “a prophet lived near Jerusalem” contains the name “devil” if you want to look for it. Or what can you find in this: “the people sat and ate”; or in “send a gnat as a curse”; or in “feed it to the dog”? The alleged Hebrew acrostics embedding “Yahweh” (יהוה) in Esther, as described by *The Companion Bible*, expose them only as meaningless, random and occurring in different words: “all the wives will give” (1\20) in a backwards-reading acrostic; “let the king and Haman come this day” (5\4) in a forwards-reading acrostic; “all this profits me nothing” (5\13) in initial letters of the final letters of four words; “who is he, and where is he” (7\5) in initial letters of a forwards-reading acrostic; “that evil was determined against him” (7\7) in a forwards-reading acrostic from the initial letters. There is no pattern, no consistency and no meaning in any of that, unless strangled out of it, which you can do with any text. Doubtless other wholly unintentional codes and acrostics can be found buried in many phrases in many books. Those in Esther cannot be proved to have been deliberately done, or with any illuminating purpose, such as can be said concerning, for example, acrostics in Psalm 119. Even if the author of Esther did intend them, what do they mean? Why would you want to strangle patterns and types and symbols out of a story of unrighteous people, in order to justify its inclusion among righteous writings of the prophets and apostles? As with The Song of Songs, what is the value of the inclusion of Esther, an uninspired and uninspiring deathly story? WHO BENEFITS? *Cui bono* (for whose good)? Not the body of Christ. Nor the record of the inspired writings of the prophets and apostles. It contradicts righteous behaviour and celebrates evil. This work, like The Song of Songs, cannot be claimed as being θεόπνευστος (*theopneustos*), “inspired by God”, “by divine inspiration” (2 Timothy 3\16). It has no lesson from God. It is not edifying in the love of God. Its tone and spirit are alien to Biblical writings and do not read like the righteous works of the prophets and apostles. It is not cited anywhere in Scripture and it does not cite Scripture – the ultimate test. Such cross-referencing is one of the authentications of divine inspiration. The story concludes with smugness over a mass slaughter of uninvolved Persians, including “little ones and women” (8\11). It displays feasting, drunkenness, a harem, “sexual undertones ... that are deeply disturbing” (*Jerusalem Post*). Numerous Christians and scholars have rejected it as fiction and doubted or disputed it on grounds of inspiration, authenticity and usefulness, whether fiction or not. The behaviour of Esther is in contrast to Daniel, the righteous man of God. Compare Esther with Daniel who, unlike Esther, *refused* the king’s table and prospered (Daniel 1\8-20). Why did Esther not do the same? How, if Esther is real, would she have responded to the rebuke of prophets? Some commentators, including Josephus, have suggested king Ahasuerus of the story is the same as Artaxerxes who caused the rebuilding of Jerusalem to be stopped (Ezra 4\21) (although both names appear at Ezra 4\6-7); the LXX, a different and more dramatic version of the story, has him so. And if the same, that Artaxerxes, causing hostility to Jerusalem, would be the Herod-like king with whom Esther was happy to be made his queen. If true, why is this not mentioned in either Ezra or Esther, and why did Esther’s charms not influence him in *this* matter? Should anyone regret the loss of a (questionable) story of the protection of Israelites, they can turn to the true and authentic story of the day God delivered a prayerful Israel from the Midianites with just 300 of Gideon’s men (Judges 7); or the day God defended a prayerful Jerusalem from the Assyrians by His angel striking 185,000 of them (2 Kings 19\35). These were through the righteous prayers of Gideon and Isaiah, not defiant people, not celebrations of drunken feasting, not whoring with the nations, not people making an illegal marriage, not the vengeful slaughter of innocents including babies because of one inimical man. “Finally, brothers, whatever things are true, whatever things honourable, whatever things righteous, whatever things pure, whatever things lovely, whatever things of good report, if any virtue, if any praise, meditate on these things” (Philippians 4\8).

Just because The Song of Songs and Esther might have been smuggled into an OT text, just

because they are in the KJV and its derivatives does not mean they should be there. If they can get the books of the Old Testament in the wrong order, add and take away, alter grammar, invent meanings, paraphrase, if they are men of the wrong spirit to be handling the word of God, if they can race through the translation work in a few years, then in what else, we have to ask, can they be misled? In what else can we fail to trust them? The modern versions of the international religious system even use corrupt Alexandrian Greek texts, when the preserved Byzantine texts are freely available to their translators and editors. How, then, can these popular versions also be trusted concerning the so-called canon of the word of God?

It is those having the true spirit of Christ who must decide from *internal* evidence what are God's books, and we must not shirk from that or be timid about it. From *internal* evidence it becomes quite a simple matter. It is not to early Jews and robed bishops, nor to the Council of Trent, nor to decorated theologians from academies that we should entrust one of the most important tasks on Earth, the selection of the canon of our Scriptures. Nobody of the early centuries after the apostles had any more authority in determining what are God's book than have knowledgeable and concerned believers in Christ today. It must come finally from those having the true spirit of Christ, for those not having his spirit "are not his" (Romans 8\9) and are disqualified (although their academic contributions and histories might be valuable). They are *our* books. *We* are the custodians. Work concerning the canon, the manuscripts, and translation – as this preface demonstrates – is not a finished work, although I anticipate the canon is settled without The Song of Songs and Esther. They cannot be said to be the word of God. Nothing of righteousness and faith is lost without the impediments of these two uninspired and uninspiring books; rather, on the contrary, translations of the word of God are cleansed and purified without them, another alleluiah for translation truth.

5. Examples of PROCESSED translating and the harmonious and restorative effects of ORGANIC translating

As I said above, I first applied myself to this nearly impossible task in August 1997. Nobody begins this work as an expert. It could not ever possibly be satisfactorily completed within a single decade. Not until you have made long advances into the project do you begin to formulate refined and impregnable translation principles.

When, in applying my fruit-bearing **ORGANIC** principles, I came to compare the underlying languages with the KJV and other translations, I was astounded into years of sleeplessness. Was the idea not to translate the original languages? How had concerned Bible readers not been complaining bitterly? Who would ever believe this? The word of God has never been translated properly in the English language. Words have been added; words have been taken away; nouns and adjectives, verbs and adverbs, pronouns and prepositions have been grammatically misrepresented; punctuation misapplied; meanings altered. Everything major is disturbed: the order of the books; who God is; who Jesus is; creation; who "the Holy Spirit" is; what "the holy spirit" is; man's structural identity; man's destiny; election; Jesus' death; Jesus' resurrection; the success of Jesus' New Covenant; the divine promise to the patriarchs; what "satan" and "devil" mean; the identity in the New Testament of the house of Israel and God's faithfulness to them; the gospel promise of life on Earth in "the coming eons" (Ephesians 2\7); what Paul's work really was; and even the immortality of God.

The most obvious example of the KJV's breaking Internal Harmony is the order of the Old Testament books in the popular translations, which conflicts with Jesus' division of the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms (Luke 24\44). They end at 2 Chronicles. Then comes Matthew. The KJV order is chaos. See Appendix 2.

The pronouncement to Eve by Yahweh Elohim at Genesis 3\16 is not, as tradition would have it, about God making command that her passionate "desire" shall be to her husband. (How can that be commanded, when relationships run dry or old?) It is, rather, her "will" and

institution of the authority of the husband, that he should be, as Paul says, “the fountainhead” (1 Corinthians 11\3, Ephesians 5\22, 1 Timothy 5\8). Not dissimilarly, concerning the same word, “will”, the pronouncement to Cain by Yahweh Elohim at Genesis 4\7 is not a personification of sin “lying at the door”, but is better understood as Cain exercising his authority with “a sin offering” (lamb, goat), and Abel’s “will” being subject to him – not sin’s “desire”. The passage concerns Cain’s acting on his duty concerning his birthright as older brother, in which he fails with his mean offering. With the acceptable offering crouching at Cain’s door, he has the opportunity to act well in his priestly function by birthright. He fails.

When the prophet Moses initiated the form of the Passover for the sons of Israel he said it was a decree that is **עַד-עוֹלָם** (*ad olam*), which is well translated as “throughout the duration of the eon” (Exodus 12\24), or “for the duration of an age” (the preposition “throughout” often occurring as ל (*le*), though not here). Moses described the Passover decree as **עוֹלָם** (*olam*), “for an age / eon”, “throughout the eon” (Exodus 12\14, 12\17). The Passover has been superseded; it was a foreshadowing of Christ and now “our Passover, Christ, has been sacrificed” (1 Corinthians 5\7), and Christ is the great High Priest (Hebrews 2\17 et cetera) and there is no other mediator (1 Timothy 2\5). Former things are done away with. Nevertheless, the KJV describes the Passover Moses instituted as “an ordinance for ever”. The word **עוֹלָם** (*olam*) is not an adverb “ever”, but a noun “eon”, “age”. So the KJV “for ever” is grammatically wrong and factually untrue. Ordinances of the Old Covenant are not “for ever”.

At Numbers 22\22, 22\32 we see the Angel of Yahweh standing in the road and acting “as an opponent / an adversary against” Balaam. The Hebrew word for “adversary” is **שָׂטָן** (*satan*), so the Angel is acting as an opponent, a “satan”, an adversary. The KJV correctly has “adversary”. Then 2 Samuel 24\1 says, “the anger of Yahweh burned against Israel”, and 1 Chronicles 21\1, commenting on that event, says “an adversary stood up against Israel”, so we know from 2 Samuel 24\1 that that adversary, the **שָׂטָן**, was Yahweh, God. The word “adversary” is again **שָׂטָן** (*satan*). From these is established the meaning of **שָׂטָן** as “adversary”, “enemy”, “foe”, “opponent”. In the first passage the adversary, the **שָׂטָן**, is the Angel of Yahweh. In the second passage the adversary, the **שָׂטָן**, is God. If the adversary at 2 Samuel 24 is God why, then, does the KJV have “Satan” at 1 Chronicles 21\1, calling God “Satan”? Blasphemy! There is also a verb form of **שָׂטָן** (*satan*), meaning “to accuse”, “to oppose”, “to be an adversary”, occurring at Zechariah 3\1, Psalm 38\20, 71\13, 109\4, 109\20, 109\29. This verb form **שָׂטָן** (*satan*) gives us information about the meaning of the noun. If there are devils, is not one of them the mastermind that in ignorance or willfulness parades itself and strides across the pages, pulling off all the stratagems of grammatical bedevilments in the King James Bible?

The King James translators did not like the word “road”. They liked the less concrete-sounding “way”. Perhaps “road” was not spiritual or heavenly enough; one day they would all stand on clouds in Heaven. However, they did write “road” just once, at 1 Samuel 27\10. But that single occurrence was wrong: it should have been “raid”. The KJV has Achish asking David, “Wither have ye made a road to day?” – and that in the middle of a battle, as if you could build a road in one day in the middle of a battle. And this is the only occurrence when the KJV men wrote “road”. Everywhere else they put “way”.

At Isaiah 14\12 the prophet uses astral – star – imagery to describe the fall and destruction of the arrogant king of Babylon (14\4). Isaiah uses the poetical imagery of metaphor, calling the proud king a “shining star” who now has “fallen from the heavens” (his once exalted position. Compare Luke 10\18). The astral imagery is extended in the phrase “son of the morning” (14\12). Describing people as “stars” is a frequent literary device of the prophets and apostles, and of Jesus also. Isaiah had used it earlier (Isaiah 13\10). Deborah used it (Judges 5\20). Daniel used it (Daniel 8\10). Jesus used it (Matthew 24\29). John used it (Revelation 1\16, 12\4). This astral imagery in Isaiah is a reversal of Job’s astral metaphor, where Job personifies stars rejoicing

(not being destroyed, like the king of Babylon) in the clauses “the morning stars sang” and “the sons of Elohim shouted for joy”, personifying stars as rejoicing at Elohim’s creation, as if even creation itself had been in joyful wonder (Job 38\7). Isaiah, on the other hand, depicts the king of Babylon as a star to create a metaphor of cruel and powerful rulership of the worst kind imaginable. Isaiah continues his pronouncement of destruction on the king of Babylon with the words “You are cut down to the ground”. The words “shining star” in Isaiah 14\12 are from the Hebrew **הילל** (*hêlêl*), which occurs only here, therefore having no precedent, and can only be translated contextually. Green has it correctly as “shining star”. It could also be rendered “bright star”. The King James men, however, unfortunately failed to perceive the typical astral imagery of a star fallen from the heavens, despite having the word “stars” at 14\13, the very next verse. Instead, they imposed their ancient paganistic dogma and translated **הילל** (*hêlêl*) as “Lucifer”. In doing so, they broke the structure of the passage, and shipwrecked the internal harmony of a typical biblical metaphor. Furthermore in Isaiah 14, they introduced into the text a different character, for the passage concerns the king of Babylon who is defined as a “man” and “carcass” at Isaiah 14\16 and 14\19. And on this disharmonious blunder is founded the fictional mythology of “Lucifer”. The KJV men, all the king’s men, did not understand the word of God.

The KJV translators continued their paganistic opposition at Isaiah 14\15, saying of the king of Babylon “thou shalt be brought down to hell”, down to, that is, **שאול** (*sheol*). It should be “grave”. (Also in KJV’s Isaiah falsely as “hell” at 5\14, 14\9, 28\15, 28\18, 57\9, yet schizoid and correctly as “grave” at 14\11, 38\10, 38\18.) Yet it has the words “stars” (correctly) and “grave” (correctly for the same word **שאול** (*sheol*)), and “grave” (for another word which would be better as “sepulchre”) and “ground” (correctly) and “house” (acceptable, but better here as “burial house” or even “dungeon”) and “pit” (better as “burial place”) at 14\9, 14\11, 14\12, 14\15, 14\17, 14\18, 14\19. The blunder and disharmony and PROCESSING are fantastic.

Another example of breaking Internal Harmony occurs at Isaiah 45\17 and Ephesians 3\21 where the KJV has the phrase “world without end”. But then at Matthew 13\39, 13\40, 24\3, 28\20, Hebrews 9\26 the KJV has “at the end of the world”. So which phrase is right? Neither of them; both phrases represent PROCESSED translating, for none of the words in “world without end” occur in either passage; and the second list should read “at the end / completion of the eon / age”.

At Ecclesiastes 1\4 the KJV has “the earth abideth for ever”. But the KJV’s 2 Peter 3\10 says “the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up”. Which, then, “for ever”? Or “burned up”? The truth is, it will be renewed, its rebellious and offensive elements removed by burning.

At Daniel 9\24 the KJV has the phrase “everlasting righteousness”, their adjective “everlasting” supposing to represent the Chaldean word **עלמים** (*olamim*). However, that **עלמים** is a noun in its plural form, “eons” or “ages”, so that the grammatical form has been violated in the KJV. This is PROCESSED translating. In its context the phrase should be translated as “the righteousness of the eons / ages”, a beautiful phrase, looking forward to the coming ages in Christ and affecting the understanding of the passage; this is ORGANIC translating. All the king’s men pulled off the same PROCESSING at Isaiah 9\6 where they once again changed the noun “eon” or “age” into the adjective “everlasting”, so obscuring the passage.

A word must be said on the word, in all English versions, “repent” at Matthew 3\2 et cetera. Otis Q Sellers said that the meaning of the Greek verb **μετανοέω** (*metanoëo*) is “one of the great major problems of New Testament interpretation”. He reports outstanding Greek scholars as saying that “repent” is “the worst translation in the entire New Testament” (Sellers, Seed & Bread articles 106, 107, 108, 137, 138). The problem with “repent” is its relation to the Latin Vulgate’s *poenitentiam agite* (to do penance), man being supposed to pay his own penalty, enact something to pay for his own sins, a practice destructive of and anathema to the free gift of

Christ. No such ideas as man paying a penalty are intended in the Greek word of the gospel. Tyndale, in defiance of *poenitentiam agite*, said of the word μετανοέω (*metanoeo*): “be converted and to turn to God with all the heart, to know his will and live according to his laws, and to be cured of our corrupt nature with the oil of his spirit and wine of obedience”. Thayer includes: “amend with abhorrence of one’s past sins” (Thayer, p. 405). As Sellers says, the KJV translators, Protestants, knew that μετανοέω did not mean carrying out acts of penance, but nevertheless translated every occurrence “by a word that says and means exactly that”. So “repent” misses the mark. The word is well understood as “after + mind”, therefore “having an after-mind”. Such a phrase as “have an after-mind” would be awkward to use. A single synonymous English word does not seem to exist. Since having this after-mind can only come through conviction by God and belief, and since conviction and belief can only come from a submissive mind, I have chosen to represent μετανοέω as “submit”.

So it is with the noun form, μετάνοια (*metanoia*), at Matthew 3\8 et cetera. Rather than the KJV’s penance-sounding “repentance”, I represent it as “submission”. And so also with the related verb μεταμέλομαι (*metamelomai*), at Matthew 21\29, 21\32 et cetera, which I represent in various ways: “being regretful”, “submit”, “seized with remorse”, “regret”, “make revocation” (the KJV has “repent” every time). I would say, however, it is true that “repent” has, over time, and since Sellers’ day, lost its Latin *Vulgate* implications of self-penance, and few would now think of that, but in the day of the KJV translators that was not so. Most readers now, quite justifiably, do not at all mind the words “repent” and “repentance”, as the self-penance memory is happily all but lost. If not for the *Vulgate* associations there would be no problem. For myself, though, I consider “submit” safer and stronger, and a refreshing change.

At the beginning of Jesus’ teaching on the mountain, he repeats to the Israelite audience the Covenant made by God with the patriarchs for the possession of the promised land, saying, “Blessed *are* the submissive, for they will inherit the land” (Matthew 5\5). This promise was made first to Abraham (Genesis 12\1-7), then to Isaac and to Jacob and to the sons of Israel. The king and prophet David speaks of it six times in Psalm 37, of which Jesus’ statement is a citation: “they will inherit the land”. The KJV translators, though, preferred to reinterpret this as “they shall inherit the earth”; but that can be no more than meaningless hyperbole, for only Christ himself has been given authority over everything in the Earth. Jesus’ words are made by the KJV to dissolve into a bland and isolated statement. This Covenant of Yahweh Elohim with the patriarchs and the sons of Israel seems to have caused the King James translators confusion and indecision. For in Psalm 37, for the same word אָרֶץ (*eret*), they wrote “inherit the land” three times (37\3, 37\29, 37\34), and “earth” three times (37\9, 37\11, 37\22). With their “inherit the earth” at Matthew 5\5 and the three Psalm 37 occurrences, they removed the reminder of the promise to the patriarchs of land, for who thinks about that when they read “inherit the earth”? The identity of the beneficiary of the Covenant of the land fades away. This is a start most foul to the New Covenant writings, because it affects the entire reading, assisting the unhappy forgetfulness of “the twelve tribes of the sons of Israel” and their worldwide scattering spoken of right through the four Gospels and through the letters and to their final exaltation in the Holy City (Revelation 21\12-14, and see Matthew 19\28, Luke 22\30, Acts 26\7, Romans 1\31, 9\25-26, Galatians 3\7, 3\29, Ephesians 2\12-17, 2 Timothy 2\12, Jacob (James) 1\1, 1 Peter 1\1, 5\13, and much more), and even forgetful that the making of the New Covenant is with “the house of Israel and the house of Judah” (Hebrews 8\8, Jeremiah 31\31-34), all as if the house of Jacob has become irrelevant and their promises, as somebody insisted to me, are now “of no effect” – which manner of contradiction and adversary (“satan”, in its proper use), Paul perfectly repudiates: “It is not as though the oracle of God has taken no effect” (Romans 9\6).

Again, considering Jesus’ teaching on the mountain, in another violation of the word of God’s

Internal Harmony, the KJV correctly translates the Hebrew גֵּי הִנּוֹם (*ge hinnom*), where God will have to destroy violent adversaries, as “the Valley of Hinnom” (Joshua 15\8, 2 Kings 23\10, Jeremiah 7\31-32, 19\2, 19\6, 32\35, also “Tophet” at Isaiah 30\33). But its Greek equivalent γέεννα (*gehenna*), the Valley of Hinnom, the KJV translates as “hell” (Matthew 5\22, 23\15 et cetera). These blunders break the deliberate embedded code of God’s Internal Harmony. The King James translators, instead of regarding verbal Accuracy and Internal Harmony, followed the post-Babylonian mythology imported from the Latin *Vulgate* with its *inferno*, and put the Valley of Hinnom as “hell”. So what had been a valley with a burning rubbish tip outside Jerusalem became, in mythology, a place of ever-burning torture (master-minded, of course, by a ferocious devil with bull horns and a pitchfork), and where their God consigns those who resist the fables of its pseudo preachers, and which they will never leave, as in the mythical Hades of old, as in the poetical writings of Homer.

And again on the mountain, Jesus gave a model prayer for the disciples, including “bring us not into adversity” (Matthew 6\13). This, to an Israelite ear immersed in the prophets, would echo passages such as Leviticus 26\14-39, Deuteronomy 28\15-68, Isaiah 45\7, and Amos 3\6, with their warnings of severe adversity and calamity for disobedience, and it would echo Israelite history. The KJV, however, turns this into “lead us not into temptation”. First, that is forgetful of any previous context of divine and prophetic understanding of adversity and calamity. Second, it conflicts with what is written at Jacob (James) 1\13: God “does not tempt anybody”, which the KJV has in the words “neither tempteth he any man”. The Luke 11\4 version of the prayer, slightly different, and spoken in another place and time, contains the same KJV mistake. The King James translators have surely maligned the character of God. It cannot be argued in defence that by “temptation” they meant the same as “trial”, for they have the word “trial” elsewhere, such as 1 Peter 4\12. Their “lead us not into temptation” is disharmonious with the KJV’s own Jacob (James) 1\13. God tempts nobody.

At Matthew 12\18 we read Jesus quoting from Isaiah 42\1. This is the prophecy concerning Israel’s Messiah, saying, “in whom I Myself have found delight”. The KJV, though, has the phrase “I Myself” as “my soul”. For God to speak of having a “soul” threatens His immortality because the Hebrew word the KJV has as “soul”, נֶפֶשׁ (*nephesh*), is shown at Ezekiel 18\4 and 18\10 to be destructible and mortal; and the word is also used for “corpse” (e.g. Leviticus 19\28, 22\4, Psalm 16\10), as is its Greek equivalent ψυχή (*psuchē*) also destructible and mortal and used for “corpse” (Acts 2\27, 2\31, Revelation 6\9, 20\4). Man and nature are mortal, not God Who is spirit (John 4\24). The KJV’s “My soul” defies Logic. The reflexive pronoun phrase that I have as “I Myself” *The Companion Bible* margin sensibly explains as “I (emph.)”, which means an emphatic, reflexive “I”. In Hebrew and Greek “my *nephesh*” and “my *psuchē*” are linguistic devices, idioms, and are to be translated as idioms. (Other occurrences: Leviticus 26\11, 26\30, Isaiah 1\14, Jeremiah 5\9, 5\29, 6\8, 12\7, 13\17, 15\1, Psalm 11\5.)

When Peter took Jesus aside and objected to his words of going to Jerusalem to be killed, Jesus replied, “Get behind me, adversary!” (Matthew 16\23, Mark 8\33). The Greek word for “adversary” here is σατανᾶς (*satanas*). The KJV, though, has Jesus calling his friend Peter “Satan”, suggesting some monstrous and hideous demon, the one with a pitchfork at the gates of Hades. Peter would never have recovered. Thirty years ago I heard a man at his doorstep call his wife “Satan” to her face, and I have never forgotten it. The same rebuke by Jesus, “Get behind me, adversary!” also occurs at Matthew 4\10.

In passages such as Matthew 16\11-12 we read of Jesus telling his disciples to turn away from the false teachings of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Matthew 23 records Jesus’ anger at the false practices and false teachings of the scribes and Pharisees. They had stolen the seat of Moses (Matthew 23\2). Do not follow their practices, for they are hypocrites and offsprings of serpents, fit for the fire of the Valley of Hinnom, Canaanite (not true Israelite) descendants of murderers of prophets (Matthew 23\30-35). But he says that, despite those leaders’ hypocrisies,

the crowds are following them so that “everything that they instruct you to observe you do observe and you do put into practice” (Matthew 23\3a); or, altering the syntax, “you observe and you put into practice everything that they instruct you”. This is a warning to turn away from them and all their false teachings. All this is disturbed in the KJV which says “whatsoever they bid you observe, *that* observe and do”, turning it into a command to obey and follow those pseudos, exactly reversing the sense! The error lies in the verb ποιείτε (*poieite*), which the King James translators took as imperative (“do”), but is obviously an indicative, well rendered contextually in English as an emphatic indicative, “you do put into practice” (implying obviously they shouldn’t). The mood of the verb is the same in the imperative as in the second person plural present indicative, but the King James translators transgressed Logic and Internal Harmony and, consequently, mangled the sense of the passage. Had the King James translators applied the translation principle of Grammar they would have realised the choice, imperative or indicative: only the indicative is sensible and harmonious. Had they applied the principle of Internal Harmony they would have realised that disciples follow commands of God, not the leaven of Pharisees. Had they applied the principle of Logic, they would have marvelled over Jesus saying, in the words of the KJV, “but do not ye after their works”. How can you obey hypocrites’ commands but not do the works they command? Or was the word of Jesus to reject falsehoods of religious leaders so politically dangerous back in 1611 that the cloak of integrity had to be slipped off? In contrast, not a word of *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible* has been intentionally or knowingly hoicked out of its grammatical form so as to alter its meaning and change the teaching.

Preceding his arrest, Jesus, seeing his hour had drawn near and that Judas was coming, admonishes his disciples, “Are you still sleeping and taking your rest?” He tells them to “Rise up,” because Judas was arriving (Matthew 26\45-46). The KJV, though, has Jesus instruct them, “Sleep on now, and take your rest: ... the hour is at hand ... the Son of man is betrayed .. Rise, let us be going.” So: all in one breath, while Judas was approaching, “Sleep on ... Rise.” The King James translators translated the “sleep” and “rest” verbs as imperatives, but sense demands they are indicatives, the same blunder they made at Matthew 23\3.

Matthew 27\64, 28\6 and 28\7 in the KJV have the Angel of God telling the two women at the tomb of Jesus that “He is risen” (bad grammar; the auxiliary verb should be *has*, not *is*). Some have preferred to take this as Jesus raising himself, but in that case he did not really die, so that a sacrifice for sin still remains, for to raise yourself you have to be alive. However, the Greek verb is ἡγέρθη (*egerthen*), which is not active, but passive, “He has been raised” (or “awakened”) – a phenomenal difference whose implications even a child of ten was able to describe to me.

At Luke 14\26 and John 12\25 the KJV has Jesus telling his disciples that if they do not hate their father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, and even themselves, they “cannot be my disciple”. Yet the KJV also has Jesus saying to “love thy neighbour as thyself” (Matthew 19\19), and Paul telling husbands to “love your wives” (Ephesians 5\20). It does not take much wit to work up the notion that the Greek verb μισέω (*miseo*) can mean *to love less* (see Thayer, p. 415). That resolves everything.

John’s beautiful prologue is paralleled in the testimony of his epilogue (John 21\30-31). That is how his gospel record is structured. The third verse of his prologue, John 1\3, has three active singular verbs from γίνομαι (*ginomai*), a versatile word meaning arise, become, come to pass, happen, the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew verb הָיָה (*hayah*), well translated many times as “it came to pass”. John is telling us that everything in his gospel “arose” from the word and declared plan of God, “the logos”, “oracle” (John 1\1). Yet in this passage we usually see in popular bibles that *singular aorist active intransitive stative verb* twisted into a *plural passive imperfect transitive dynamic verb* “were made”, taking away the force of John’s prologue. The verb does not mean *create*, nor does the passage concern creation. The KJV could hardly be more badly done, more

cooked! Much falsehood has poisoned the river from the KJV's bedevilment with John 1\3.

Just as they did at John 1\3, so did the translators also do at John 1\10 where John says Jesus "was in the world, and the world has come to be through him, yet the world did not know him". Jesus is now "ruler of the creation of God" (Revelation 3\14), for God has given him all authority. The KJV has turned John 1\10 into a creation passage, saying, "the world was made by him", all in conflict with Genesis 1\1, Matthew 1\20, Luke 1\26-38. They turned what should be for us a perfect active verb, "has come to be", into an imperfect passive, "was made". It is not only that a false creation story is told. For, as well as that, a great truth is concealed, that the world now is under the authority of Jesus Christ.

In Jesus' discussion with Nicodemus Jesus refers to himself as "the Son of Man, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ [*hō hōn en tō ouranō*]", that is, "who is in the Heavenly One" (John 3\13). (See textual discussion, p. xvi.) This agrees with Jesus' statement "I am in the Father" (John 14\10). And these agree with Luke 15\18 and 15\21 and John 3\27 where οὐρανός (*ouranos*), normally "Heaven", "sky", stands metonymically (by association) for God as "the Exalted One" or "the Heavenly One". And so is it with οὐρανός at John 3\13. Extraordinarily though, the KJV has Jesus turn that into an absurd statement: "the Son of man which [which??] is in heaven", so being both in Jerusalem and in Heaven at once! I suppose in the rushed and giddy eight years in which the KJV translators whizzed through their work they did not come to the realisation that οὐρανός (*ouranos*), like many words, has more than one meaning.

The King James translators often mistakenly have the word αἰών (*aion*) as "world". But Greek for "world" is κόσμος (*kosmos*), easy words to differentiate. In doing so, they are substituting a concrete noun of space, "world", for an abstract noun of time, "eon" or "age". Then, breaking their own consistency, they have its adjective form, αἰώνιος, which is "eonian", as "eternal", as in their phrase "eternal life". Very well then, if they want the noun form αἰών as "world", they ought to have its adjective form, αἰώνιος (*aionios*), as "worldly", and they should be proclaiming a message of "worldly life" (John 3\15-16 et cetera). But they were already hamstrung by their goof over the noun form.

At John 7\35 the Judahites wonder concerning Jesus, "Is he about to go to the diaspora [or, dispersion] of the Greeks and then teach the Greeks", "diaspora" (= a scattering apart) referring to the scattered tribes of Israel. Some of these dispersed Israelites "of the Greeks" would visit Jerusalem "to worship at the festival" (John 12\20) – this answers why the New Testament was written in Greek – and whom God will gather together into one (John 11\52). The KJV and some others have altered the word "Greeks", Ἕλληνας (*Hellen*), to "Gentiles", yet nothing is easier for the translator than proper nouns (names). The King James translators, realising that "dispersed of the Gentiles" is an oxymoron (senseless), attempted to repair their blunder by adding "among" (without italicising it) so as to read "the dispersed among the Gentiles".^{5 6} That is PROCESSED translating, altering words, adding words. It would not translate back into what John wrote. I will leave it to readers to ponder why the King James translators falsified the translation. ORGANIC translating is obedient to the Grammar, the Internal Harmony, the Logic, the Research. PROCESSED translating defies them all. The extent of this colossal

5. There are 12 words whose mistranslation in the KJV and others destroys the narrative of God's promise to the 12 tribes of Israel – one for each tribe, quite coincidentally – and disrupts the continuity between the Old and New Covenant writings. These words are קדוש (*qadosh*); ἅγιος (*hagios*); ἐκκλησία (*ekklesia*); שמ״ם (*shamayim*); ἐπουράνιος (*epouranios*); οὐρανός (*ouranos*); Ἰουδαῖος (*Ioudaios*); ἔθνος (*ethnos*); גוי (*goy*); Ἕλληνας (*Hellen*); ארץ (*eret*); גֵּה (*gee*). A written study on these words, their mistranslations and the effects of dispossessing the 12 tribes, will appear in the next printed edition of *The Earth-Shaking Truth*. It's on the website now.

6. The concept of the scattered Israelites seems to have given the KJV translators trouble, perhaps the results of different committees. At Jacob (James) 1\1 they translated the singular Greek noun διασπορά (*diaspora*) as a verb phrase "which are scattered abroad", and at 1 Peter 1\1 in a single verb word "scattered".

blunder affects our reading of the entire New Testament. We know from this John 7\35 that there were “the dispersed” house of Israel among the Greeks; we know from John 12\20 that there were worshipping Greeks, as it tells us: “there were some Greeks among those going up to worship at the Festival”, that is, an Israelite festival; we know from Acts 17\1-4 that such “worshipping Greeks” were from the dispersed house of Israel meeting with Judahites in a synagogue on Sabbaths; and we know from the lists in Acts 2\8-11 and 1 Peter 1\1 that among the Greek-speaking regions there were dispersed “elect exiles” of the Israelites. (That is why the New Covenant writings were written in Greek, to reach scattered Israel.) The concern of the apostles was “the dispersion of the Greeks”. To translate John 7\35 incorrectly, therefore, disrupts the entirety of the New Testament. Such a blunder results from PROCESSED translating. Contrarily, the revelation of the truth about “the dispersion of the Greeks” is the result of ORGANIC translating. It answers the Grammar, the Logic, the Internal Harmony, the Research. PROCESSED translating defies them all.

John 8\58 contains the verb *γενέσθαι* (*genesthai*), an aorist infinitive, shown in all its occurrences with their contexts to have a strong future aspect (see footnote at John 8\58). Jesus, in one of his “I Am” statements, is affirming his status as higher than Abraham, saying: “Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham is to appear, I Am.” The verb phrase “is to appear” covers *γενέσθαι* well. Unfortunately, though, the KJV and others have Jesus making the strange statement “Before Abraham was, I am”, a violation of principles of Grammar and Internal Harmony; for *γενέσθαι* is not the imperfect verb “was”, and Jesus was “made” by God and “born out of a woman” (Hebrews 3\2, Galatians 4\4). The KJV disagreeably implies that Jesus was born before Abraham. A most violent contradiction of Matthew 1 and Luke 1. Jesus was *prophesied* before Abraham, then *created* by a seed inside Mary (Maria) when the angel Gabriel announced to her his message from God. *The New European Version* (2015) translator understood well Jesus’ meaning, having “I am of higher status than Abraham ever was”. Exactly so.

At John 11\26 we read Jesus telling his friend Martha that whoever believes in him will “most certainly not die throughout the eon”. The KJV and others, though, represent five Greek words with just “never”, and they have Jesus hissing the same Eden gospel as the serpent hissed, in the words that they “will never die”. But there is no word “never” in John 11\26 (which would be *οὐδέποτε* (*oudepote*), as at Matthew 7\23, 9\33, et cetera). And there are five words, *οὐ μὴ ... εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (*hou me ... eis ton aiona*), which are not represented in John 11\26 by the KJV; they most certainly – *οὐ μὴ* (*hou me*) – mean “most certainly not ... throughout the eon”. Five words not represented; one word made up; the passage not about never dying; the entire passage about resurrection. Well do I remember my astonishment the first time I looked at the uncomplicated and agreeable Greek of this passage.

When Peter powerfully proclaimed the resurrection of Christ he cited Psalms 16\8-11, saying, “You will not abandon my dead body in the grave” (Acts 2\27, 2\31). Both in the Psalm and in Acts the KJV fails to recognise the context of resurrection, for it says falsely, “thou wilt not leave my soul in hell”, indicating (falsely, obviously) that at his death he went into “hell”. I wonder where they thought that was. The KJV men failed to recognise that both the Hebrew word *נֶפֶשׁ* (*nephesh*) and the Greek word *ψυχή* (*psuchē*) sometimes mean “corpse”, “dead body” (e.g. Leviticus 19\28, 22\4, Psalm 16\10, Acts 2\27, 2\31, Revelation 6\9, 20\4); and that both the Hebrew word *שְׂאוֹל* (*sheol*) and the Greek word *ᾗδης* (*hades*) mean nothing but “grave”, place of the dead. They did it all too quickly, for money, for an unrighteous king, to bolster his national religion, and in the wrong spirit (Romans 8\9). Pretending that Jesus went to “hell”, while he was supposed to be dead, would mean that he did not die, so that a sacrifice for sin still remains. At Luke 23\43, the KJV implies (falsely, obviously; see discussion, p. xxxviii) that Jesus at his death went straight to Paradise, but which still is yet to come (Luke 23\42-43, Revelation 2\7 with 22\2, 22\14), also meaning that he did not die, so that a sacrifice for sin still remains.

Yet further, at Matthew 27\59-60 the KJV says (rightly) that Jesus was in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. So according to the KJV, Jesus was in three places. This goof of making Jesus be in three places all at once while he's actually dead is akin to the KJV's John 3\13 where it has Jesus in two places at once while he's alive (see discussion, p. xvi).

At Romans 2\9, 2\10, 3\9, 1 Corinthians 10\32, 12\13, Paul addresses both "Judahite" and "Greek", which nouns are Ἰουδαῖος (*Ioudaios*) and Ἕλλην (*Hellen*). "Judahite", for those of the tribe of Judah, more closely imitates the underlying Greek word Ἰουδαῖος (*Ioudaios*) than does the slang word "Jew", slang either for one from the tribe of Judah, or one from the region of Judea. Unfortunately, in these five passages the KJV has carelessly written these words as "Jew" (Judahite or Judean) and "Gentile" (non-Israelite). This loaded blunder has misled most into believing that "Jew" stands for all the twelve tribes of Israel, whereas it stands only for the southern tribes of Judah. It is the KJV's "Gentile" (non-Israelite) following "Jew" (one of Judah, Judea) which has forced that mistake of identity. But Ἕλλην means "Greek", not "Gentile". In these five passages the KJV falsifies the proper noun Ἕλλην (*Hellen*), "Greek", to "Gentile", just as it does at John 7\35. However, in twenty other places the KJV translates it correctly as "Greek" (and its plural), such as at Romans 1\14 and 1\16, so they knew its meaning. (Other passages having the collocation of "Judahite" and "Greek" are Acts 14\1, 18\4, 19\10, 19\17, 20\21, 10\12, 1 Corinthians 1\24, Galatians 3\28, Colossians 3\11.) So with its "Jew and Gentile" the KJV is doubly in error, being even inconsistent with itself. "Gentile" implies non-Israelite, whereas the correct word "Greek" invites investigation, particularly in view of John 12\20 and John 7\35 with the phrases "Greeks ... going up to worship at the festival," and "the dispersion of the Greeks". With such flagrant disregard for accuracy and internal harmony and logic, as well as the KJV's inconsistency with itself, one cannot help wonder where was the competence, the integrity, consistency, the understanding, checking? The "Greeks" Paul met in synagogues, having the Sabbaths and the law and the Scrolls, in Corinth and Ephesus and Philippi and Thessalonica, were obviously not non-Israelites. They were "the dispersion [diaspora] of the Greeks", those once "lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matthew 10\6, 15\24, Acts 5\31, 13\23-24, 14\1), "the kingdom of the house of Israel" who had become "not My people" (Hosea 1\5-10, Romans 11\25, 1 Peter 2\9-10) and "the uncircumcision" (Ephesians 2\11) and "nations" (Matthew 4\15, Luke 2\32, Romans 11\25, 1 Corinthians 12\2, Ephesians 2\11 et cetera) who now, by reconciliation through Jesus, have become "Sons of the living God" (Hosea 1\10, Romans 9\25-26, 1 Peter 2\10). If Paul had written "Jew and Gentile" anywhere his Greek would read Ἰουδαῖος καὶ ἔθνος – *Ioudaios kai ethnos* – but that phrase does not appear together as a phrase anywhere in the New Covenant writings or in the Old. There is no phrase "Jew and Gentile" – Ἰουδαῖος καὶ ἔθνος – in all the writings of Paul. It's a myth. (The closest they come together is at Romans 9\24, where "nations" is put for dispersed Israelites, in apposition to "Judahites".) For certain, "Gentile" is one of the worst blunders by translators. It is a terrible translation for ἔθνος (*ethnos*), as demonstrated at Matthew 4\15, Luke 2\32, Romans 10\19 (with Hosea 1\9-10, 1 Peter 2\9-10), Ephesians 2\11 (also 3\1, 3\6), and Romans 11\25, where it is put for dispersed Israelites broken from the Covenant, so they are not "Gentiles", non-Israelites. At Revelation 21\24 and 21\26 it *does* indicate non-Israelites. So "nations" is always a safe translation, being a *neutral* word, whereas "Gentiles" is *loaded*, causing error. That disgraceful blunder by the KJV of "Gentile" for "Greek" runs deep, dispossessing the tribes of Israel, the true house of Jacob.

A frequent expression of Paul's is the exclamation μὴ γένοιτο (*mee genoito*), "may it not be" (14 times; first at Romans 3\4). The KJV, however, puts that as "God forbid", neither word matching anything in the Greek; a name in vain; hamstringing word search (where could a lexicon list μὴ or γένοιτο as "God" or "forbid"?); a failure to represent Paul's Greek. What is this "God forbid" but processing, falsification and taking the name of God in vain?

Before the apostle Paul fell down under the blinding light of Christ, he was “ravaging the Ekklesia” (Acts 8\3), “breathing out threats and homicide towards the disciples of the Lord” (Acts 9\1). This he testifies against his former life: “there are immense sorrow and unceasing pains in my heart – for I used to vow for ⁷ I myself to be an anathema from the Christ – for my brothers” (Romans 9\3). His past he puts in a parenthesis (a device known as *epitrechon*, something inserted as an explanatory remark), indicated by my dashes. Now, there is only one sacrifice for sin, and that is the death of the Lord Jesus. But, by the logic of the KJV, Paul also could be a sacrifice to save Israelites – by surrendering his own salvation, as if that would help. That would be “a different gospel” and “anathema” and make Paul “another Jesus” (2 Corinthians 11\4, Galatians 1\6-9). For at Romans 9\3 the KJV says: “For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren”. How could Paul being “accursed from Christ”, that is, being unsaved and hostile to Christ, benefit Israel? It is without sense, either to fact or hyperbole. It would benefit them nothing, for they would lose the great witness to Christ. Would it have been better, then, if Christ had not changed him? When Paul was cursed from Christ believers were suffering from him, not benefitting; it was so harmful that Christ changed him (Acts 26\9-19, 1 Timothy 1\13). Why did Christ change him if, according to the KJV, he were better unsaved? If being cursed from Christ helps others to be saved, why are we not all encouraged to do it, then those saved people could make themselves cursed to save the next lot – and when would it end? Or is it only Paul whom they imagined could be “another Jesus”? How were the King James translators deluded into this? The clause – correctly translated – “for I used to vow for I myself to be an anathema from the Christ” is a parenthesis. If not that, it could reasonably be argued *he used to vow* that being anathema would help his brothers in the flesh (resisting Christ), implying he now understands that idiocy, but the KJV disgracefully has Paul *even now wishing* himself “accursed from Christ for his brethren”. The KJV version does not even suggest Paul meant he would swap his salvation, as I heard a young man boast foolishly that he himself would do; even if the KJV meant that, that too would be utter folly; nobody would do that; you might perhaps give your life for someone but not your salvation; God would not accept that silly trade anyway; that is not how salvation works. At Acts 23\12-21 we see more than 40 Jews who similarly “bound themselves under a curse [anathema]” to murder Paul. Fortunately, they were found out by his nephew. We do not see their anathema being of any benefit. If being anathema to Christ saves Israelites, why were those 40 Jews not fruitful, fruitful according to KJV logic, in saving Israelites? At Romans 9\3, then, we see how Paul used to be just like them, a hostile anathema, but Christ changed him. Paul admits his horrific past, as he does in Acts, and now has “immense sorrow and unceasing pains” in his heart for his brother Israelites. At Galatians 1\8-9 Paul puts under “anathema” anybody proclaiming a false gospel. Grammatical wranglings there might be (absence of the particle *ἄν*), but the ORGANIC translation principles of Internal Harmony and Logic would have saved the King James translators from creating Paul as a blasphemous second sacrifice for sin. In its version of Romans 9\3, the KJV jabbars a nonsensical myth, speaking falsely. Is it not written “None of them can in any way redeem his brother” (Psalm 49\7)?

Paul rebukes his Corinthian readers’ unruly conduct for being “flesh-natured” (1 Corinthians 3\1-4), and in his opening at 1 Corinthians 1\2 and at 3\17 he addresses them as *ἅγιος* (*hagios*), so that “holy” (as the KJV and others have it) seems hardly an appropriate meaning for *ἅγιος*. It is altogether better as “set apart”. We see a clear example at Luke 2\23 where “set apart” excellently represents *ἅγιος*: “Every male who opens the womb will be said to be set apart [*ἅγιος*] for the Lord”. So also does 1 Peter 2\9 illustrate “set apart” as better representing *ἅγιος* than “holy” in Peter’s phrase “a nation set apart”. 1 Peter 2\9-10 echoes Moses’ “nation set

7. *I used to vow for*: With this the Latin Vulgate, Emphatic Diaglott, Companion Bible, Concordant Literal, Green’s Interlinear all agree.

apart” at Exodus 19\5-6, “set apart” in the Hebrew being **קדש** (*qadosh*), equivalent of the Greek **ἅγιος** (*hagios*). These words can usually be better represented than “holy”. Exodus 3\5 is an obvious case: “ground set apart”, not “holy ground”. Such words do not always imply moral quality, are not always intending to display an aura of moral purity, but indicate being set apart, set apart to God. These enhancements mean looking at a total of 930 occurrences of **קדש** (*qadosh*) and **ἅγιος** (*hagios*) and their associated words, 646 in the Old Testament and 284 in the New Testament. I like the word “holy”, but it is not always the best translation.

At 1 Corinthians 2\7 Paul speaks of his day as being “in advance of the eons”. The KJV, though, only manages that as “before the world”. So for the plural noun “eons” (which is **αἰώνων**) it puts a singular noun “world”, so that both the meaning and the number are wrong, and so is the timing wrong – all those mistakes over three easy Greek words. The KJV translators did the same at 1 Corinthians 10\11, putting “world”, a singular concrete noun, instead of “eons”, a plural abstract noun. So three times wrong: meaning, number, category. But **αἰών** (*aion*) means “eon”, or “age”: “world” is **κόσμος** (*kosmos*). See Appendix 6.

1 Corinthians 11\10, head coverings The KJV has it that “ought the woman to have power on her head, because of the angels”. Clumsy wording, but the word “power” is put by the figure of metonym for a head covering (“power” as recognition of authority). What does it mean, “because of the angels”? If you were to trust that KJV translation, you would be able to state irrefutably that the Corinthians’ meetings were attended and watched by angels, presumably, some might imagine, lusting after their pretty girls. But why, if there were such angels present, must women cover their heads? All this is like Homeric fantasy. (The fantasy of the mating of human women with “fallen angels” is from ancient mythology.) John the Baptist is described by Jesus as God’s “messenger” (Matthew 11\10, Mark 1\2). This word “messenger” is **ἄγγελος** (*angelos*), masculine noun, the same word as the KJV’s “angels” at 1 Corinthians 11\10. So must it also be “messengers” concerning head coverings. Those **ἄγγελοι** concerning head coverings are simply the men of God present. A woman’s hair is her glory, Paul goes on to say (1 Corinthians 11\15), causing attraction for men. In an Ekklesia meeting it could be distracting, even to godly men. Women should appear discreet, not flaunting wealth (1 Timothy 2\9, 1 Peter 3\3). It should read “because of the messengers”. All those years of debate ...

In the apostle Paul’s ecstatic opening to his letter to the Ephesians he says that they are exalted, blessed and seated “in” or “among” **ἐπουράνιος** (*epouranios*), that is, either “in the most high heavens”, or “among the most exalted” (Ephesians 1\3, 1\20, 2\6). The Greek word **ἐπουράνιος** (*epouranios*) is **οὐράνιος** (*ouranios*), “heaven” + the intensifier **ἐπὶ** (*epi*), (Strong’s g2032), so “most heavenly”. The whole phrase around it is “in the most high heavens”, or “among the most exalted”. The KJV in these verses has this as “in heavenly places”. The word also occurs at Ephesians 3\10 and 6\12 in relation to evil world rulers who make themselves enemies of God: so, differently to 1\3, 1\20, 2\6 in order to make distinction, as “among the most eminent”. Out of all agreement, though, the KJV at Ephesians 3\10 concerning enemies again has **ἐπουράνιος** (*epouranios*) as “heavenly places”, adding “places” and putting it in italics; this suggests the enemies of God would be in the same “heavenly places” as God’s elect (at 1\3, 1\20, 2\6). It does make the right distinction concerning those same enemies at 6\12 with “in high places”.

At Ephesians 3\11 the KJV has the phrase “eternal purpose”, turning the plural word **αἰώνων** (*aionion*), “eons” or “ages”, a noun, into the adjective “eternal”. It should be “purpose of the eons / ages”. The KJV obscures the prophets’ visions of the ages, blurring everything into an eternity.

At Philippians 1\23 Paul says he does not know which he would prefer, continuing to live or being martyred. “But”, he says, “But I am pressed out of the two”, and instead he was longing for something else, “longing for the return [of Christ] and to be with Christ – so much better!”, so much better than dying or continuing. His emphatic “But” introduces something other than

dying or continuing, something better, the return of Christ, because it would be “so much better”. The KJV, though, most sadly reduces all that to being “in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better”. That implies that with his option of dying he would be with Christ. But if he died he would be buried and awaiting resurrection. The preposition of direction, ἐκ (*ek*), which is “out of”, the King James translators reduced to “betwixt”. There is a difference in having your fingers “out of” the lion’s mouth and having your fingers “betwixt” the lion’s mouth. The Greek preposition for “between” is μεταξύ (*metaxu*), as at Acts 12\6. Paul’s phrase “for the return” is εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι (*eis to analusi*). This preposition + article + infinitive structure (which occurs at least 20 times; list at John 8\58) demands that the infinitive verb ἀναλῦσαι be rendered as a gerund, “return” or “returning”. The verb appears in a different form at Luke 12\36 where it is “he might return”. The King James translators, though, just put all that phrase as “to depart”, wholly out of joint with the verb’s meaning and omitting both the preposition and the article, and reducing Paul’s options to *two*, whereas he considered *three* options. The Latin *Vulgate* has the curiosity “desiderium habens dissolvi”, desiring to be dissolved, nothing like the meaning. However, *The Emphatic Diaglott* editor understood this phrase, having “for the returning”. In Philippians 1\23 Paul says he could become martyred or continue living, but most of all he wants the return of Jesus. The King James translators did not consider the return of Jesus, but only had in their orthodox religious minds the fanciful “flight of the soul” at death, denying Jesus’ gospel of resurrection. This is a classic example of where the translators imposed what they believed, not minding altering grammatical forms and destroying the structure, rather than looking hard into the real meaning. Their eight years, I tell you today, were nowhere near enough to translate the books of God.

Colossians 1\16 has twice the singular passive verb κτίζω (*ktizo*) – an attractive looking word – telling us that everything now, through the victory of Christ, “is founded”, aorist singular, and “has been founded”, perfect singular, in him, for all authority has been passed by the Father to the Son. But the KJV violates the Grammar and turns those *aorist* and *perfect* and *singular* verbs into *imperfect* and *plural* verbs, “were created”, violations of Grammar. It changes the obvious meaning, its “were created” implying falsely Jesus was the Creator, smuggling in an obvious conflict with Genesis 1\1 which tells us *Elohim*, God, was the Creator, not His only begotten, Jesus Christ. Acceptable would be “is made” and “has been made” – and it is “in him”, not “by him” – and the verse ends with “and for him”; it is not, then, “by him”. From the truth of this verse, correctly translated, we recall that Jesus said, “I also have received *authority* alongside my Father” (Revelation 2\27) and that he, Jesus, is now “the ruler of the creation of God” (Revelation 3\12). The creation is God’s and Christ is its ruler. Christ has been promoted. To falsify the two verbs and run a dance that Christ – who, we know, was not born until the time of John the Baptist – was the Creator is a violation of Grammar, Internal Harmony, and Logic, a denial of revealed truth. The truth is, God created the Earth by His speaking, and God created Jesus by the angel messenger’s speaking (Matthew 1\18-21, Luke 1\26-34, Hebrews 3\2). Therefore, κτίζω (*ktizo*) here is superior with the meaning *to found*, as in Ephesians 2\10, 3\9, 4\24. Everything now “is founded” and “has been founded” in Christ. Thayer says of κτίζω (*ktizo*): “prop. *to make habitable to people a place, region ... hence to found ... to create ... to form, shape ... completely to change, to transform*” (Thayer, p. 363). What Paul is telling us at Colossians 1\16 is that Jesus now has authority from his Father over all things, as is said many times and as Jesus said himself. (See the list in the footnote at Revelation 2\27.) Therefore, everything now is founded and established in Christ. The KJV implies two Creators, two gods. But Moses said and Jesus said, “Yahweh our *Elohim* *is* one Yahweh” (Deuteronomy 6\4), and “Hear, Israel, *the* Lord our God is one Lord” (Mark 12\29). Not two. To make that into two is rebellion and disagreement. As Jeremiah speaks: “How can you say, ‘We *are* wise and the law of Yahweh is with us?’ Look, the lying pen of the scribes has certainly worked deceit” (Jeremiah 8\8).

The KJV pulls off an ungrammatical eon-avoiding strategy at 1 Timothy 1\17. By the correct translation, Paul exalts God with the elegant phrase “King of the Ages” or “King of the Eons”. But the KJV translators pull off their ungrammatical eons-avoiding strategy with “King eternal”, juggling a plural noun αἰώνων (*aionon*) into an adjective, not only a grammatical violation but also losing the elegance. Placing the adjective after the noun in that way is Latinate, and it does not express the underlying Greek.

At 2 Timothy 1\9 the apostle Paul speaks of God’s purpose and mercy “given to us in Christ Jesus in advance of times of the eons” or “before times of the eons / ages”. The KJV turns that into “given us in Christ Jesus before the world began”. This makes out that God’s grace was given to Paul and his readers “before the world began”. However, Paul and his readers were not alive before the world began to be given anything by anybody. And worse, it bends a false knee to the obnoxious inventions of Calvinism, that before the beginning of time, before any human existed, some humans were pre-elected for salvation and others for eternal damnation in fire, with men having no choice. If naïve and unsuspecting, you would imagine that the underlying Greek text must contain words that bear that meaning, “before the world began”. However, that is not the case. That phrase does not appear once anywhere in the NT; it’s all a falsification. There is no article “the”, no word “world”, and no verb “began”. It’s all made up. The only part they got right is the preposition “before”. The Greek phrase that the translators altered is πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων (*pro kronon aionion*). It is not difficult Greek. What it means is “in advance of [or, ahead of / before] eonian times [or, the times of the ages / eons]”. The word πρὸ is “before”. The word χρόνων is a plural noun meaning “times”. The word αἰώνων is a plural adjective and means “eonian” or “age-enduring”, describing the plural noun “times”. And what they mean together is “before / in advance of eonian times”, or “before the times of the eons / ages”. So Paul was saying to Timothy that God’s grace and purpose and calling into separateness were promised in advance of the times of the ages, but they are “now brought to light by ... our Saviour Jesus Christ” (1\10), which promise we can find in Genesis (to the patriarchs) and at Exodus 19\5-6 (echoed at 1 Peter 2\9), and they are given and received now for Paul and his audience. The King James translators did the same woeful thing with Titus 1\2, speaking of what God *promised* “before the world began”, yet, in contradiction, at Romans 16\25 the KJV speaks of the gospel *kept secret* “since the world began”. In a similar spirit of Calvinism, all the king’s men blundered at 1 Corinthians 2\7, speaking of a wisdom “that God ordained before the world”, but which really translates as “in advance of [or before] the ages [or eons]”. See also Romans 14\24.

Titus 2\13 speaks of “the magnificence of the Mighty God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ”, everything after “of” (twice) being in the genitive. The KJV omits the second “of”, having “great God and Saviour Jesus Christ”, leaving an implication that Jesus might even be that “great God”, a falsehood and a delusion – and yet another violation of Internal Harmony.

Hebrews 1\2 and 11\3 state that God “designed the eons” (αἰώνας, plural), meaning that He has framed all the past and present and coming eons, divisions of time marked by His different ways of speaking to and dealing with mankind, and marked by voices of prophets. However, in these two verses the KJV translators put “he made the worlds” and “the worlds were framed”. But there is only one world. And αἰών (*aion*) means “eon”, “age”, never “world” and never “worlds”.

Hebrews 3\2 speaks of Jesus Christ being “faithful to Him having created him” (or, “Him Who created him”). The verb “having created” is ποιέω (*poieo*), from which comes our word “poetry”, implying something made. This is the great oracle that tells us that Jesus is a created man, who was “born of a woman” (Galatians 4\4), just like Jesus described John the Baptist (Luke 7\28). The verb ποιέω (*poieo*) occurs 18 other times in Hebrews, and always as a creating word. The word in Hebrews for “appointed” is in its prologue at 1\2, which tells us that God

“appointed” Jesus as “heir of all things”: the verb for “appointed” being τίθημι (*titheemi*). God “created” (Hebrews 3\2) Jesus and “appointed” (Hebrews 1\2) him as heir of all things. However, at Hebrews 3\2 the KJV translates the verb ποιέω (*poieo*) also as “appointed”, missing the point of God’s creating activity concerning His Son. Jesus was created, with no previous existence, inside the young Israeli virgin called Maria at the moment of Gabriel’s announcement. Thayer, praise God, comments well on the KJV’s “appoint”: “to this sense some interpreters would refer Heb. iii.2 ... but it is more correct to take ποιέω here in the sense of *create*” (Thayer, p. 525, column 2). Thayer also says of ποιέω (*poieo*): “roughly speaking, [ποιέω] may be said to answer to the Lat. *facere* or the English *do*” (column 1, p. 527). The LV has this correctly, with “fecit”, “he made” (and for the whole clause, “qui fidelis est ei qui fecit ilium”; “who is faithful to him who made him”). Tyndale also was correct with “made”. Green correctly has “making” in the text (but “appointed” in the margin). Bagster’s *Interlinear Greek-English New Testament* has this correctly, with “making”. Alford correctly comments: “to him that made him (so we must render ποιήσαντι, not, ‘that appointed him’)” (Alford, p. 58). *The Literal Idiomatic Translation* by Hal Dekker (online) has “having made”. Yet the KJV has “appointed”, even though it has this verb as “appoint” nowhere else. Bullinger’s *Critical Lexicon* gives 13 other words which he has as meaning “appoint” or “appointed”. Strong gives 11 other words which the KJV has as “appoint” or “appointed”; the KJV did not need ποιέω (*poieo*) as “appoint” also. Concerning the KJV’s “appointed”, once again the prophet Jeremiah speaks: “Look, the lying pen of the scribes has certainly worked deceit” (Jeremiah 8\8).

At Hebrews 4\8 the KJV says “if Jesus had given them rest”, implying he did not, therefore his New Covenant was a failure. Yet Jesus had said, “I will give you rest” and “you will find rest” (Matthew 11\28-29). Speaking of Moses’ successor, the KJV names him at Acts 7\45 as “Jesus”. Both passages should read “Joshua”. There is no excuse in the overlap of the names “Joshua” and “Jesus” because the KJV manages “Joshua” and “Jesus” correctly elsewhere. Nothing is easier for the translator than names (see above concerning John 7\35 and Romans 2\9, 2\10 et cetera).

Hebrews 9\26 has the two phrases “foundation of *the* world [κόσμος]”, “world” singular, and “completion of the eons [αἰών]”, “eons” plural. Hence it’s absurd to want both κόσμος (*kosmos*) and αἰών (*aion*) as “world” singular. Yet that is exactly what the KJV does have, with “the foundation of the world” and “the end of the world” – wrong in number and as if, absurdly, Jesus’ death was at the end of the world. Ephesians 2\2 most happily provides the distinction between the two words κόσμος (*kosmos*) and αἰών (*aion*), having both words in a single phrase, “the eon of this world”, so the King James translators were forced to make a distinction. But they did not make a distinction; they got round it with “course of this world”. Now, I do think that “course” is a good rendering in that context. But if only they had got it right elsewhere. Their “course”, though, testifies against them that αἰών (*aion*) is an abstract noun of time (“age”, “eon”), never a concrete noun of space (“world”). At Hebrews 11\3 and 11\7 we again see the distinctions: “the eons [αἰών] ... have been framed by ... God” and “Noah ... condemned the world [κόσμος]”. Noah did not condemn the eons that God had purposely designed and framed. See Appendix 6.

About 2 Peter 1\19 Peter writes, “we have the more certain prophetic oracle, which you do well in guarding – as if to a light which shines in a murky place, until the day dawns and *the* daystar rises – in your hearts”. This certain prophetic oracle we must be “guarding ... in our hearts”. There is a figure of parenthesis, an insertion. The verb could be repeated (in italics) to make supply for the ellipsis: “rises – *guarding* in your hearts”. The KJV translators failed to recognise any of this, writing: “until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts”. But “the day star” symbolizes Christ; and Christ, in his day, will not be making his rising inside human hearts. What is in hearts is the “guarding”. *The Companion Bible* (Appendix 6, page 11) draws

attention to the parenthesis. The phrase “in our hearts” relates back to the guarding, the taking heed, at the beginning of the sentence. (See also Bullinger’s *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*, a world masterpiece.)

At 2 Peter 2\4 Peter makes reminder of Korah, Dathan and Abiram who rebelled and were “swallowed underground”, described also at Numbers 16\1-34, Psalm 106\17, Jude 5, 6, 11. The verb for “swallowed underground” is ταρταρόω (*tartaroo*), which is the equivalent of the Hebrew בלע (*bahlag*) at Numbers 16\30-34 and used of Jonah: “Yahweh provided a large fish to swallow [*bahlag*] Jonah” (Jonah 1\17). Peter’s comment on those rebels falling into a pit the KJV describes as being “cast down to hell”. I reject the excusing argument that “hell” means a hole in the ground: everybody, including the translators, knows exactly what “hell” means and exactly why the KJV men put it. There is nothing about any “hell” in any of these passages about Korah: they are all about falling into and dying in a pit.

Diligent readers might also like to look at Numbers 14\23 (“certainly they will see” against KJV’s “they shall not see”); for ⁸ Matthew 24\22 and Mark 13\20 (“all flesh ... not” against KJV’s “no flesh”); Matthew 24\36 and Mark 13\32 (“has known” against KJV’s “knoweth”); Luke 3\23 (“he of Heli” against KJV’s “the son of Heli”); Acts 10\28 (“tribe” against KJV’s “nation”).

Concerning capitalizations. First, Mark 1\1, Luke 1\2, Philippians 4\15 and the opening of John’s first letter all speak of “The beginning of the gospel” and “the beginning”. The beginning of John’s gospel, John 1\1, also speaks of “the beginning” and “the oracle”, which is the word and proclamation and mastermind plan and thought of God. The KJV capitalizes “Word” at John 1\1, suggesting a title of Christ, but that is in conflict with its also saying “the Word was God”. The capitalization is an imposition, multiplying unreliability. Second, in John 14\16-17, 14\26, 15\26, 16\7 we read of Jesus promising the coming of the Holy Spirit for the disciples, teaching them “all things”; this is a title of the *personality* of the Holy Spirit (see Genesis 48\15-16, Exodus 23\21, and Isaiah 63\9-11 and footnote, the Angel). At Ephesians 1\13 Paul speaks of the sealing with the “holy spirit of promise”; this is the *abstract gift* of the renewed mind. For the distinction, the first I capitalize; the second I do not. The KJV, however, first mystically calls the “Spirit” the “Ghost”; second, it capitalizes “spirit” in both places (wrong at Ephesians 1\13), failing to make a distinction, and doing the same elsewhere. *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible* makes the distinction in all places, and so restores the personality of the Holy Spirit, with his numerous titles, to his true status (Genesis 48\15-16, Exodus 23\21, Isaiah 63\9-11), previously confused with the spirit of the renewed mind (and sometimes with one of the deities of the triad system). The KJV, however, is better than many versions concerning the capitalization of “spirit”, offending far less often than some.

Concerning ghosts. The death of Abraham is recorded as “Abraham expired, and he died in a good old age” (Genesis 25\8). Rather than the single word “expired” the KJV men wrote “gave up the ghost”. They used this same expression concerning Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob (Genesis 25\17, 35\29, 49\33). It was not a ghost they gave up, but the spirit (breath) of life in them, as recorded concerning Adam: Yahweh Elohim “breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living soul” (Genesis 2\7). This was not a “ghost”, for that is something we recognise from men’s silly horror films and mythological fables as the soul of a dead person, and something that is said in men’s superstition to haunt castles and old houses. Those patriarchs, in expiring, were giving up the breath of life, not ghosts. If the KJV men were insistent on paraphrasing the Hebrew with a verb phrase they should have written “gave up the spirit”. To “give up the ghost” is an English idiom; it is an unfortunate phrase to impose on the word of God. The KJV men did the same thing concerning the death of Jesus, saying that he “yielded up the ghost” and “gave up the ghost” (Matthew 27\50, John 19\30). He “gave up his spirit”, the breath of life, not a ghost.

8. This comment concerning Numbers 16\23 was error, and I make my apology.

When the angel Gabriel was divinely empowered to make announcement to the young Israeli virgin Mary (Maria) to create the seed of Jesus in her, that power of God is expressed by Matthew as πνεῦμα ἅγιον (*pneuma hagion*), “holy spirit” (Matthew 1\18). Luke expresses this as both “holy spirit” and “power of the Most High” (Luke 1\35), so that we know here, by the figure of parallelism, Luke’s term “holy spirit” signifies divine power, as does Matthew’s. Where Matthew describes Mary as “with a child from the holy spirit” – the words “holy spirit” being an abstract noun phrase – it is depressing that the KJV men chose the unfortunate and unattractive wording “with child of the Holy Ghost”, the abstract noun phrase capitalized as if representing a titled being, and unattractive for using the genitive “of” for the dative “by”. This is to be regretted. In this context it is even worse to impose wording which carries men’s superstition and mythology of ghosts and ghouls.

The KJV extends its vocabulary of superstition concerning baptism, blasphemy, the title of the Angel of God, and concerning divine empowerment and anointing: it has John saying of Jesus he will “baptize you with the Holy Ghost” (Matthew 3\11): it has Jesus speaking of “blasphemy *against* the *Holy* Ghost” (Matthew 12\31): it has Jesus speak of “the name of the ... Holy Ghost” (Matthew 28\19): it says that the apostles together, then Peter, then Stephen, were “filled with the Holy Ghost” (Acts 2\4, 4\8, 6\5, 7\55). If, in the KJV framework, they thought “Holy Ghost” represented a titled being, how could Peter and Stephen be filled in their bellies with another being? (Where would be the space?) The KJV men put their “Ghost” 91 times into their New Testament. Why they selected “Ghost” – and capitalized it – rather than the more obvious, correct, and consistent (and not spooky) “spirit”, which they used elsewhere for the same Hebrew and Greek words, is indeed a curiosity.

Concerning italics and style. It is good translation practice to add italics for supplied words and, as described in the box on the page preceding this preface, I keep these to the barest reasonable minimum, another **ORGANIC** principle guarding against adding. But it is not good translation practice to add words unnecessarily. 1 John 2\23 reads: “Whoever denies the Son does not have the Father.” The KJV generally adds italics for supplied words, which is good. However at this passage it does the following: “Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: (*but*) *he that acknowledgeth the Son bath the Father also.*” The King James translators added an entire clause which is unnecessary.

Concerning lineation. An extraordinary debility of style in the KJV is its translators’ failure to mark poetical passages, particularly necessary in the prophets and Psalms and Proverbs and Job, by devices of lineation. Lineation means line-breaks. It is a device in poetry: the closure of lines before the right-hand margin, either by end-stopping with punctuation or by enjambement (carrying over the grammatical sense into the next line), making it visually definable and identifiable as poetry. The KJV presents everything, prose and poetry, in the same way, each verse a numbered paragraph, so that its prose is not continuous and its poetry is not lineated. Where effects of parallelism are used, especially in the Psalms, lineation visually helps to draw attention to them. This visual attention is lost without lineation.

Concerning more regarding style. Adjuncts, asyndeton, syntax, polysyndeton, alliteration, acrostics. The king and prophet David, in his beautiful Psalms, often made use of the adjunct, a qualifying or additional phrase following the main clause, creating a list effect. For example: “He brought out His people / with joy, His chosen with gladness” (Psalms 105\43). The phrase “His chosen with gladness” is an adjunct. For another example: “They forgot El, their Saviour, / He Who performed wonderful things in Egypt, / ²² wonderful works in the land of Ham, / wonderful things at the Red Sea” (Psalms 106\21-22). The phrase “He Who performed wonderful things in Egypt” and the two phrases of verse 22 are all adjuncts, additions to the main clause at verse 21. The adjunct is a literary style frequently in use by good writers today. The KJV translators preferred to lose this style by adding “*and*” in italics, so that the adjunct effect is lost: “And he brought forth his people with joy, *and* his chosen with gladness” (Psalms

105\43); and “Wondrous works in the land of Ham, *and* terrible things by the Red sea” (Psalm 106\22). The list effect is lost. With the unnecessary adding of “*and*”, a symbolic time and distance are put between the main clause and the adjunct, time and distance between God’s action and its effects. The loss of the style for its own sake is regrettable also. A further example is Psalm 141\2: “Let my prayer be laid before You / *as* incense, the lifting of my palms / *as* the evening gift offering”. The KJV unnecessarily adds “*and*” in front of “the lifting”, spoiling the effect of the adjunct.

As well as the adjunct, David also used effects of asyndeton, a compacting together of short clauses or sentences without conjunctions (joining words), creating an abrupt detachment, staccato, so to speak, in tone. For example: “they called to Yahweh in their distress; / from their troubles He delivered them” (Psalm 107\6); and “they cried out to Yahweh in their distress; / from their troubles He saved them” (Psalm 107\13); and “they cried out to Yahweh in their distress; / from their troubles He saved them” (Psalm 107\19). These were intended to be short and blunt, bringing close together the desperate call and God’s swift answer (“His word runs very quickly”; Psalm 147\15). To separate the clauses with “*and*” is symbolic of delay, destroying both the literary style and the impact of the implication of God’s swiftness to help. Yet that is just what the KJV flesh-minded translators did in Psalm 107 and elsewhere: “they cried unto the LORD in their trouble, *and* he delivered them out of their distresses” (Psalm 107\6); they did the same in Psalm 107\13 and 107\19. We notice another change in those verses. The syntax (word order) changes from “out of their troubles He saved them” (the Hebrew syntax) to the KJV’s “he delivered them out of ...”. The underlying Hebrew translates as “in their distress; from their troubles He delivered them”, fronting the “troubles” in the second clause, creating a structure: the call, the distress, the troubles, the deliverance. This syntactical structure of these clauses might be marked ABBA. Unfortunately, the KJV translators chose to reverse the structure of the second clause by writing “and he delivered them out of their distresses”, so that their structure reads ABAB. This alteration of the underlying structures occurs throughout the KJV. Many modern versions, by their paraphrases, are far worse. It is a translator’s duty to try to recapture as closely as is reasonably possible the style of the underlying language, with all its devices. (As I have said elsewhere, there is more work I can do on this in my translation. Alliteration is difficult; meaning comes first.) Where Psalm 34, Psalm 119 and Proverbs 31\10-31 use acrostics I have indicated that with the Hebrew alphabet and drawn attention to it in footnotes. I have not attempted to reproduce the equivalent English alphabet effects.

None of these stylistic faults affects anything doctrinally. They do, however, destroy the spirit of the writings of the prophets and apostles. They are also a demonstration of the sloppy methods of the translators, and of their attitude towards the word of God. Recovering something of these original styles is another alleluiah for the project of translation truth.

Dr. Robert Alter, in his *Art of Bible Translation*, draws detailed attention to many literary and linguistic effects destroyed by translators. He does say, and I agree, that the KJV in its narrative style, such as in describing the flood where it *should* be syndetic in style (the deliberate joining of clauses and passages with “and”, called syndetic or polysyndeton (many “ands”)), does not offend in the ways of some versions, whose styles can sound pedestrian, bureaucratic, and “schoolboy fiction”. In narrative passages the KJV translators were, happily, not shy to use the repeated “and” where it is in the Hebrew. In this factor it and its derivatives excel modern versions.

Concerning punctuation, paragraphing, speech marks. Luke 23\43, Romans 9\5, 1 Timothy 3\15 Jesus promised a criminal dying alongside him that when he appears in his Kingdom the believing criminal would be with him in the Paradise which is the New Jerusalem coming after the thousand years (Luke 23\42-43, Revelation 2\7 with 22\2, 22\14). Jesus told him, “Truly, I say to you this day, you will be with me in Paradise”. The opening “I say to you today” was a Hebraic idiom used even in the days of Moses (see footnote at Luke 23\43). At

Luke 23\43 the King James translators put a comma *in front of* its “To day”, but to complete the Hebraistic idiom it should come *after* “today”; by placing the comma in the wrong place they made it seem as if Jesus would appear in his Kingdom that very day when they were both dying; as if the Paradise after the 1,000 years would be inhabited by that dying thief that very day, three thousand years in advance; as if, also, Jesus did not really die but went to Paradise (although its Acts 2\27 and 2\31 say he went to “hell”, and its Matthew 27\57-60 says he was buried in a tomb). Such a bluster of confusion is caused by one misplaced comma, so inventing the possibilities of several false ideas. At Romans 9\5, Paul, having said of the patriarchs, “from whom *is* the Christ in relation to flesh, he being over everything”, then gives praise to God, saying, “God be praised throughout the ages!” For my “everything” the KJV has “over all” (which is fine), but then inserts a comma after its “over all”, instead of a full-stop, and has “who is over all, God ...”, giving the impression Paul was, after all, in defiance of the prophets, making Christ “God”. At 1 Timothy 3\15 the KJV puts a comma after its “church of the living God”, instead of a full-stop, making its “church” the “pillar and ground of the truth”, rather than all that follows concerning Christ in verse 16 being the “pillar and ground of the truth”. With colons and semi-colons splattered mercilessly all over the place, and its making each verse a numbered paragraph with a new capital letter even after a comma, the KJV is the worst punctuated and worst displayed published book I have ever seen. I have seen better punctuation and paragraphing in primary schools. Punctuation is a strategy for courtesy, as is paragraphing. They assist readers. Done badly they impede and interrupt readers. And they impede and distort understanding. Understanding governs how we think. And how we think governs how we behave. Paragraphing is a visual display to assist readers in recognising units of theme and dialogue and narrative. These have to be marked and organised by the writer. Without paragraphing there is just a disorganised blur of text, discouraging reading. Newspaper and magazine editors recognise this and display their articles in columns with short paragraphs in order to give their readers every visual and mental assistance. Bibles are usually and sensibly printed in columns because that allows more words per page, hence creating a smaller book. The presentation of the work of God should be a *Gesamtkunstwerk*, a complete work of art, honouring to God.

The KJV translators failed to include speech-marks. Creating the correct speech-marks in passages such as Jeremiah 29, Ezekiel 36 and Zechariah 1, for example, requires concentration in determining where the appropriate marks open and close. During over 24 years of creating *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible* I have spent hundreds of hours giving attention to conventions of paragraphing and punctuation and speech-marks and styles, wishing to make for readers a courteous and helpful display. (A reader of an early edition of my New Testament translation described its punctuation as “world-class”; another reader felt encouraged to read on and on because of the agreeable style and helpful display.) Some modern versions have at least done some of these cosmetic things well. I have used the convention of underlining in this preface in order to assist readers in finding passages they wish to refer to.

Concerning the eons or ages. (Also discussed pp. iv-v, p. xxiii, p. xxviii, pp. xxxiii-iv, Appendix 6.) The most abundant blunders in English translations have been over the Hebrew word עולם (*olam*), (“eon”, “age”; 438 occurrences); the Greek word αἰών (*aion*) (also “eon”, “age”; 126 occurrences); its adjective form αἰώνιος (*aionios*), (“eonian” or “age-lasting”; 71 occurrences); and the adverbial phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (*eis ton aiona*), (“throughout the eon / age”; 27 occurrences). These, allowing for some idiomatic uses, account for over 600 losses of the prophetic ages with just these parts alone. Yet there is no difficulty: the Greek word αἰών (*aion*) is simply where our English word “eon” comes from, and αἰώνιος (*aionios*) is where our English word “eonian” comes from. And, interchangeably, the Hebrew עולם (*olam*) means the same as αἰών (*aion*). King James’s translators, in obdurately refusing to translate these words as “eon”

or “age”, rejected the prophets’ and apostles’ visions of the eons past, present and future. They often perversely wanted עולם (*olam*) and αἰών (*aion*) as “world”, so substituting a concrete noun, “world”, for an abstract noun “eon” or “age”. Then, inconsistently, wanting “world” for the noun – which should press the adjective form to be “worldly” – they have the adjective form, αἰώνιος, as “eternal”, as in their phrase “eternal life” (John 3\15-16). At Ecclesiastes 3\11 the KJV has the phrase “the world in their heart”, which is without meaning. It should say “the eon in their heart”, a yearning for a golden age where all in Christ are happy and blessed. The KJV also wrongly has עולם (*olam*) as “world” at Isaiah 45\17, 64\4 and Psalm 73\12.

The King James translators often translated phrases with the nouns עולם (*olam*) and αἰών (*aion*) as “for ever”, but “ever” is an adverb, not a noun. The KJV translators’ mistranslation of those Hebrew and Greek words and phrases has meant the concealing of the coming Messianic eon, with its threat of hurling down all political potentates, which will happen as written (Luke 1\52, Matthew 24\29). And many other such things the popular translators do, so that if they were all written down I do not imagine the world itself to contain the written books. Yet nobody says a word. Now, though, the corrections and straightening out announce the coming Kingdom of God. While most Christian teaching mistakenly finishes everything up in Heaven, causing a distraction from the action here on Earth, the reality of the fulfilling of the prophecy of resurrections of the prophets and apostles will begin the dissembling of the political powers, and the Kingdom of God and Christ will be established.

Concerning vulgar words and ugly gibberish. The KJV has some unfortunate vulgar words. It also has plenty of ugly gibberish: for example, Genesis 43\25, Exodus 38\4, Numbers 10\21, Deuteronomy 23\13, Hosea 9\10, Ephesians 3\2.

Concerning the character of translators. It is an historical fact that those who hold a King James Bible in their hands are holding a book made and overseen by inquisitors, persecutors and torturers of Christians, those inquisitors and persecutors including Richard Bancroft, Lancelot Andrewes, Hadrian à Saravia, William Hutchinson, George Abbott, John Overall, and Thomas Sparkes. I would refer readers to an unbiased book about the making of the King James Bible, *Power and Glory*, by Adam Nicolson (2003). From that book I found that the KJV men were inquisitors, torturers, a debauched drunken pornographer, cruel, brutal, Calvinists, thieves, nepotists, purchasers of titles, ambitious and self-seeking careerists, sickly crawlers to royalty, lovers of wealth, intolerant, entirely worldly, ornamental, religious (not spiritual), haters and hunters of those with different viewpoints, haters of Catholics and haters of Separatists. They were then, on the whole, an unlikeable and unrighteous brood, inquisitors for the king and persecutors of men who held different views to themselves, such as denying the authority of the churches’ bishops. Such rightful dissenters, Separatists, were imprisoned, hung up on chains, tortured, interrogated by the bishops including the chairman of the KJV translators, Lancelot Andrewes, and condemned to cruel deaths, watched on by the bishops. An eighteen-year old boy was imprisoned. Catholics had to hide themselves in safe houses, crouching in chimneys and wherever they could to conceal themselves from the king’s search parties. Real believers in Christ, often gone into hiding having seen the wolf coming, were hunted down and jailed and subjected to inquisition by men such as these. Wolves, scattering the sheep, and from whom the sheep fled. The Pilgrim Fathers, eventually setting out in the *Mayflower* and settling in America, had been driven out of England by religious persecution under King James, who said, “I shall make them conform or I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse.” The Pilgrims compared their escape to the flight of the Israelites out of Egypt. Let the high seas rage over those Christ-hating pharaohs and their chasing iron chariots. Little wonder the King James Bible is a stale book of the traditions of men. The translating of God’s books should never have fallen into the hands of wolves. Their works, or any like them, cannot survive the fire. Besides its insulting layout, with every verse a new paragraph even mid-sentence which is a disgrace (I know of no other book abused like that; let a publisher do that to a Dickens or Austen novel and

watch the outrage), its lack of poetical lineation, lack of speech marks, wrong punctuation, the King James Bible is an altogether sloppy work from start to finish. The word of God was “betrayed into hands of sinners” (Matthew 26\45). The Ark of the Covenant of the Elohim of Israel was taken by a strange hand (1 Samuel 4 e⁵5), causing confusion and uncertainty, tumours of the spirit.

Every individual, group, nation, kingdom, state or empire, however well-intentioned, which trusts and is founded on the KJV or other popular commercial versions, will have trusted serious errors, even if they think they’ve seen through errors.

And what more could I say? For time would fail in narrating how the system of translating the word of God in the righteous **ORGANIC** method is refreshing and effective in recovering the whole counsel of God, as well as the stylistic effects of its divinely inspired writers.

6. *The greatest scandal in literary history and the two roots of the rot.*

The teachers of the body of Christ have been at fault in accepting corrupt translations

The religious sheriffs of this world have doctored the language of angels and quenched the sparkle of prophets. No greater scandal could occur in literary history than that possession of the Bible could be banned by Archbishop Arundel, the word of God be so vandalised and mutilated by sheriffs of natural religion, and that men such as Tyndale and Rogers should be murdered by them, an outward show of the sheriffs’ “death-dealing venom” (Jacob (James) 3\8). That the Sacred Writings should have been so abused throughout the centuries, commissioned for the wrong reasons, fallen into the wrong hands, and that its righteous broadcasters should be murdered, insulted, harassed and hated, there is little more reprehensible. The word of God has been hijacked. It began with good spirit, with Wycliffe, Tyndale, Rogers working in opposition to the authorities. Then the religious sheriffs stepped in. Henry VIII used William Tyndale’s New Testament for his own purpose. King James saw his chance to use the Bible, and employed compliant men who would do it his way.

The rot took root. Why have their false works been accepted by the body of Christ? Little wonder there is so much contention. The preface to the NKJV (1985, superior to the KJV, but still errant), speaks of the KJV as being the “mainspring of the religion ... of our civilization.” Unfortunately, yes. No Christian individual, group, kingdom or empire based on wild translations can be without serious faults. Pure + impure = impure.

As the false shepherds and the sheep were at fault and had to be admonished by the prophets, so also have the body of Christ and its teachers been at fault in accepting false translations. Of course, it is not fair to blame the sheep. The teachers with the linguistic skills are the culprits. From the sloppy pages of errant translators, we know that we are being given false information. I hope that lovers of the word of God will now be awakened out of their tolerance and satisfaction with translations containing false teachings, and hunger will burn for verbal and grammatical accuracy and complete internal harmony and purity, so that they can discover exactly what the prophets and apostles of God have written. *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible* can be trusted to be striving for a reliable imitation of the underlying forms, and for a continual striving for perfection.

This is how Benjamin Wilson found the King James Bible:

Obsolete words, uncouth phrases, bad grammar and punctuation, etc., all require alteration. But this is not all. There are errors of a more serious nature which need correction. The translators of the Common version were circumscribed and trammelled by royal mandate; they were required to retain certain old ecclesiastical words ... Thus the minds of many who had no means of knowing the meaning of the original words have been misled and confused. (Wilson, *The Emphatic Diaglott*, p. 2)

It has uncouth phrases, gibberish, vulgarities, and bad grammar, like “given me to you-ward”

at Ephesians 3\2. That curiosity “you-ward” does not reflect the underlying Greek. If only Wilson had listed the errors *he* found. And:

How important, then, that [the Sacred Writings] should be correctly read and understood! But can it be fairly said that such is the case with our present English Version? We opine not. Though freely acknowledging that it is sufficiently plain to teach men the social and religious duties of life, and the path to immortality, yet it is a notable fact that King James’ Translation is far from being a faithful reflection of the mind of the Spirit, as contained in the Original Greek in which the books of the New Testament were written. There are some thousands of words which are either mistranslated, or too obscurely rendered; besides others which are now obsolete, through improvement in the language. Besides this, it has been too highly colored in many places with the party ideas and opinions of those who made it, to be worthy of full and implicit confidence being placed in it as a genuine record. In the words of Dr. Macknight, “It was made a little too complacent to the King, in favoring his notions of predestination, election, witchcraft, familiar spirits, and kingly rights, and these it is probable were also the translators’ opinions. That their translation is partial, speaking the language of, and giving authority to one sect [sic]”. And according to Dr. Gell, it was wrested and partial, “and only adapted to one sect;” but he imputes this, not to the translators, but to those who employed them, for even some of the translators complained that they could not follow their own judgment in the matter, but were restrained by reasons of state.” (pp. 6-7)

“[R]estrained by reasons of state” ... Conscience forbids juggling with the word of God. The King James Bible, its title page bearing the name *The Holy Bible*, and *The Revised Version Bible* (1885), also bearing that name on its title page, are the deeply corrupt works of deeply corrupt men. Consider the pedigree of the former: commissioned by an unrighteous king who slandered Christ (my evidence is unrepeatable); its purpose not to discover the prophets and apostles but to unite his empire; a committee headed by an inquisitor; accompanied by other inquisitors and ambitious churchmen; a work not of spirit but of flesh; the Old Testament books in the wrong order; its style deliberately Latinate, sometimes gibberish; “APPOINTED TO BE READ IN CHURCHES” on its title page; its idolatrous preface to the king, not God; its layout a mockery; its punctuation hideous; alterations of grammatical forms and meanings of words; a shipwrecking of every major teaching of the prophets and apostles; a Christ who threatened people with eternal torture; a Christ who spoke like the serpent in Eden (John 11\26); a Son of God who is his own father; a Christ who did not die at all but went to Paradise and Hell (Luke 23\43, Acts 2\27, 2\31); a Christ whose Covenant was a failure (Hebrews 4\8). However pure our intent, it is a scientific law that pure + impure = impure. Can you gather grapes from thorns and nettles? For “a corrupt tree produces noxious fruits ... Every tree not producing good fruit gets cut down and is thrown into fire” (Matthew 7\16-19). As demonstrated already, God hates mixture (p. vii). It is true that the KJV can sometimes be relied on to choose an excellent word in literary terms, and I think its Psalms are often strong and enjoyable; but it collapses when it comes to all the major teachings, for the translators did not understand them.

Pope Damasus I commissioned the work of the Latin *Vulgate* translation, completed in about 384 AD, in order that it would, in his mind, authenticate and give authority to his new religion. The translators had to bend the Hebrew and Greek to make it pleasing to their employer. It became the official version of the conquering Roman Church. Similarly, the purpose of King James for commissioning his translation, published 1611, was to extend his empire, a naive eirenicon, peacemaker, an impossible and deluded intention of reconciling, making peace between the factions of English Christendom, Protestants and Catholics both under the “royal Church of England”. (Three years after its publication James’s relations with parliament reached their limit because of his financial indulgences and *The Geneva Bible* continued to sell and in 1616 James attempted to stop it being printed.) I have already cited Benjamin Wilson’s view (section 1) that “the authorised version is simply a revision of the Vulgate” (Wilson, *The Emphatic Diaglott*, p. 7). Both these works, the *Vulgate* and King James Bible, were commissioned by worldly rulers

in hope of extending empires. (Perhaps that is why the King James translators did not have too much difficulty in writing “God save the king!” when there is no word for “God” in the Hebrew and should read “May the king live!” at 1 Samuel 10\24, 2 Samuel 16\16, 2 Kings 11\12, and 2 Chronicles 23\11.) To these works all English translations have allegiance. Then the modernist versions, based on corrupt Greek texts, set in even deeper rot, for they owe their allegiance to the editors, openly professed disbelievers, of *The Revised Version* (1885) who considered a superior Greek text “vile”, lying about the better text and preferring a few mutilated Alexandrian texts, debunked by Burgon, now even further debunked, that they promoted as “the most ancient authorities”, cutting out many vital words, phrases, clauses and passages of the New Testament.

The threads between motives behind popular English translations is the extending of empires and deletion of much of the New Covenant writings. The writings of the Covenants were not made for kings to extend and control their empires with religion, nor for opponents to make depletions of at their will. My 93 pages of tabulation on how the King James translators followed the Latin *Vulgate* in many matters concerning Jesus, and invented some of their own errors, demonstrates how both works conceal the true Jesus. They’ve doctored the language of angels. Where, in all this, was the howling and hunger to retrieve the truth of the messages of the prophets and apostles concerning God and Jesus Christ? Their roots are rotten. Now the axe is laid to the roots, for, as Jesus says, “Every tree ... not producing good fruit gets cut down and is thrown into fire” (Matthew 3\10). I had heard preachers talking about “getting back to the doctrines of the Reformers” and for a while I was seduced by that. Then I put the question, what about getting back to the doctrines of the prophets and apostles? That is what began driving me.

Readers and seekers have been cheated. The world has been forked up mixtures, sold strange fires. We have been held back from the straight facts and magnificent promises of the one true God. This failure represents the greatest literary scandal of all time.

Other than a few heroic torch-bearers, for century after century, generation after generation, decade after decade, translation after translation has, for the most part, done little more than, in Thomas Hardy’s withering phrase, “advance / Sound parish views” (poem, “The Conformers”; the ironies of “advance” and “Sound”). The achievement of all this underwhelming heritage has been pulled off by the over-bearing dark wizardry of the wording of creeds whose gravity has impressed the minds of men more than the writings delivered by the Angel of God. If this were not so, bar the heroic torch-bearers, how is it that the blunders of darkness are still among us stronger than ever? This should really be no surprise: this age we are in is described by the apostle Paul as “the present eon of evil” and “this eon of darkness” (Galatians 1\2, Ephesians 6\12), and “*the* day of man” (1 Corinthians 4\3). And “the god of this eon” has “blinded the minds of those unbelieving, so that the brightness of the radiant gospel of the Christ, who is *the* image of God, might not beam out to them” (2 Corinthians 4\4).

Truly the translation of the word of God needs urgent reform, in the spirit of Josiah (2 Kings 23). It must be most strongly insisted that there are some virtually unknown versions which have not followed the popular versions and are of a reforming spirit, but none went far enough.

7. *The Revised Version*

And what of *The Revised Version* (RV) of 1885? Once again the Ark of the Covenant of the Elohim of Israel was taken by a strange hand (1 Samuel 4 & 5). The RV is to be as condemned as the KJV, in fact more so. Its two chief editors openly expressed their unbelief, and were not afraid to do so, nor were they afraid to lie. Based on a heavily mutilated Greek New Testament text, it was chiefly the work of Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892) and Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901), a most curious pair of mystagogues. Westcott and Hort called the Greek text behind the KJV “vile”, expressing their intention as to “rid the church of that vile text”. The Textus Receptus Greek text is not “vile”, as it contains a full record of the

word of God that the RV editors preferred to mutilate. Their own text was a mutilated record.

Their work was not a “Revision” of the blunders of the traditional version, but a “Revision” of the New Testament Greek texts. Westcott and Hort introduced their own corrupt and “hopelessly depraved” (Burgon) Greek texts, alleging their antiquity as authentic, a phony and deceiving logic. They favoured evolution, were opposed to literal belief in the first three chapters of Genesis, and upheld so-called Higher Critical views of the Old Testament. Wescott wrote: “no one now, I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history.” He must have known that was a lie. His *Gospel of the Resurrection* amounts to nothing more than a re-creation of an idealized pagan Greek culture. They were not believers in the word of God. Hort wrote of “serious differences with Evangelicals ... and especially on the authority of the Bible.” And: “I am inclined to think that no such state as ‘Eden’ (I mean the popular notion) ever existed.” He wrote in a letter that he preferred the idea of “a ransom paid to Satan”. Lest anybody doubt that, I have seen the letter for myself and held it. Their testimony did not point to the narrow road of salvation, but the broad road that leads to destruction.

At 2 Timothy 3\16 is that most vital foundation of the faith of members of the resurrection: “Every Scripture *is* inspired by God, and *is* profitable”. Not having that, Wescott and Hort managed to find it in their conscience to alter that to “Every scripture inspired of God *is* also profitable ...”. In other words, not all of it is inspired and not all of it is profitable. If the word of God was not in them, how can it come out of them? They were not men worthy to touch the word of God, other than to read it for rebuke and correction and to beg for salvation.

John Burgon, fierce opponent and exposé of Wescott’s and Hort’s works, in response to the RV, published *The Revision Revised* (1883), a withering critique. Burgon called the Greek text behind the New Testament of their RV “hopelessly depraved”, “deliberately invented”, “full of errors from beginning to end”, “untrustworthy from beginning to end”. And: “the English (as well as the Greek) of the new Revised Version is hopelessly at fault.” He described “uncouth phraseology ... jerky sentences ... pedantic obscurity ... unidiomatic English”. He called the RV “the poisoning of the River of Life at its sacred source”. And he considered it “the most astonishing, as well as the most calamitous literary blunder of the Age”. So much for the RV, another unrighteous work of unbelieving and unrighteous, contradicting men.

The purpose of Wescott and Hort with the RV was, they said, “to rid the church of that vile text”, the good Greek text behind the KJV New Testament (now improved by the Robinson-Pierpont Textform 2005).

Do not think that popular modernistic versions have done any better. *The Revised Version* is the father of modernist versions. They are derived from its “hopelessly depraved” and “deliberately invented” New Testament Greek text. With all the printed and online resources now available so easily, that should not be the case: translations should be getting better. Yet, mostly, the contrary is true. The 1985 NKJV revision of the KJV is, incidentally, infinitely better than its parent book. As for some popular 20th century versions, were they made to recover the prophets and apostles, or were they opportunities for big finance? The number of translations which have made bold and commendable labours to depart from orthodoxy are few.

Even the rulers of the Philistines were advised, “Send the Ark of the Elohim of Israel away, and let it go back to its own place” (1 Samuel 5\11). Let the Scriptures of God now be returned to Him and His righteous people.

8. Prefaces and warnings

Urge readers to examine the prefaces to their popular translations. In these they give themselves away. You will find such things as the translators saying that “no attempt was made” to reproduce the frameworks and grammatical forms; boasts of “financial aid”; “committees”; having “undoubtedly fall[en] short of its goals”; conveying “something at least of ... the New Testament”; completions made in short numbers of years; undergoing only three or so revisions. A friend lent me an erratic New Testament translation whose preface boasts that it took its author (I cannot say its *translator*) two years, as if that were a long labour. Another friend lent me an erratic version whose preface boasts that “God told” the writer to do it. (Even I would not say that, but only that I saw it had to be done, and I committed it to God.) The abundance of these erratic versions is all part of the warfare, a mass preservation of myth and error. The preface to the KJV is worshipful of King James, making a very unrighteous man “the wonder of the world”. The preface to the RV is extraordinary. It concludes: “The Revision was completed in eighty-five sessions, ending on 20th June, 1884; and it occupied 792 days. The greater part of the sessions were for ten days each, and each day the Company generally sat for six hours. The labour therefore has been great.” I do not call 792 days and 4,752 hours (792 x 6) a great labour. I call that terrible haste. Little wonder John Burgon called it “uncouth”. It is said you become an expert in a craft after 10,000 hours labour in it. It might be argued that translators of old did not have the resources available to us today. This is true. It does not, though, excuse the twisting and processing of the word of God that they concocted.

It will not go well for those who pervert the word of God. It is for such works that we have been sternly warned: “Do not add to His words in case ... you are found a liar” (Proverbs 30\6). Peter says of Paul’s writings “the untaught and unstable make perversions, as they do also to the other writings, to their own destruction” (2 Peter 3\16). John warns: “If anybody should add to the words of the prophecy of this scroll, God will add to him the plagues written in this scroll. And if anybody should take away from the words of the scroll of this prophecy, may God take away his share from the Tree of Life, from the Holy City and things written in this scroll” (Revelation 22\18-19). The truths from God written down by His appointed prophets and apostles have been obscured by what I call the ἡρπεψυχία (*herpepsychia*), serpent nature, of religious-mindedness. For are not all these blunders the very same twisting and perverting and adding and taking away by the “untaught and unstable” that Peter and John describe, ending in men’s destruction?

Are such men to be our teachers? Have these versions been effective in freeing God’s people from the chains of Babylonian mythology and orthodoxy? Did Jesus not warn to beware of the scribes (Mark 12\38)? Their books have been the *very sources and poison fountains* of post-Babylonian mythology and error. It is to these books that men will turn to demonstrate to others those false teachings, who will then pass on the false teachings to others. Such translations are counterfeits. I wince when I hear them.

Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible has received no “financial aid”; nor has it hinted or asked for any; nor is it the product of only academic “committees”; it has not been rushed through in less than a decade; it has not undergone only three revisions, but many hundreds; every attempt has been made to reproduce the frameworks and grammatical forms of the Hebrew and Greek text. Nor has it “fallen short” of its goals: in over 24 years of its making, it has, thanks be to God, flashed light years beyond my original vision.

If to have the testimony and the laws and Sabbaths and the words of God written on our hearts and minds is to bind them and have them inscribed as a sign or mark on our hands and a symbol between our eyes (Exodus 13\9, 13\16, Deuteronomy 6\8, 11\18, Isaiah 44\5, Jeremiah 31\33, Hebrews 10\16), and is to be like those 144,000 “virgin” firstfruits in having the name of the Father written on our foreheads (Revelation 14\1-5), radiant with the star who has arisen out of Jacob (Numbers 24\17), then is following the nefarious international religious system of the world, with its sun-God Sabbath and revived Babylonian orthodoxies and

adulteries, not to take the mark and name of the Beast on the hand or forehead, and to follow in the streets of that city-builder with the name and mark of Cain, of whom Yahweh had disregarded his small mean offering, and who burned with anger and lied to God and murdered his righteous brother? And if the King James Bible is “the mainspring of the religion of our civilization”, that doctored translation being so rooted in the Latin *Vulgate* of old, with the daring boldness of its Babylonian orthodoxies and adulterations, as also are many of its companion volumes rooted, and if that religion of our civilization is the system of the Beast, with the blood of the prophets and sons of the resurrection on its hands, the blood of those who will not take its name and mark, and who, for their slaughter by the Beast, will receive “a better resurrection” (Hebrews 11\35), is it, then, not also a sickly offspring and a small mean offering like Cain’s of the worldly system of the Beast, and is basing our religion on its doctrines not akin also to taking in advance the mark and name of the Beast?

But who will believe our report? (Isaiah 53\1). Come out of her, come out of her, a voice from Heaven cried and still cries (Revelation 18\4, Isaiah 52\11, 2 Corinthians 6\17-18). “Come out of her, My people, so that you might have no partnership with her sins and so that you might not receive anything from her plagues.” The Star of Bethlehem did not trail across the sky to old Babylon, but to a new birth. Babylon, back then, to God’s people, signified wickedness and captivity. Yet even today the world is charmed with its mythology and is in captivity to its deceitful heritage. In the cradle of that inn of Bethlehem was the cradle of the rescue of mankind from the captivity of the world that has become depraved. The red flag of internationalism waves across the world in an ill wind of scenes of fire, blood, destruction. As it is written, and soon is the time, when mighty Babylon will be hurled down, and its potentates will be hurled from thrones (Revelation 18\21, Luke 1\52). John heard it said to the merchants and magnates of the Earth, “by your sorcery all the nations were deceived, and in her was found blood of prophets and set apart people and of all those murdered on the Earth” (Revelation 18\23-24). The word for “sorcery” is *φαρμακεία* (*pharmakeia*). The “sorcerers” are *φαρμακεύς* (*pharmakeus*) and *φαρμακός* (*pharmakos*) (Revelation 21\8, 22\15). And some do not “unburden themselves out of their murders, nor out of their sorceries [*pharmakeia*], nor out of their fornication, nor out of their thefts” (Revelation 9\21). We make our choice.

9. *To be aligned with prophets and apostles*

Let us, I say, be found consanguineous with the prophets and apostles, those whose blood is on the hands of the religious sheriffs of this world. Let us set out to be aligned with the paths of righteousness described only in the blood and fire and gold of the writings and teachings of the messengers of the one true God, the Father of Jesus Christ.

If we want to find “the keys of the Kingdom”, we have to have undefiled translations in order to recover the truths of the prophets and apostles. Enough has been illustrated in these pages to show that this *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible* can be relied on to represent the Sacred Writings, and that a light has shone in the darkness. As I said above, and I swear it, not a word of this translation has been knowingly or forcefully hoicked out of its grammatical form so as to alter the meaning. It had to come that one day the English translation of the complete books of God should be done outside the religious system, outside the city gates, as Christ “suffered outside the gate” (Hebrews 13\12), a translation made for the benefit of those who hunger and thirst only for the messages of the prophets and apostles of the one true God and the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, a translation made for those who reject the work of translators unqualified and disqualified because they work by a fleshly flabby nature.

Perfection in translation and any notion of literal translation are not attainable. Translation loses grammatical idiosyncracies, idioms, and connotations, and it might gain connotations that are either enhancing or distracting or misleading. Genesis 1\1 sets the pattern. Should we write – rendering the Hebrew syntax literally – “In beginning created Elohim ...”, for that is how the

Hebrew reads; or (turning that into English grammar) “In *the* beginning Elohim created”? Obviously the latter, making readable English. So also with the Greek: it has a different grammar to English. Literal translation is not a possible concept. A translation can be untrue and impure, sending deceiving messages, support of dogma hostile to the mind of the messenger prophet. On the other hand, a translation can be true and pure – as are a few unknown versions in many places – transmitting the words and spirit of the messenger prophet and reviving the truth.

In every word of this translation, I have laboured – and continue to labour – to make the closest equivalent of the Greek and Hebrew, as much as that is possible, following **ORGANIC** laws, in order to get an imitation of the original writers’ messages and style. As God gave Adam and Eve food from every herb-bearing seed of the ground and the fruit of every tree yielding seed, the purest raw energy food, so does the *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible* translation give raw energy spiritual food, refined in its forms, and not **PROCESSED**.

That God has preserved the writings of His prophets and apostles is unquestionable. To this I owe my life and to this have committed my life. His word is “settled in the heavens” (Psalm 119\89). But it is not settled on Earth. We must conquer in our minds the myth that the collection of the Scriptures has now been handed down and presented to us in perfect form, the correct text, the correct collection, the correct translation. Such an idea is myth and naïvete. In truth, all this has been and is an immense battleground. It has been for centuries. If not so, we would have one common Bible, with no blunder, no bickering. The truth is, though, there is a mighty sound of the clashing of swords concerning text, canon, translation, meaning and interpretation.

I have already said enough about text. Regarding the canon, we have to ask what the apostle Paul had in mind when he wrote, “Every Scripture *is* inspired by God” (2 Timothy 3\16). Which works are “inspired by God”? First, those whose writers say “The word of the Lord came to me”. Second, those authenticated by internal citations. Third, those which are internally harmonious concerning the teachings and histories. These three preoccupations authenticate the 64 books and letters in this translation. And there is much that they exclude: the Apocryphal writings (though of interest); those other hostile and falsely named alternative “gospels”; the harem drunken and violent stories of the Song of Songs and Esther.

This work needs guts. It needs integrity and principles. We need the guts to stand up to orthodoxy and tradition, on which almost every Christian group is based, some long put to drowsiness by the myth that we have the Scriptures handed down to us in perfection. Nobody has told them that the Old and New Testament texts are battlefields. Nobody has told them that the canon is a battlefield. Nobody has told them that pure translation of the prophets and apostles is a battlefield. Nobody has told them that that battle is far from concluded, and the swords are still clashing.

The work in *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible* has been to base the Old Testament and New Testament on the most agreeable texts and make slight variations where necessary, in order to present a perfect harmony; to present purity, harmony and logic concerning the collection of the writings, which books are God’s; to repair the translation, and to bring to light once again what the prophets and apostles were *really* wanting to tell us; to present the books in the correct order; to offer this in accuracy, clarity, literariness, and attractive design; all this towards something I hope to be, at last, agreeable to God and Christ.

If the word of God “is settled in the heavens” (Psalm 119\89), but not settled here on Earth and is a battlefield, I hope and pray that this work, aided by the writings of many who have gone before us and many alive today who have contributed, will help to settle the word of God on Earth, in English, as God would like it, regarding text, canon, meaning, understanding. The battle will not end because of the international religious system and other opponents. What matters is the truth of God and Christ as written by the prophets and apostles. I hope *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible* – and continuing work on it – climb a high mountain towards settling the word of

God on Earth in the eyes of God and Christ.

These adventures in Translation Truth have, indeed, brought to light many things long hidden or known by too few. It was with the patriarchs and the twelve tribes of the sons of Israel that Yahweh Elohim made the first Covenants (Genesis 12, 17 et cetera, Exodus 19\5-6), and it was with the house of Judah and the house of Israel that Christ announced God's New Covenant (Matthew 26\26, Hebrews 7 and 8 and 9). Of these were the prophets and apostles and their writings concerned, from the promises to the fulfilment shown at Genesis 12 to Revelation 21\12. After the house of Israel was taken captive and dispossessed, the house of Judah became custodians of the scrolls of the prophets and apostles (Romans 3\2). The Greek dispersion of Israel had scrolls and Gospels and letters also (Acts 16\6, 16\12-13, 17\1-4, 18\19-28, 19\8-10). When persecuted, dispossessed and wandering in our scattering, we alone with the memory of the true God and Christ in our hearts, God oversaw it that the scrolls and manuscripts were preserved and we became – producing the fruits of our New Covenant – careful custodians, then translators, lexicographers, commentators, teachers, and heralds of the gospel, and we have taken the gospel to the world, even building empires (however flawed) and founding countries on Christian principles. And “some he appointed as apostles, and some prophets, and some proclaimers of the gospel, and some shepherds and teachers” (Ephesians 4\11). We have taken the gospel to the world. The bibliography (Appendix 5) of KTK broadcasts the character of who are the true dispersed tribes; it is all their work, their New Covenant fruit. To the Levites once were entrusted the tablets and scrolls of the law, then the house of Judah (Romans 3\2), and now it is shared among our scattered tribes. Perhaps those drawn to engagement with the house management of the word of God might themselves be of Levite stock for all we know. We know the twelve tribes are on the Earth at the time of Christ's appearing, which must be near, because at that time he will gather his elect (Matthew 24\31, Deuteronomy 30 et cetera). In these last days, we have a better New Testament text than ever (and enhanced with this translation's minute corrections); we now surely have the correct collection of the Old Covenant writings; we have all the lexical helps we could need, even accessed by touchscreens; and we have a complete translation fit, I pray, for the Sanctuary of God. Maybe our work is almost complete. Now the true Israel has to realise his blindness (Romans 11\25, Deuteronomy 30). Then, surely, at last the writings will be aligned with the prophets and apostles, and we who are the true Israel will be fully aligned with our Covenants and promises.

10. Conclusion, Testimony & Translation Truth

On his having finished *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, the historian Edward Gibbon turned to compose his memoirs. He begins: “In the fifty-second year of my age, after the completion of an arduous and successful work, I now propose to employ some moments of my leisure in renewing the simple transactions of a private and literary life” (*Autobiography*, 1796). Such leisure is not the employment for the disciple of Christ who must say, at the end, “We are unworthy servants. We have done what we had to do” (Luke 17\10). For Jesus says, “Nobody who lays his hand on a plow, while gazing to the things behind, is fit for the Kingdom of God” (Luke 9\62). And “The harvest *is* truly vast, but the labourers few” (Matthew 9\37, Luke 10\2, John 4\35).

That “private and literary life” that Gibbon proposed for himself is, in contrast for the disciple of Christ, a closing of the door and praying to the “Father Who is hidden, and your Father Who observes in secret will reward you in the open” (Matthew 6\6). The celebrated hymn writer and poet Isaac Watts (1674-1748) had his “secret chamber”, that he called his “technophyon”, where he could “retire from the world and converse with God and his own heart ... Abandon the secret chamber, and the spiritual life will decay.” This is true, and I have discovered it for myself. In the private life of Jesus “he would withdraw himself into the wilderness and pray” (Luke 5\16). We do well to imitate the Master.

As for the public life, there is the urgent task to set these things down “before faithful men who also will be competent to teach others” (2 Timothy 2\2). There is, too, alas, the enduring of the stiff-necked teachers locked in traditions and orthodoxy, and of contradictors, and of wolves arising in the last days. By those of the religious flesh I have been called names, shouted at and insulted for my enquiries and labour after the prophets’ and apostles’ truth. (Yes, if a verb is active singular, I do not translate it as passive plural.) The Lord Jesus said to rejoice (Matthew 5\12), and I do rejoice. I’ve been lied about, received threats, hated, betrayed, rejected, called liar, heretic, antichrist, cursed and a curse, “deluded hippie”, “brain-damaged”, “foulsmore creature”, and other abuses. They do not discuss the factors of translation and interpretation, just spit abuse. There has been an attempt to block publication of my works. (Why?) “And as for now, Lord, look on their threats and appoint Your servants to speak Your word with all boldness” (Acts 4\29). Aggressive, intolerant and abusive behaviour is, in itself, exposure enough of the evil spirit that is behind tradition and orthodoxy. The man of God, the woman of God, born of the spirit, presents evidence of truths, is happy to be corrected, is happy to correct, learns to evaluate, and happily entertains good-natured discussion. But the follies of the adversaries I have encountered are nothing compared to what many have endured. Those of the spirit will encounter opposition and aggression from some of those of the religious flesh, hostile to the prophets and apostles of God and hostile to the real Christ. There will come mindless aggression even from some of those of the spirit, who prefer to defend their own traditions and orthodoxies and ritualistic behaviours. Strangely obnoxious is it to some that the so-called “Satan” and “Devil” figure should be exposed as mythology and fiction. As a man of the spirit, one of the “faithful men”, wrote to me with his twinkling irony, “They love their Devil.” It is, as with the gods in the poetry of Homer, someone on whom to put the blame. Since the beginning, not for everyone is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth of the prophets and apostles. Not attractive enough for them is the separation from the world, willingness to be abandoned by friends, willingness to abandon safety. For the flesh rages against the spirit, and the spirit rages against the flesh.

On the other hand, ecstatic and illuminating and equally manifold are the encouragements and blessings and thanks I have received from those of the spirit. For them I thank God. These are His elect. One brother wrote to me: “The work you are doing is the most awesome gospel furtherance I know of.” From the beginning of this work I have known that God can only want, and most certainly does want, the preserved writings of His prophets and apostles translated in purity and truth. At the front of my mind I have been bolstered, knowing again and again from God that “You have maintained my right and my cause” (Psalm 9\4, 1 Kings 8\49, 8\45, 8\59).

I asked a correspondent what he thought Jesus meant in giving Peter “the keys of the Kingdom” (Matthew 16\19), after which this translation is titled. Of course tradition has it that on a certain day the apostle Peter will be at the gates of Heaven, interrogating queues of applicants on how he or she had lived their lives. Such mythology denies the gospel of salvation and resurrection from the grave into new life in a renewed Earth. The correspondent’s reply was wonderful. He said (I paraphrase) Peter was given two letters to write – both to the Israelite dispersion – and the first concerns the inexpressible joy of salvation and the second the suffering and affliction we must endure to inherit salvation. What better secret is there to describe the lives of the patriarchs and prophets and apostles, the Lord Jesus himself, those like William Tyndale and John Rogers who have gone before us, and today ourselves in this depraved world of lies and corruption? The real gates, not the gates of mythology, are the gates to the restored Zion. Well did king David exclaim:

⁴ Enter His gates with thanksgiving,
His courts with praise;
be thankful to Him; exalt His name,

⁵ for Yahweh *is* good;
His mercy *endures* throughout the eon,
and His truth to all generations. ~ Psalm 100\4-5

Nobody would pretend this is easy. Those of the spirit are caught between two minds, the law of God and the law of sin; and caught between two eons, this “eon of darkness” and the coming Kingdom of Christ. Only the Lord Jesus is the perfect one. God is looking for men like Caleb, “My servant Caleb, because he had a different spirit about him and has followed Me fully” (Numbers 14\24). We have to walk this lonesome valley. Nobody else can walk it for us.

As long as God grants me life, I will not cease from this labour, striving for perfection in the transmission of the word of God. For now at last is the hour for TRANSLATION TRUTH. This translation has been through hundreds of revisions. Translating the word of God is nothing short of a lifetime commitment, and there is still more I will do, particularly regarding style. My list of honours and acknowledgments tells that, really, translating the word of God is a body of Christ project. I always welcome suggestions. Where I have erred I will amend, and I will be embarrassed and sorry for my mistake. I feel a burden if delivering any false transmission of the word of God. Where I can enhance the translation I will do so.

My prayer and hope is that *Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible* is honouring to God and Christ; that it recovers the rich and sparkling revelations of the prophets and apostles buried before in religious orthodoxy; the prophets and apostles would recognise their own writings; it represents the true Christ; that the personality of the Holy Spirit is distinguished from the abstract gift of “holy spirit”; its integrity is evident; it wholly achieves its targets of accuracy and refreshing clarity and literariness; it contains no detested mixture; it is fit and pure for the Sanctuary of God; and that it will burn a new hunger for apostolic truth and set alight a new fire for Jesus in the hearts of millions and save millions.

Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible, with its footnotes, subject headings and appendices, is a deep study Bible, to give every reader and myself much help for understanding the deep things of the word of God. After over 40 years now of my reading and studying the books of God, it has become my strong conviction that we have only begun to understand a portion of all that the prophets and apostles have written for us. Of those 41 years of reading and studying I have spent 24 of them in translating. One thing is certain: pure doctrine only flows out of the clean and clear waters of the fountains of pure translation. Jesus says, “If anybody is thirsty, let him come to me and let him drink. ³⁸ Whoever believes in me, just as the scroll has said of me, ‘Out of his inside will flow rivers of living water’ ” (John 7\37-38). Impure translation and mixture of truth and error can have no place in the Sanctuary of God. The depths of all the truths that have been written for us from the books of Genesis to Revelation are without end. “Oh the depth of the riches of both the wisdom and knowledge of God! How inscrutable His judgments and His ways past finding out!” (Romans 11\33). When we think we’ve come a long way, we’re probably just beginning.

✱

Christopher Sparkes, September 2024