

August 2022

Frank W. Nelte

150 MISTRANSLATIONS IN THE BIBLE PART 7

This is the seventh and final article in this series of seven articles. The following Scriptures are discussed in a Genesis to Revelation sequence.

(Comment: As you can see below, there are now already 151 Scriptures, and in time there will be more. But I see no reason to change the number "150" in the title at this stage. Think of #151 as a bonus Scripture.)

PART 7

131 HEBREWS 2:7,9

132 HEBREWS 3:11,18; 4:1,3-5,8-11

133 HEBREWS 4:3

134 HEBREWS 4:6,11

135 HEBREWS 7:12

136 HEBREWS 7:21

137 HEBREWS 9:26

138 HEBREWS 11:1

139 HEBREWS 11:37

140 JAMES 5:15

141 1 PETER 1:20

142 1 PETER 1:23

143 1 PETER 3:3

144 2 PETER 1:19

145 1 JOHN 5:7-8

146 JUDE 1:13

147 REVELATION 2:1,8,12,18; 3:1,7,14

148 REVELATION 6:12

149 REVELATION 9:7

150 REVELATION 13:8

151 REVELATION 22:2

#131 = HEBREWS 2:7,9

THE VERSE:

You made him a little lower than the angels; You crowned him with glory and honor, and did set him over the works of Your hands: (Hebrews 2:7)

But we see Jesus, who was made **a little lower than the angels** for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man. (Hebrews 2:9)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

Hebrews 2:7 is fully explained in the section that deals with Psalm 8:5, because this is a quotation from Psalm 8:5. Both these verses are also examined in great detail in my 2009 article "You Have Made Him A Little Lower Than The Angels". That article also discussed Hebrews 2:9. See that article for detailed explanations.

Hebrews 2:7 is speaking about man. And Hebrews 2:9 is speaking about Jesus Christ.

Note that the explanations for Psalm 8:5 and for Hebrews 2:7 are **completely different**. When Paul quoted Psalm 8:5 he was making a completely different point from the point David made in Psalm 8:5.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THESE TRANSLATIONS:

In both verses "a little lower" represents a mistranslation. The Greek text should be translated as "for a little while lower". These mistranslations in these two verses create a wrong focus.

CORRECT TRANSLATIONS OF THESE VERSES:

You made him for a little while lower than the angels; You crowned him with glory and honor, and did set him over the works of Your hands: (Hebrews 2:7)

But we see Jesus, who was made **for a little while lower than the angels** for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man. (Hebrews

2:9)

#132 = HEBREWS 3:11,18; 4:1, 3-5, 8-11

THE VERSES:

So I swear in My wrath, They shall not enter into My **rest**. (Heb 3:11)

And to whom did He swear that they should not enter into His **rest**, but to them that believed not? (Heb 3:18)

Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left *us* of entering into His **rest**, any of you should seem to come short of it. (Heb 4:1)

For we which have believed do enter into **rest**, as He said, As I have sworn in My wrath, if they shall enter into My **rest**: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For He spake in a certain place of the seventh *day* on this wise, And God did **rest** the seventh day from all His works. And in this *place* again, If they shall enter into My **rest**. (Heb 4:3-5)

For if **Jesus** had given them **rest**, then would He not afterward have spoken of another day. There remains therefore **a rest** to the people of God. For he that is entered into His REST, he also **has ceased** from his own works, as God *did* from His. Let us labour therefore to enter into that **rest**, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief. (Heb 4:8-11)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THESE TRANSLATIONS:

The implication of these verses is that this is speaking about **resting**. These verses underlie the totally false idea that salvation is about “idly sitting around in heaven playing a harp”, that there is nothing to do, that it will be an existence of nothing but rest and relaxation. That is not correct.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

Here we are dealing with a mistranslation that is universally accepted. In **all** of these verses the word “rest” represents a mistranslation. At no stage does the concept of “rest” ever enter the picture in the Book of Hebrews.

These verses are explained at length in my 2009 22-page article entitled “WHAT IS ‘THE REST’ OF HEBREWS CHAPTER 4?” Basically, the words translated as “rest” refer to “a period of cessation from rebellious human conduct”. See the article for details. Look for the key word “**rest**” on my website.

One other mistranslation in Hebrews 4:8 is that instead of “Jesus” it should read “Joshua”.

CORRECT TRANSLATIONS OF THESE VERSES:

Because of the universal misunderstanding regarding what Paul is really speaking about in this section, there are no precise words to express the correct translation concisely. This makes a correct translation somewhat cumbersome. This is explained in the article.

Below are what we might call “the corrected amplified translations” for these verses.

So I swear in My wrath, they shall not enter into **My place dedicated to the cessation of rebellion and provocation** (katapausis), the promised land. (Hebrews 3:11)

And to whom swear He that they should not enter into **His place of cessation of all rebellion** (katapausis), but to them that believed not? (Hebrews 3:18)

Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left *us* of entering into **His state of cessation of all human endeavors** (katapausis), the Family of God, any of you should seem to come short of it. (Hebrews 4:1)

For we which have believed do enter into **a state of cessation from all forms of wrong conduct** (katapausis), as He said, As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into **My place dedicated to the cessation of rebellion and provocation** (katapausis): although the works were finished from “the foundation of the world”. (Hebrews 4:3)

(Comment: This expression “the foundation of the world” is examined in the next section.)

For He spake in a certain place of the seventh *day* on this wise, And God **did cease** (katapauo) the seventh day from all His works. (Hebrews 4:4)

And in this *place* again, If they shall enter into **My place of cessation of all rebellion** (katapausis). (Hebrews 4:5)

For if **Joshua** had given them **the condition of cessation from rebellion** (katapauo), then would He not afterward have spoken of another day. (Hebrews 4:8)

There remains therefore **a millennial period of cessation from rebellion** (sabbatismos) to the people of God. (Hebrews 4:9)

For he that is entered into **His cessation** (katapausis), he also **has ceased** (katapauo) from his own works, as God *did* from His. (Hebrews 4:10)

Let us labor therefore to enter into that **period of cessation of human rebellion** (katapausis), lest any

man fall after the same example of **disobedience**. (Hebrews 4:11)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THESE VERSES:

The focus of Hebrews chapters 3-4 is on the need for rebellious human conduct to stop. In the days of Moses Israel didn't cross the Jordan because of rebellion against God. Later in the days of Joshua, when they did cross into the promised land, the rebellion against God never stopped.

So Israel **never** entered a state of cessation from rebellion against God. Paul used Israel's example to explain that God's Church is also looking forward to entering a state of cessation from all rebellion against God, i.e. the resurrection into God's Family, and then ruling with Jesus Christ during the millennium.

Paul's main point is that we too need to guard against disbelief and disobedience.

#133 = HEBREWS 4:3

THE VERSE:

For we which have believed do enter into rest, as He said, As I have sworn in My wrath, if they shall enter into My rest: although the works were finished from **the foundation of the world**. (Hebrews 4:3)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

We are here dealing with a mistranslation in the expression "the foundation of the world". This expression is explained in great detail in my 2011 12-page article titled "**What Does The Foundation Of The World Really Mean?**". Please see that article for the details.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

For we which have believed do enter into rest, as He said, As I have sworn in My wrath, if they shall enter into My rest: although the works were finished **from the throwing down of human society**. (Hebrews 4:3)

(Comment: I have left the word "rest" in this verse, to avoid being cumbersome. But the comments for "rest" in the previous section apply to this verse as well.)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

The expression "from the throwing down of human society" refers to the time of the flood in the days of Noah. This expression applies to the time when God modified His plan for how to work with human beings, **the time when God regretted that He had created human beings** in the first place. That's recorded in Genesis 6:6. This expression "the throwing down of human society" has nothing at all to do

with the time when God created Adam and Eve.

#134 = HEBREWS 4:6, 11

THE VERSES:

Seeing therefore it remains that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered not in because of **unbelief**:

Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of **unbelief**.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This mistranslation hides the fact that Paul elevated the problem with Old Testament Israel to a higher level. This translation implies that the only problem was unbelief. But that is only the start of the story.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The word correctly translated as “unbelief” in Hebrews 3:12, 19 is “**apistia**”. But the word wrongly translated as “unbelief” in Hebrews 4:6, 11 (KJV) is “**apeitheia**”.

This word “apeitheia” really means “**obstinate rejection, disobedience**”. Many other translations have clearly identified this switch in words by Paul, by in these two verses translating “apeitheia” as “disobedience” (ASV, ERV, NAS, NIV, RSV, NKJV, etc.) or as “obstinacy” (Rotherham).

Paul's reasoning in chapter 3 starts out with identifying Israel's lack of faith in God (i.e. unbelief). They repeatedly failed to trust God for all their needs. But then, when Paul repeats the same information in chapter 4, he changes the charge against Israel from “unbelief” to “disobedience”. Paul is showing that Israel **never ceased from** disobeying God and from rebelling against God, even after crossing the Jordan.

The word “apistia” (unbelief) focuses on **the mind**. Unbelief is something that takes place in the mind. But whatever takes place in the mind never remains confined to the mind. Sooner or later what happens in the mind will manifest itself in some outward actions or conduct.

And the word “apeitheia” (disobedience) focuses on that transition from the mind into **outwardly discernible conduct**. The word “apeitheia” focuses on the actions which really should have ceased! We need to recognize the inevitable escalation that is involved in going from “apistia” to “apeitheia”.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THESE VERSES:

Seeing therefore it remains that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached entered

not in because of **disobedience**.

Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of **disobedience**.

(Comment: As in the previous section, I have here also left the word “rest” in this verse, to avoid being cumbersome. But the comments for “rest” in the earlier section also apply to this verse as well.)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

These verses are right in the middle of Paul’s discussion about OT Israel’s problems. And so these verses are also explained in the 22-page article referred to in the previous section, “WHAT IS ‘THE REST’ OF HEBREWS CHAPTER 4?”. These verses should be understood within the context of the discussion about “rest”.

#135 = HEBREWS 7:12

THE VERSE:

For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity **a change** also **of the law**. (Hebrews 7:12)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This is not a mistranslation. Rather, this is a verse that is very commonly explained incorrectly.

THE PROBLEM

The expression “**a change of the law**” is not a reference to any law that applies to any Christians today. It is not a reference to the ten commandments, and it is not a reference to any laws that affect either our conduct or our beliefs. It is not a reference to any laws that God requires us to obey, or to laws that Old Testament Israel was required to obey.

Let’s understand.

In Hebrews 7 Paul is comparing the Levitical priesthood with the priesthood of Melchizedek. In verse 11 Paul points out that the Levitical priesthood did not represent or achieve perfection.

Perfection can only be achieved by Jesus Christ reclaiming the priesthood of Melchizedek. Paul then explains in verses 13-14 that there was a law that established the Levitical priesthood, while Jesus Christ had come from the tribe of Judah. But descendants from the tribe of Judah were not eligible to become priests ... that office was limited to Levites who had descended from Aaron.

Therefore that specific law had to be changed.

This is the point Paul spells out in verse 28.

For **the law makes men high priests** which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, *makes* the Son, who is consecrated for evermore. (Heb 7:28)

What law makes men high priests? The ten commandments don't make any man a high priest. The laws that establish clean and unclean meats, the annual Feasts and Holy Days, tithing, etc. don't make any man a high priest.

So what law is Paul referring to?

Paul is referring to **the very specific law** that establishes who may become a high priest. He is not talking about any other law. Paul is referring to the law that was established in Exodus chapters 28 and 29.

And **take** you unto you **Aaron** your brother, **and his sons** with him, from among the children of Israel, that **he may minister unto me in the priest's office**, *even* Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, Aaron's sons. (Exodus 28:1)

And you shall put them upon Aaron your brother, and his sons with him; and shall **anoint them**, and **consecrate them**, and **sanctify them**, that they may minister unto Me in **the priest's office**. (Exodus 28:41)

And you shall gird them with girdles, Aaron and his sons, and put the bonnets on them: and **the priest's office shall be theirs for a perpetual statute**: and you shall consecrate Aaron and his sons. (Exodus 29:9)

This "perpetual statute" of Exodus 29:9 "of necessity" had to be changed, so that Jesus Christ from the tribe of Judah could become a High Priest. And that is what Paul is referring to in verse 12.

Now the change in that law, that "perpetual statute", doesn't affect what laws we are to live by. It doesn't affect our observance of the weekly and annual Sabbaths, or the dietary laws, or any other laws that God requires us to observe.

The only effect of that change of the law applies to who may become a High Priest before God.

The change of that law also means that in this age leading up to Jesus Christ's second coming **no human being can possibly become a high priest!** Even if theoretically some man could irrefutably prove to be a descendant of the line of Aaron, he still could not become a high priest in this age! Why?

Because the law that might have entitled him to become high priest was changed.

That law is no longer valid at this point in time. That's what Hebrews 7:12 teaches us. So even if the Jewish religion does, theoretically speaking, establish a priesthood before Christ's second coming, **that priesthood would not be recognized by God**. Today only the Melchizedek priesthood is accepted by God the Father.

#136 = HEBREWS 7:21

THE VERSE:

(For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by Him that said unto Him, The Lord sware and will not **repent**, You *are* a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek:)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This translation implies that the word "repent" could also apply to God. But that is wrong.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

This verse contains a mistranslation. The Greek word that means "repent" is "metanoeo", and this Greek word is **not used** here in Hebrews 7:21.

The Greek word "metamellomai" which is used here, only means "to be sorry, to regret". But that is not at all the same as "repent".

The distinction between "metanoeo" and "metamellomai" is discussed in great detail in the section devoted to Matthew 21:29. The explanation there applies equally to this verse.

A number of translations have recognized that "repent" is not really correct here. Thus RSV, NRSV, NIV and NAS read "and will not change His mind", and Rotherham reads "and will not regret". All of these are better than the wording "and will not repent".

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

(For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and **will not regret**, You *are* a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

Repentance doesn't enter the picture in this verse. This verse tells us that God the Father will never regret that He appointed Jesus Christ to the position of being the High Priest in the Family of God during the millennium and during the 100-year period.

#137 = HEBREWS 9:26

THE VERSE:

For then must He often have suffered since **the foundation of the world**: but now once in the end of the world has He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. (Hebrews 9:26)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

We are here dealing with a mistranslation in the expression “the foundation of the world”. This expression is explained in great detail in my 2011 12-page article titled “**What Does The Foundation Of The World Really Mean?**”. Please see that article for the details.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

For then must He often have suffered since **the throwing down of human society**: but now once in the end of the world has He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. (Hebrews 9:26)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

The expression “from the throwing down of human society” refers to the time of the flood in the days of Noah. This expression applies to the time when God modified His plan for how to work with human beings, **the time when God regretted that He had created human** beings in the first place. That’s recorded in Genesis 6:6. This expression has nothing at all to do with the time when God created Adam and Eve.

#138 = HEBREWS 11:1

THE VERSE:

Now faith is **the substance** of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This is actually a correct translation, but here the common meaning of a word has changed.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The Greek word translated as “substance” in this verse is “hupostasis”. This Greek word literally means “that which stands under”; i.e. **a foundation**.

Now the English word “substance” comes from the Latin “substans”, which is the present participle of

“substare”, and this Latin word also means “**to stand under**”.

So the word “substance” used to be a good translation for the Greek word “hupostasis”.

The problem is that today most people who hear the word “substance” think of the meaning “the physical material from which something is made”. In other words, while this English word used to be seen as a synonym for “foundation” (definition for “foundation” is “the basis upon which something stands or is supported”), it is now more commonly seen as referring to the composition of something.

So the commonly accepted meaning of “substance” has changed from “a foundation” to “composition of something”. This changed perception of the word “substance” makes it unsuitable today as a translation of “hupostasis”.

Many modern translations recognize this shift in the meaning of the English word “substance”. And so many translations have exchanged “substance” in this verse for “assurance” (ASV, RSV, NRSV, ERV, NAS, Williams, etc.) or for “being sure” (NIV), or for “a confidence” (Young’s Literal Translation), etc.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

“Now faith is **the foundation** of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.”

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

Our relationship with God has to be built on a foundation of total trust and faith in the immutability of God’s promises. Unless we are willing to trust God implicitly in everything, we can never become spirit-born members of His Family. Without complete faith in God everything else is totally worthless (see verse 6).

#139 = HEBREWS 11:37

THE VERSE:

They were stoned, **they were sawn asunder**, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (Hebrews 11:37)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

The implication that some of God’s servants were killed by being sawn into two pieces, like cutting down a tree, is utterly absurd. Something like that has never happened.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The expression “they were sawn asunder” is a mistranslation, motivated by the desire to support the completely false Jewish claim that the Prophet Isaiah was supposedly “sawn asunder” by King Manasseh.

This verse is explained in great detail in my 2011 31-page article “**Jewish Mythology and the Angel Metatron**”. That article examines the Hebrew words involved in the Old Testament, noting that originally the Hebrew word for “saws” was “**megerah**” and the Hebrew word for “axes” was “**magzerah**”.

But the later writer of Chronicles, one of the last books to be written in Old Testament times, used the word “megerah” to mean both saws and axes. And by the time of the Apostle Paul there was linguistically hardly a distinction between these two tools, or even the processes involved in using them.

I believe that in Hebrews 11:37 Paul was thinking in general terms of people in the Old Testament who had been “**cut into pieces**” with a sword or an axe, **but not with a saw**.

The specific example that affected the tribe of Benjamin extremely significantly (Paul was a Benjamite) is the account of the Levite whose wife had been raped to death by Benjamites. The Levite then **cut his wife into twelve pieces**, very likely with an axe, to send to all the tribes of Israel (see Judges 19:29). That may have been the precedent Paul had in mind when he wrote this statement in Hebrews 11:37.

Coming to the Greek text of Hebrews 11:37, the expression “**they were sawn asunder**” is the translation of the Greek verb “epristhesan”, a form of the verb “**priso**”. Hebrews 11:37 is the only place where this verb is used in the New Testament. It is not found in the Greek language LXX of the O.T. So it is a unique word in biblical Greek.

The only other Greek word that is **related to “priso”** is used two times in the New Testament, and that is in Acts 5:33 and in Acts 7:54. In both cases the word in the text is “dieprionto”, a form of the verb “**diaprio**”.

The biblical Greek dictionaries all approach this word “priso” from the assumption that the Jewish fable about Isaiah having been sawn in half is true. And they assume that sawing a person in half was an established cruel Jewish form of punishment. But there is not the slightest evidence for such a practice. The stupid mythology found in the Talmud about Isaiah having been sawn in half is easily disproved in my article about Metatron. But all Greek scholars have a bias here.

Let’s look at the verb “diaprio”, which is formed from “dia” + “prio” (“prio” is the word from which “priso” is formed). Like “priso” the word “**diaprio**” also has the meaning of “**to saw asunder or in two, to divide by a saw**” (Thayer’s Lexicon).

So let’s look at the only two places where “diaprio” is used.

When they heard *that*, **they were cut** (“diaprio”) *to the heart*, and took counsel to slay them. (Acts 5:33)

When they heard these things, **they were cut** (“diaprio”) to the heart, and they gnashed on him with *their* teeth. (Acts 7:54)

In Acts 7:54 Luke himself provided the words “to the heart”, whereas in Acts 5:33 Luke left out “to the heart”, but our translators then provided this expression, appropriately so.

The point here is that Luke clearly used this word to also mean “**to cut**”, not just “to saw”. Luke didn’t mean that they were “sawn” to the heart. No, Luke clearly meant “cut” and not “sawn”.

My point here is that while the word “priso” means “to saw”, **it also meant “to cut” in a general sense**. That is what Luke shows in Acts 5:33 and in Acts 7:54. And it is with that general meaning that Paul used this verb in Hebrews 11:37.

And that is what the Levite in Judges 19:29 had done when he “cut” his dead wife into twelve pieces.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

They were stoned, **they were cut into pieces**, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (Hebrews 11:37)

#140 = JAMES 5:15

THE VERSE:

And the prayer of faith **shall save** (Greek “sozo”) the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him. (James 5:15)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

By translating the Greek verb “sozo” as “shall save” in this verse, some people might conclude that the prayer of faith for a sick person ensures that sick person’s salvation. But this verse is not speaking about salvation.

THE PROBLEM WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The Greek verb “sozo” does mean “to save” in regard to salvation. But this verb also has other applications. It also refers to physical healing, in the sense of “saving someone from a sickness”.

For example, here are some verses with the verb “sozo”:

For she said within herself, If I may but touch His garment, **I shall be whole** (Greek “sozo”). (Matthew 9:21)

For she said, If I may touch but His clothes, **I shall be whole** (Greek “sozo”). (Mark 5:28)

But when Jesus heard [it], He answered him, saying, Fear not: believe only, and **she shall be made whole** (Greek “sozo”). (Luke 8:50)

So when “sozo” is used in the context of sicknesses, then it means “to be made whole, to be physically healed”.

The context of verse 15 makes clear that here “sozo” should also be translated as “made whole”. The result of being made whole from some sickness is “the Lord has raised up the sick person”. The person is not “raised up” in a resurrection; the person is raised up from the sickbed.

To be raised up in a resurrection is not at all connected to a sick person asking for healing. When a sick person is anointed and prayed for, **the expectation** is healing, not a resurrection from death.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

And the prayer of faith **shall make the sick whole**, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him. (James 5:15)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

The prayer of faith is focused on asking God for healing. God’s response is that God makes the sick person whole. In other words, God raises up the sick person from the sickbed.

And if the person had committed any sins **that caused or contributed to the sickness**, then those sins shall be forgiven. That must really be the case; there is no other possibility. Thus: it can’t be that someone contributed to his own sickness by sinning in some way, and God then heals that person, but the sins that caused the sickness somehow stay around unforgiven. That is not possible.

Whenever God intervenes in our lives by taking the consequences of our sins away from us, then the sins that caused the consequences God took from us **must also be forgiven by God**. The removal of a penalty or bad consequence always requires the sins that resulted in that penalty or the bad consequences are also removed. And that is what the last part of verse 15 is speaking about.

Now that last part of verse 15 starts with “if”, because in many cases we ourselves have not actually sinned, as far as the causes of our sicknesses are concerned. And in such situations we don’t need to have any sins forgiven.

#141 = 1 PETER 1:20

THE VERSE:

Who verily was foreordained **before the foundation of the world**, but was manifest in these last times for you, (1 Peter 1:20)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

We are here dealing with a mistranslation in the expression “the foundation of the world”. This expression is explained in great detail in my 2011 12-page article titled “**What Does The Foundation Of The World Really Mean?**”. Please see that article for the details.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Who verily was foreordained **before the throwing down of human society**, but was manifest in these last times for you, (1 Peter 1:20)

#142 = 1 PETER 1:23

THE VERSE:

Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which lives and abides for ever. (1 Peter 1:23)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This verse, together with John 3:3 and John 3:7 is used to claim that the Bible teaches that we must be “born again”. But that is not correct.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

We are dealing with mistranslations in all three verses. Refer to the section dealing with John 3:3 for a more detailed explanation.

These mistranslations are thoroughly explained in my 2013 30-page article “What The Bible Teaches About ‘Born Again’”. Please see that article for all the grammatical technicalities involved in this question.

Briefly:

The Greek word for “being born again” in 1 Peter 1:23 is “anagennemenoi”. This word consists of the prefix “ana” and the verb “gennao”.

The Greek verb “gennao” means both “to be born” and also “to be conceived/begotten”. The Greek preposition/adverb “ana” is derived from the Greek adverb “ano”. This word means “**above**” or “**to the top**”, and this meaning is not disputed by anyone.

The point is that “**ana**” **never has the meaning of “again”**. So in 1 Peter 1:23 the Greek verb “**anagennao**” means “gennao **from above**”, and this can theoretically mean either “born from above” or “begotten from above”. In this context here it means “begotten from above”.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Being begotten from above, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which lives and abides for ever. (1 Peter 1:23)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

“Begotten from above” basically means “having received God’s holy spirit”. This verse is addressed to mortal human beings who had repented, and who then had received God’s spirit.

#143 = 1 PETER 3:3

THE VERSE:

Whose **adorning** let it not be that outward *adorning* of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; (1 Peter 3:3)

THE PROBLEM WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

There isn’t really a mistranslation here.

It is just that the Greek word here translated as “adorning” is “kosmos”. In every other place in the New Testament “kosmos” is always translated as “world”. In those places it should really be translated as “**human society, the condition of human affairs**”. The word is focused on people, and not on the Planet Earth.

In our context here it is acceptable to translate it as “adorning”. But this use of “kosmos” also reveals to us the meaning of “adorning” in the New Testament. Here is what it means.

In 1 Peter 3:3 the word “adorning” is focused on “**seeking to impress the society around us**”, i.e.

“seeking **to impress** the world”, “seeking **to be accepted** by the world”. It refers to the dress, the shoes, the hair styles, the jewelry and the makeup which this world’s society is imposing on all women, i.e. if they want to be accepted by people in the world.

Put another way, Peter is admonishing the women in God’s Church not to dress themselves and to groom themselves with **the motivation** of fitting in with this world’s standards for what a cultured woman is expected to look like in our society.

[Comment: A woman who back then had gold and expensive clothing was obviously wealthy and a part of the upper class in society.]

We have a fashion magazine called “**Cosmopolitan**”, which on its own website is advertized as “Your source for the latest sex tips, celebrity news, dating and relationship help, beauty tutorials, fashion trends, and more”.

Those things are all about how to be accepted in society today. And those things are precisely the type of influence about which Peter is warning women in this verse. This description of “Cosmopolitan” also illustrates that the meaning of “kosmos” refers to “the condition of human society”. (Our word “Cosmopolitan” is derived from the Greek word “kosmos”).

Yes, the word “kosmos” very effectively presents **this specific focus** of wanting to be like the world, and wanting to be liked and accepted by the world.

#144 = 2 PETER 1:19

THE VERSE:

We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto you do well that you take heed, as unto a light that shines in a dark place, until the day dawn, and **the day star** arise in your hearts:

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This is another enormous mistranslation! It carefully disguises what Peter is really telling us in this verse. This translation implies that here Jesus Christ is referred to as “the day star”. This is an enormous deception.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

This mistranslation must be seen in conjunction with the mistranslation in Isaiah 14:12. See the explanation provided in that section.

The Greek word here translated as “the day star” is “**phosphoros**”. This Greek word has nothing whatsoever to do with either “day” or with “star”. The Greek word for “day” is “hemera”, and the

Greek word for “star” is “aster”. The word “phosphoros” has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with any kind of star!

This is a deliberately devious mistranslation! Here is the deception that is involved:

1) The Greek word used here is “phosphoros”.

2) **All the translators** have recognized that this is the Greek equivalent of the Latin word “lucifer”. “Lucifer” and “phosphoros” are 100% identical in meaning, with zero margin of error! Both words mean “light-bringer”. So in this verse the New Testament **indisputably** calls Jesus Christ “Lucifer”, if you happen to be speaking Latin!

3) And so the Latin Vulgate text here correctly reads “lucifer”. There was no other possible way for Jerome to correctly translate “phosphoros” into Latin.

4) The first English language translation, made by John Wycliffe around 1380, was made from the Latin Vulgate text. John Wycliffe **immediately** realized that in his Latin Bible Isaiah 14:12 refers to **Satan** as “lucifer” (incorrectly so); and that 2 Peter 1:19 (correctly!) refers to **Jesus Christ** as “lucifer”.

5) Since it would obviously have been a major problem to use the name “lucifer” for both Jesus Christ and Satan, therefore John Wycliffe opted to use **some deception!** Instead of either retaining the word “Lucifer” as a name for Jesus Christ, or alternately actually translating “lucifer” into English as “light-bringer”, Wycliffe decided to use **a correct name for Jesus Christ from somewhere else!**

6) In Revelation 22:16 Jesus Christ identifies Himself as “the morning star”. So Wycliffe borrowed this title from Revelation 22:16 (see also Revelation 2:28) and simply inserted it into 2 Peter 1:19. In this way he avoided the word “lucifer” completely, while still using a biblically correct title for Jesus Christ. **That was dishonest.**

7) To some people “Day Star” may not seem to be so bad, since “day star” or “morning star” are both correct titles for Jesus Christ. However, the sole purpose for this transposition was **to hide the embarrassing fact that Peter called Jesus Christ “Lucifer”!**

8) So in the Old Testament John Wycliffe chose to retain the word “lucifer” (he was translating from the Latin Vulgate) as a name for Satan in Isaiah 14:12. Then in the New Testament Wycliffe chose to totally obscure the word “lucifer”, and to replace it with a title from elsewhere. Had he been able to do so, Wycliffe would have expunged the word “lucifer” from 2 Peter 1:19. This he could not do, and so the next best thing was to replace it with a more acceptable title. As I said, the man was deliberately dishonest.

9) To be clear: **no translator** (i.e. after Jerome’s Latin text) has ever yet accepted the word “lucifer” as “acceptable” for the text of 2 Peter 1:19, even though that is an exact translation of the Greek word

Peter used.

[Question: So just how honest and unbiased are all the people who have taken it upon themselves to translate the Greek text of the New Testament into English? When it comes to 2 Peter 1:19, then **not a one of them has passed the integrity test**. If we can't trust them with faithfully translating a simple Greek word like "phosphoros", then we need to be on our guard with every other Scripture as well. And that's what I am trying to do with this series of articles.]

10) And so every translator since Wycliffe's time has upheld this deception, by using either "day star" or "morning star" as a supposed translation for the words "phosphoros" or "lucifer" (i.e. when translating from the Vulgate). In his NT translation **Murdoch** goes one further, and translates this phrase as "**the sun shall arise ...**". That translation is **plain garbage**. Translators don't want people to know that in this verse Peter called Jesus Christ "Lucifer"!

See the section on Isaiah 14:12 for more details on this subject.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

"We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto you do well that you take heed, as unto a light that shines in a dark place, until the day dawn, and **Lucifer** (Light-bringer) arise in your hearts:"

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

Lucifer is not originally an English word; it is a Latin word that was simply accepted into the English language. IF you choose to retain it as a name in one place, then you should also retain it as a name in other places. Be consistent.

However, there is absolutely no way that God would inspire one and the same name to apply to Satan in one place, and to Jesus Christ in another place. Used as a name "Lucifer" can only apply to one of those two beings. **That is what Wycliffe** (and every English translator since then) **recognized**. And so Wycliffe and every translator since then opted to apply the name "lucifer" to Satan! It follows that none of them could afford to then also use it for Jesus Christ.

As far as "phosphoros" in 2 Peter 1:19 is concerned: this Greek word has one meaning, and one meaning only. There is no possible ambiguity in this word. It cannot be misunderstood. If you speak Latin this word means "lucifer", and if you speak English this word means "light-bringer". And if you speak Hebrew this word means "Aaron". There are no other possible options for "phosphoros". To claim this word means "day star" or "morning star" is a staggering lie!

As far as the word "heylel" (translated as "lucifer" in Isaiah 14:12) is concerned: this Hebrew word is **extremely ambiguous**! The word "heylel" was never again used in any other writing, preventing us from establishing a meaning from other contexts. The root word "halal", one of two possible Hebrew words from which "heylel" has been formed, has contradictory meanings.

On the one hand it means “bright, shiny”, etc. But on the other hand it also means “mad, arrogant, boastful”. Both of these sets of meanings are clearly established in the Old Testament. I suspect this connection in the meanings of the Hebrew word “halal” exists because it is typically the “bright and shiny ones” who end up being “arrogant” and “boastful”, and eventually “mad”. At least, that is what happened to Satan.

It follows that theoretically there is a 50% chance that “heylel” could mean “bright and shiny one”, and there is a 50% chance that “heylel” means “arrogant boaster”. The only way to establish for certain which of these two possible meanings was intended by God (remember that it was **God** who called Satan “heylel”!) is to examine the context in which God used this word “heylel”.

What do the verses that **follow** this word “heylel” actually say? Do they refer to wisdom and great intelligence (i.e. the bright and shiny one), or do they refer to arrogant bragging?

The context for Isaiah 14:12 is clearly one of staggering boasting on the part of Satan. It follows that in Isaiah 14:12 “lucifer” is a mistranslation.

[Comment: The other possible source for the Hebrew word “heylel” is discussed in the section that deals with Isaiah 14:12.]

If we do use the Latin name “Lucifer” at all, then **this name should only be applied to Jesus Christ** (and that one use should be in the text of 2 Peter 1:19). And in reference to Satan Isaiah 14:12 should contain an expression like “arrogant boaster”, instead of the word “lucifer”.

This case illustrates an important principle. Once the translators had committed themselves to a mistranslation of Isaiah 14:12, this created the need for another mistranslation in 2 Peter 1:19. Their mistranslation of Isaiah 14:12 actually **prevented** them from translating 2 Peter 1:19 correctly.

That is the way lies always work: one lie creates the need for another lie somewhere else, and that in turn creates the need for additional lies. Mistranslations follow the same pattern. Eventually all the mistranslations become entwined, mutually supporting one another, like a house of cards.

Once we start to unravel one mistranslation, it opens the door to recognizing other mistranslations. And that in turn opens the door to identifying further mistranslations. It is extremely difficult to recognize some mistranslations without first correctly identifying certain other mistranslations. That is one more reason why I am writing this article, to present all the major mistranslations in the Bible in one place.

#145 = 1 JOHN 5:7-8

THE VERSES:

For there are three that bear record **in heaven, the father, the word, and the holy spirit: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth**, the spirit, and the water, and the blood:

and these three agree in one.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This verse is intended to support the idea that God is supposedly a trinity.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

It is well-known that all the words in bold text in the above quotation were only added to the text at some point in the Middle Ages.

As far as manuscripts predating the invention of printing by Gutenberg in the 1450's are concerned:

1) There are 112 Greek manuscripts which include this epistle and which **do not include this added section**.

2) This added section is found **in only one** manuscript, known as Codex Montfortii (also known as Montfortianus). This manuscript belongs to Trinity College in Dublin (a very appropriate location for this document).

Codex Montfortii is a late Greek MS that was made as a back-translation from a copy of the Latin Vulgate. It was **not made from earlier Greek language manuscripts**. This is a known fact.

Now think about that for a while!

Why on earth would anyone in Europe (i.e. in Ireland) in the Middle Ages have wanted to translate a Latin language document back into the Greek language? **Why?** At that time Latin was **the universal ecclesiastical language** throughout Europe. By contrast, very few scholars in Europe (i.e. outside of Greece) could read Greek before the fall of Constantinople in 1453. So **for whose benefit** was such a back-translation into a far lesser known language made?

The answer is that it was made specifically for the benefit of the Catholic Church.

The Catholic Church needed some "manuscript evidence" for a trinity text in order **to persuade Erasmus to include it in the Greek text he was preparing**. Therefore the monks at "Trinity" College conveniently produced a Greek text with these trinitarian words in it.

Scholars are aware of the fact that this MS was not a copy from an earlier Greek MS. It was a back-translation from a very flawed Latin text into Greek.

It should be noted that these added words had appeared in the Latin Vulgate several centuries earlier. Thus John Wycliffe, translating from the Latin text, already included these words. John Wycliffe himself knew nothing about Greek, and he would not have been capable of translating anything from Greek into either Latin or English. John Wycliffe only knew English and Latin.

The point is that these words do not appear in any Greek manuscripts before the time of the “back-engineered” (i.e. producing a Greek manuscript from a Latin source document, with the intent of making it appear to be an original Greek MS) Codex Montfortii.

Let’s understand something very clearly. Whenever someone produces a “back-translated” manuscript, **the purpose** is always the same! That purpose is **always to mimic a genuine source document!** In plain language: the purpose of any “back-translated” document is to produce something that is **supposed to look authoritative.**

In this case here: the monks at Trinity College in Dublin were far, far, far less conversant with Greek than they were with Latin. So they didn’t produce this “Codex Montfortii” for their own benefit, to somehow do a deeper study of the Scriptures. No, they produced this codex with the explicit intention of **gaining some “authority” for their Latin version** which contained these spurious words, and of pressuring Erasmus to include these words in his Greek text. **They personally had no use for this Greek codex** which they produced; it was simply a way to gain acceptance for some heretical words that had been spuriously introduced into the New Testament text of the Latin Vulgate.

Anyway, Erasmus, a life-long Catholic, initially did not include these words in his Greek text. However, when Codex Montfortii was conveniently brought to his attention, he then added these words to the subsequent editions of his Greek NT text. That is how these words ended up in our Bibles (KJV, etc.).

Scholars know that these words were fraudulently added to the text.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THESE TWO VERSES:

For there are three that bear record: the spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

In this verse the Apostle John was referring to the three things he had mentioned in the previous verse, that’s all. Notice:

This is He that came by **water** and **blood**, *even* Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is **the spirit** that bears witness, because the spirit is truth. (Verse 6)

Then the next verse should correctly read:

“For there are **three that bear record: the spirit, and the water, and the blood**; and these three agree in one.” (Verse 7, and no text for verse 8)

John’s statement “these three agree in one” means that the three things he has listed identify the ministry of Jesus Christ, and they agree in establishing one overall plan of salvation. Notice the change in the sequence of these three things. Verse 6 lists “water - blood - spirit”, and verse 7 lists “spirit - water - blood”.

Verse 6 refers to this sequence: **start** of Christ’s ministry (baptized in water by John the Baptist), **end** of Christ’s ministry (shed His blood and died on the stake), **start of the Church** (the holy spirit bearing witness in Acts 2).

Verse 7 refers to this sequence: the **holy spirit** announcing Christ’s coming and identifying Christ (Matthew 1:20; Matthew 3:17; etc.), the **start** of Christ’s ministry (water), the **end** of Christ’s ministry (blood).

#146 = JUDE 1:13

THE VERSE:

Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; **wandering stars**, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

“Wandering stars” does not fully convey what this statement actually tells us.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The two Greek words translated as “wandering stars” are “asteres planetai”, the nominative plural of the words “**aster**” and “**planetes**”.

“**Aster**” means “**star**”. The word “**planetes**” is derived from the word “planos”, which means “**deceiver**”. “Planos” is also the root word for the Greek word “plane”, which means “an error”, and for the verb “planao”, which means “**to deceive**”.

A clear illustration of this meaning is found in Matthew 27:63, where the priests and Pharisees referred to Jesus Christ as “that Deceiver” (Greek “ekeinos ho **planos**”). The idea of “wandering” comes into this from “wandering away, straying out of the way that is right”, etc.

“Planetes” really means: “**to deceive by wandering out of the right way**”. The primary focus is on this attribute of deception, rather than viewing this as “wandering arbitrarily”.

Our English word “planets” really means “deceivers”. The reason the planets got this name is because the sailors in antiquity relied on the constellations of the stars to navigate their ships by night. In this regard the locations of the vast majority of the stars were quite dependable. But certain ones among the stars were “deceivers” because they constantly changed their positions in relation to the other stars.

From here on earth they **looked just like the other stars**, but they were imposters, or fake stars, since they kept moving. Therefore they could not be relied upon for navigation purposes, and so these “wandering stars” (i.e. planets) were named “deceivers” in Greek. And once people had determined that these “deceivers” (i.e. the planets) were totally unreliable, they promptly named all of them in honor of their pagan gods. I wonder what that is supposed to tell us about their pagan gods?

With the expression “asteres planetai” Jude was calling these individuals “**deceitful stars who lead people into error**”. In other words, the real stars symbolize the holy angels of God, and the planets symbolize the fallen angels with Satan. And the individuals Jude was speaking about in this verse were people who clearly represented Satan and his way of life.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; **deceiving stars**, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

This verse presents some more attributes of the “ungodly men” (verses 4 and 15). When they get into leadership positions **they use deceptions to lead people astray**, like the planets leading sailors astray in antiquity. And in the past few decades we have also had our share of such leaders.

#147 = REVELATION 2:1,8,12,18; 3:1,7,14

THE VERSES:

Unto **the angel** of **the church** of Ephesus write; These things says He that holds the seven stars in His right hand, who walks in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks; (Revelation 2:1)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

The first implication here is that this message is **supposedly addressed to an angel**. The second implication is that this message is supposedly addressed to only people who are converted (i.e. the Church). Both of these implications are wrong, and they are based on two mistranslations.

All of the things I will say in this section apply equally to six more verses in Revelation. Those verses are Revelation 2:8, 12, 16 and Revelation 3:1, 7, 14. In each case the problems are the words “**the angel**” and “**the church**”. The following explanation covers all seven occurrences of the expression “the angel of the Church” in these two chapters of the Book of Revelation.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The **first problem** concerns the words “**the angel**”.

The Greek word here translated as “angel” is “**aggelos**”. This word has in fact been accepted into the English language as the word “**angel**”. However, the Greek word “aggelos” does not really refer exclusively to the spirit beings we call “angels”.

This Greek word really means “**messenger, someone who brings something**”.

We need to distinguish between: **what** a word literally means, and **how** that word is **applied**. Most of the time those two things, the what and the how applied, are the same. But there are also many cases where they are not the same.

For example:

The meaning of the word “Hollywood” and how the word “Hollywood” is applied are two completely different things. This word **literally means** “a wood composed of evergreen holly shrubs”. But this word **is applied** to a city in Southern California. We all know that the name “Hollywood” has nothing to do with holly shrubs. So the application of “Hollywood” is different from the actual meaning of the word.

It is that type of thing that we have with the Greek word “aggelos”.

As already stated, the word “aggelos” **means** “a messenger”. But the word is in the New Testament **applied to** three different categories of messengers, which are in fact on three different levels. Those three levels are:

1) **Jesus Christ** was “the messenger” from God the Father, sent to human beings. So the word “aggelos” applies to Jesus Christ in certain situations. During His whole ministry **Jesus Christ was the “aggelos”** sent by God the Father.

2) **Various angels** were in biblical times sent by Jesus Christ to various human beings. So **those angels were clearly the “aggelos” of God** in all those specific situations. They brought messages from God to specific human beings.

3) **Various human servants** of God were at various times sent as messengers to specific people or groups of people. For example, God said:

Since the day that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day **I have even sent** unto you all my servants the prophets, daily rising up early and sending *them*: (Jeremiah 7:25)

Three distinct categories (Jesus Christ, angels, human beings) can at times be correctly identified as “aggelos”, because in certain situations they were “messengers”.

In fact Jeremiah 7:25, which was written in Hebrew, actually provides us with **the correct definition for the Greek word “aggelos”**. This Greek word refers to someone **who has been sent** with a message to certain people.

So here in Revelation 2:1 the Greek word “aggelos” literally means “messenger”, and it can be applied **either to Jesus Christ**, who was God the Father’s messenger, **or to angels** who have been sent to deliver messages, **or to human beings**, who have been sent to deliver messages from God.

Now in this context “aggelos” can obviously not apply to Jesus Christ. Therefore “aggelos” can here refer to **either angels or to human beings**. Of itself this Greek word gives us no clue whatsoever. It is **the context** that must establish whether in these seven verses “aggelos” refers to angels or to human beings.

Now when “aggelos” refers to angels, then it must be translated as “**angel**”. And when “aggelos” refers to human beings, then it must be translated as “**messenger**”. When it refers to human beings, it is completely wrong to translate it as “angel”.

Now the 7 messages in Revelation 2-3 are not addressed to any “angels”! There is no such thing as “angels” supposedly being over the 7 eras, with each era supposedly being under the control of an angel. That whole idea is **utter nonsense!**

God doesn’t send messages to angels! Let’s look again at the actual statement that Jesus Christ made in Revelation 2:1.

Unto “the angel” of the church of Ephesus **write**; These things says He that holds the seven stars in His right hand, who walks in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks; (Revelation 2:1)

Here is what we have in this verse.

- 1) Here Jesus Christ is telling John, a human being, to write a message to **the “aggelos”** of the Church.
- 2) Jesus Christ then identifies Himself in a very specific way to **this “aggelos”** of the Church.
- 3) It is really pretty strange **to think that Jesus Christ would instruct a human being to send in writing a message to a spirit being** (i.e. to an angel), and then Jesus Christ chooses to identify himself **to that spirit being** in a certain way.

4) What would that specific identification have meant to any “angel”?

5) How would the Apostle John ever be able to deliver that message to those 7 “angels”? Would those 7 “angels” each have come to the Apostle John and said: hey John, do you have any messages for me? Or are those 7 “angels” supposed to read the Book of Revelation, to find out about the messages that they are meant to receive and then pass on?

6) Just how can any human being on this earth send a message to some unidentified “angel” who resides in heaven? That just isn’t possible.

The truth here is that **“the aggelos” to the Ephesian era could have been either Jesus Christ Himself during His earthly ministry, or else it had to be the Apostle John.** While it was Christ who delivered a message from God to that era during His human ministry, Christ would not send a message to Himself. And therefore “the aggelos” to the Ephesian era was the Apostle John. He was the messenger who passed on to that era the Book of Revelation. And he was the servant of God who completed the canonization of the New Testament.

What really matters is that **none of the seven messages is addressed to “an angel”.**

Each message is addressed to **a human messenger.**

In each of the next six eras “the messenger” would have been God’s leading servant during the time of that era. For the Philadelphian era I believe that Mr. Herbert Armstrong was that “aggelos” to the era, though I cannot prove that.

In each case the messenger had to be a servant of God, who certainly would also have had God’s holy spirit. God does not deliver messages to His Church in this New Testament era through unconverted messengers. God does not send the unconverted with a message to the converted.

Right, so our first mistranslation is sorted out. Instead of “the angel” in each of these seven verses it should read **“the messenger”.** That’s because Jesus Christ addressed these seven messages to **seven human leaders** in His Church, spanning a period of about 2,000 years.

The **second problem** concerns the words **“the church”.**

The word **“church”** in these 7 verses is a translation of the Greek word **“ekklesia”.** Once again we have two issues to consider. First, we should establish what this word “ekklesia” actually means. And second, we need to understand how this word is commonly applied in our translations.

“What it means” is not necessarily the same as “how the word is applied”!

The meaning of “ekklesia” is: **those who have been called out of a larger group or gathering**. We already know that Jesus Christ tells us that “many are called, but few are chosen” (Matthew 22:14). This means that there are three groups of people on Earth.

GROUP 1: There is the original larger group from amongst whom a smaller group is “called out”. The larger group in this context consists of **all human beings**.

GROUP 2: From “the many” who are called out, a still smaller group are “those who are also chosen”. **The “many who are called”** constitute the second group.

GROUP 3: Those who are called and then chosen are the smallest of these three groups. They are **the converted members** of God’s Church, people who possess God’s holy spirit, and they constitute the third group.

Now here is the point we need to grasp:

The word “ekklesia” in these 7 messages refers not only to group 3 (i.e. those who are called **and** chosen), but also to group 2 (i.e. those who are called but **not** chosen).

The word “ekklesia” refers to **all who are called and come into God’s Church, including those who are subsequently not chosen**. That’s what the word “ekklesia” means in this context.

In other words, “ekklesia” **includes** both, the five wise virgins (church members who have God’s holy spirit), and also **the five foolish virgins** (those adults who consider themselves to be members of God’s Church, but who don’t have God’s spirit, those who only have leaves and no fruit). These called out individuals who do not have God’s spirit also **include all those who are “tares”** within God’s Church (see Matthew 13:24-30).

Let’s understand that **the group of people who attend God’s Church has always included people who have only produced leaves**. The wise and the foolish virgins have always been together, all the way back to the time of the original apostles.

Here is how the 7 verses in our context are currently translated. We already looked at them earlier:

“Unto **the angel of the church** at ... write” (Revelation 2:1, 8, 12, 18; 3:1, 7, 14)

Let’s correct the whole statement. Corrected, these seven verses really should read:

“Unto **the messenger to the called out ones** at ... write” (Revelation 2:1, 8, 12, 18; 3:1, 7, 14)

The point here is this:

These messages are not addressed only to “the Church”. They are not only addressed to converted individuals who have God’s spirit.

No, these messages are **also** addressed to unconverted adults who do not have God’s spirit, but **who consider themselves to be a part of God’s Church**. That’s because the two groups have always been together.

This should also be clear from a careful examination of these messages. For example, to Pergamos Jesus Christ said:

But I have a few things against you, **because you have there them** that hold the doctrine of Balaam ... **So have you also them** that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate. (Revelation 2:14-15)

What is Christ saying here? Christ is saying: **you’ve got unconverted people amongst you**. But those unconverted people must have had “the leaves” to even be accepted by the converted church members. “You have there them ...” says: you’ve accepted into your midst people who don’t have My spirit. And these individuals are included in this message.

And to Thyatira Christ said:

Notwithstanding I have a few things against you, because **you allow that woman Jezebel**, who calls herself a prophetess, **to teach and to seduce My servants** to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols. (Revelation 2:20)

“Jezebel” is a reference to the Catholic Church. Once again this means that people who held pagan beliefs had been accepted into the fellowship, and they were even given opportunities to preach their perverse teachings. Once again Jesus Christ is saying: **you’ve got unconverted people** attending with you. And those unconverted people are included in this message.

And to Sardis Jesus Christ said:

You have a few names even in Sardis which have not defiled their garments; and they shall walk with Me in white: for they are worthy. (Revelation 3:4)

What do you mean ... “a few names in Sardis”? What Christ means is that by the time of Sardis **the majority** who attended God’s Church did not have God’s spirit. **The unconverted people** with nothing but leaves **heavily outnumbered the converted members** at that point in time.

The influence of the unconverted people attending God's Church kept growing as the centuries went by. The problems in Pergamos were bad, but by the time of Thyatira they were worse. And by the time of Sardis the converted members were steadily being pressured out of God's Church. That kind of reminds you of Diotrephes in the first era, who was disfellowshipping the converted members at the time of the Apostle John (see 3 John 1:9-10).

And when we get to Laodicea, there aren't any converted people left amongst the "ekklesia" (the called out ones) of that era. That last era will consist **exclusively of called out people who have nothing but leaves**. They are not converted, but they are "ekklesia", i.e. they were called by God, but they never came to a real repentance.

Let's understand that none of the problems in any of the 7 eras are caused by those who are "called and chosen". None of the problems are caused by any of the "wise virgins" at any time in the Church's history.

All of the problems in all these eras are always caused by one of two groups of people:

Either the problems are caused by unconverted people **outside of the Church**;

Or the problems are caused by unconverted people who have **come into the Church**. These are the people who have leaves but no fruits.

However, either way **problems** in these 7 eras **are always caused by unconverted people!**

The converted people in these eras are not the ones who cause problems. In each case it is **the called out ones who never produce fruits**, who cause problems for the whole era.

So my point here is this:

These 7 messages are not addressed exclusively to what we mean by "the Church". They really are addressed to "the called-out ones", all of whom should have become converted members with God's spirit guiding their minds. But some of them don't ever repent.

The warnings are especially **directed at the called out ones** in each era **who had** (or have, for Laodicea) **never repented**. People can produce some leaves without repenting, and that's how the Laodiceans got themselves accepted by the Philadelphians, with whom they mingle. They produce leaves.

References to "the called-out ones" in each era certainly include converted members who have God's spirit. But the warnings in those messages are directed primarily at the called out ones who have developed nothing but leaves, and who don't have God's spirit. They may well have passed some tests

in coming into the Church, but once in the Church **they make no efforts to renew their minds**. They don't deal with the tests that come upon us after we have come into the Church. **They don't really change**. It is to those people that the warnings in these messages are primarily addressed.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THESE 7 VERSES:

Unto **the messenger to the called out ones** at ... write

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THESE VERSES:

These 7 messages are all addressed to **the human leaders** of the 7 eras. Each era consists of both converted members and unconverted people, who consider themselves to be members of God's Church.

"The called out ones" **include** the people who are **called but not chosen**. In other words, they include all the people who attend God's Church, whether they are converted or not. They include "the tares" amongst God's people. And they include the five foolish virgins who don't have God's spirit (i.e. they don't have any oil). They include not only the people on good ground, but also the people on stony ground and the people amongst thorns.

We need to recognize that these seven messages are addressed to larger groups than just the people who have really repented, and who have God's spirit, the people we commonly think of as "the Church of God".

#148 = REVELATION 6:12

THE VERSE:

And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and, lo, there was a great **earthquake**; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood;

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

The implication here is that the sixth seal involves a great earthquake. That is completely wrong! This is a misleading translation.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The Greek words translated as "great earthquake" are "seismos megas". "Megas" means "great", and "seismos" means "**shaking**". Note! The word "seismos" does **not** mean "**earthquake**"; it only means "shaking".

"Seismos" can refer to a shaking of **the heavens**, or **the earth**, or **the sea**. The context in which this

word “seismos” is used establishes whether we are talking about an event in the heavens (i.e. “a shaking of the heavens”), or an earthquake (i.e. “a shaking of the earth”), or a storm at sea (i.e. “a shaking of the waters”).

For example, Matthew 8:24 tells us that “there arose a great **seismos** in the sea”, which is correctly translated as “a great **tempest** in the sea”.

The point is this: while the word “seismos” will often refer to “a shaking of the earth” (i.e. an earthquake), this is not the only meaning of this word. It is the context that has to reveal to us what is actually being “shaken”. The word “seismos” does not intrinsically refer to the earth; the earth simply happens to be the most common thing that “is shaken”.

In the sequence of end-time events seal #5 is “the great tribulation”, and seal #6 is “the heavenly signs”. And seal #6 follows seal #5. Now Matthew 24:29 speaks about the same events as Revelation 6:12. Notice:

Immediately **after the tribulation** of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and **the powers of the heavens shall be shaken**:
(Matthew 24:29)

“Immediately after the tribulation” refers to the start of seal #6. And here Jesus Christ very clearly said that it is **the heavens** that shall be “shaken”. With this expression “the powers of the heavens” Jesus Christ was not using code language! He meant exactly what He said! Read the entire context of Matthew 24 and it is clear that Jesus Christ is speaking about literal events throughout. So “powers of the heavens” is not code language for any spirit beings, good or bad.

With the expression “powers of the heavens” Jesus Christ was referring to the powers that keep this earth and all the planets in their orbits, the powers that keep all the constellations in the universe in their respective places, the powers that uphold this universe in its present configuration. But this expression is not a reference to demons or to angels.

Matthew 24:29 is really a reference to something most people may view as “unbelievable”. It is **the universe** that is going to be “shaken up”. This will be the time when **the orbits** of the moon around the earth, and of the earth around the sun **will be changed!** Very possibly the positions of the stars will be changed also, so that thereafter there will not be a single constellation (of the signs of the zodiac, etc.) that will look the same when viewed from this earth. These events will **prepare the heavens** for Jesus Christ to commence His 1000-year rule on earth.

It is precisely because the orbit of this earth around the sun will be changed that “the sun shall be darkened”. The sun is not darkened permanently, but for some time during which the change in the earth’s orbit is made. And “the moon shall not give its light” because the moon’s orbit around this earth will also be altered at that time.

There are reasons why these things (sun being darkened, etc.) will take place. Changes will be taking place in the configurations in the heavens.

Now Revelation 6:12 speaks about the same time and same events as Matthew 24:29. And so the word “seismos” in Revelation 6:12 is really a reference to **the heavens being shaken**. Perhaps this also includes the possibility of the earth being shaken at the same time? But the focus of Revelation 6:12 is on the shaking of the heavens, as Matthew 24:29 also makes clear.

A consequence of this shaking of the heavens will be that **it will appear as if all the stars are falling** (Revelation 6:13). That is a reference, not to some meteorite shower, but to **the positions** of all the stars being changed! An observer on earth will see the stars moving to different positions, giving the appearance of “falling”.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and, lo, there was a great **shaking** (of the heavens); and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood;

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

This verse refers to the same events as Matthew 24:29.

#149 = REVELATION 9:7

THE VERSE:

And **the shapes** of the locusts *were* like unto horses prepared unto battle; and on their heads *were* as it were crowns like gold, and their faces *were* as the faces of men.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This translation gives the impression that this discusses the appearance of these “locusts”. Consequently many people have tried to find similarities between locusts and horses.

That is absurd!

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

In NT Greek there are two words that concern us in this regard. The Greek word “eikon” refers **an image** of something. “Eikon” refers to looks, to appearance.

The Greek word “homoioima” refers to **a conceptual comparison**. It is often applied to comparing abstract things, things that don’t have any form or shape. And “homoioima” has no reference at all to any kind of physical looks or appearance.

The Greek word translated as “the shapes” in this verse is “homoioima”. “Eikon” would refer to shape and appearance, but “homoioima” has no reference to shape at all.

The distinction between the Greek words “eikon” and “homoioima” is discussed at length in the section dealing with Romans 1:23, and also in the article on Romans 1:23, which is available on my website.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

And **conceptually** the locusts *were* like unto horses prepared unto battle; and on their heads *were* as it were crowns like gold, and their faces *were* as the faces of men.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

The whole army that is spoken about here (also known as “the first woe”) is conceptually compared to a swarm of locusts. In actual looks they are more like military cavalry units prepared for battle, though this description is also based on the military actions with which the Apostle John was familiar from his own time.

The comparisons John has drawn here are intended to be conceptual, not literal. That is why John used the word “homoioima”.

#150 = REVELATION 13:8

THE VERSE:

And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain **from the foundation of the world**.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This translation implies that Jesus Christ was predestined to be slain even before the creation of mankind, or even at the exact time that Adam was created. That is not true!

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The key to understanding this statement correctly lies with two Greek words: the word translated as “**foundation**”, and the word translated as “**world**”.

The expression “from the foundation of the world” in this verse is a translation of the Greek expression “**apo kataboles kosmou**”.

The correct NT Greek word for “foundation” is “themelion”. It is used 16 times in 15 verses, and it is always translated as “foundation”. The 15 verses are: Luke 6:48, 49; Luke 14:29; Acts 16:26; Romans 15:20; 1 Corinthians 3:10, 11, 12; Ephesians 2:20; 1 Timothy 6:19; 2 Timothy 2:19; Hebrews 6:1; Hebrews 11:10; Revelation 21:14, 19.

The contexts in which “themelion” is used in the above verses make quite clear that this is the correct word for “foundation”. However, this word “**themelion**” is **never used in the expression “foundation of the world”**.

The expression “**foundation of the world**”, on the other hand, is used ten times in the New Testament, and it is **always “kataboles kosmou”**. This tells us that all ten references to “the foundation of the world” refer to exactly the same thing. But it should also be clear that this expression does not really refer to “the foundation” of anything, since the Greek word for “foundation” (i.e. “themelion”) is not used in this expression. It must refer to some event **other than** “the foundation” of the world.

The noun “katabole” is formed from the verb “kataballo” which means “**to throw down**”. Thus the noun “katabole” literally means “**a throwing down**”.

Now the Greek word “katabole” is used eleven times in the NT: ten times in the expression “foundation of the world”, and one time in Hebrews 11:11. This verse reads:

Through faith also Sara herself received strength **to conceive** (Greek “katabolen”) seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised.

“Katabolen”, the accusative singular of the noun “katabole”, is here translated into English as the verb “to conceive”. Here the Greek expression “eis katabolen spermatos” literally reads that Sarah received strength “**into the throwing down of seed**”. Paul used the Greek noun “katabole” to refer to Sarah conceiving because “katabole” literally means “**to throw down**”.

To refer to Sarah conceiving, Paul could have used the verb “sullambano” (used in Luke 1:24, 31, 36) or the verb “gennao” (used in Matthew 1:20) or even the noun “koite” (used in Romans 9:10). But instead of using any of these words, Paul chose to use the noun “katabole”. By using “katabole” in reference to Sarah, Paul was presenting a much more graphic and dramatic picture to his readers, in talking about “the throwing down of seed”.

Next, let's consider the English word “**world**”. This word comes from two Anglo-Saxon words meaning “the age of man”. The Old English “woruld” means “human existence”. However, the first three out of twelve meanings for the word “world” that are listed in Webster's Unabridged New 20th Century Dictionary are:

1) **the earth**, 2) **the universe**, 3) **the earth and its inhabitants**.

So where the word “world” originally meant “**the age of man**”, it has since then come to mean “the earth” or even “the universe”. That is quite an expansion in the meaning of this word. It is in fact very common today for people to think of this planet earth when they hear or read the word “world”.

Now the Greek word “**kosmos**”, which is always used in the expression “the foundation of the world” refers to “**human society**”, rather than to this planet earth. In other words, the Greek word “kosmos” means exactly what the English word “world” originally meant! It used to mean only “the age of man” or “human existence”.

When people today think of the word “world” as referring to this planet (or even to the universe), then it is no longer appropriate to translate “kosmos” as “world”. In our context today it is much more accurate to translate “kosmos” as “the age of man” or as “human existence”.

When the Greek words “katabole” and “kosmos” are used together, as is the case in this Scripture, then this expression has the following meaning:

apo kataboles kosmou means from the throwing down of human existence!

Note! “Apo kataboles kosmou” is **not** a reference to the **creation** of human beings. It is a reference to an event long **after** Adam and Eve had been created. It is a reference to **the time of the flood**, when God “threw down” humanity.

When the New Testament refers to the time of the **creation** of Adam and Eve, then it uses the phrase “**from the beginning of creation**” (Greek is “ap arches ktiseos”). This is clear from the following Scriptures. (“ktiseos” is the genitive singular of “ktisis”, meaning “creation”; “arches” is the genitive singular of “arche”, meaning “beginning”; “apo” or “ap” is a preposition meaning “from”)

But **from the beginning of the creation** (“ap arches ktiseos”) God made them male and female. (Mark 10:6)

Here the expression “from the beginning of creation” clearly refers to when Adam and Eve were created.

For *in* those days shall be affliction, such as was not **from the beginning of the creation** (“ap arches ktiseos”) which God created unto this time, neither shall be. (Mark 13:19)

Again, this verse refers to the time when Adam and Eve were created.

And saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as *they were* **from the beginning of the creation** (“ap arches ktiseos”). (2 Peter 3:4)

This too is a reference to the time when God created human beings.

Then there is also the expression “from the creation of the world” in Romans 1:20, which in Greek reads “apo ktiseos kosmou”.

For the invisible things of him **from the creation of the world** (apo ktiseos kosmou) are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: (Romans 1:20)

So we have three different Greek expressions:

1) “**ap arches ktiseos**” refers to the time when God **created** Adam and Eve.

2) “**apo ktiseos kosmou**” refers specifically to **the creation** of human beings, i.e. the same time as the previous expression.

3) “**apo kataboles kosmou**” refers to the time of the flood, the time when God “threw down” human society.

We should recognize that “apo kataboles kosmou” does not mean the same as “apo ktiseos kosmou”. These expressions are not synonymous! Both expressions contain the word for “human society” (i.e. “kosmou”).

But one expression contains the word for “creation” (i.e. “ktiseos”), while the other expression contains a word that means “a throwing down of something” (i.e. “kataboles”).

When the Bible refers to “the throwing down” of human society that is never a reference to God having “created” human society.

At the time of “apo ktiseos kosmou” mankind (i.e. Adam and Eve) still had access to the tree of life, and the future looked extremely positive. God was going to rule over human beings.

But “apo kataboles kosmou” refers to the time of the flood, when God modified His original plan for working with mankind.

These verses are examined in greater detail in my 2011 article entitled “WHAT DOES ‘THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD’ REALLY MEAN?”.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from **the throwing down of human society**.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

Jesus Christ tried to work with human beings for over 1600 years, at which time God saw that “the wickedness of man was great in the earth”, and human thoughts were “only evil continually” (Genesis 6:5). So at the time of the flood God “threw down” humanity and modified His original plan for mankind. That point in time (when Noah came out of the ark) became the reference point for God’s dealings with mankind from then onwards. And that reference point is identified by the expression “the throwing down of human society”.

The other places in the NT where the expression “the foundation of the world is used are:

In all these verses this expression should also be translated as “from the throwing down of human society”.

#151 = REVELATION 22:2

THE VERSE:

In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, *was there* the tree of life, which bare twelve *manner of* fruits, *and* yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree *were for the healing* (“therapeia) of the nations. (Revelation 22:2)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This is a scene on the new earth in the new heaven. There will only be spirit beings. All physical human life will have ended with the lake of fire. This translation here implies that spirit beings are going to need “healing”. But that is not correct.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The Greek word here translated as “healing” is “**therapeia**”, which is formed from the Greek verb “**therapeuo**”. Here in Revelation 22:2 the Greek word “therapeia” does not refer to “healing” at all! We are dealing with a mistranslation.

To understand the difficulty here, we should consider two sets of New Testament Greek words. Here are these two sets:

The first set of Greek words:

- **iaomai** = the Greek verb which means “**to heal**”;
- **iasis** = the Greek noun which means “**healing**”;
- **iama** = another Greek noun which means “**healing**”;
- **iatros** = the Greek word which means “**healer**” and “**physician**”.

The second set of Greek words:

- **therapeuo** = the Greek verb which means “**to serve**”
- **therapon** = the Greek noun which means “**a servant**” or “**an attendant**”
- **therapeia** = the Greek noun which means “**service**” and “**well-being**”.

Now here is the point:

When the **focus** of a statement is **on “healing”**, then in the New Testament the main Greek word for healing is “**iaomai**”. Examples where “iaomai” is used include Mark 5:29, Luke 6:19, Luke 8:47, Luke 9:2, John 4:47, John 5:13, Acts 3:11, Acts 9:34, James 5:16, etc. There is no question that “iaomai” is the correct and appropriate word for the meaning “to heal”.

Similarly, the word for “doctor” or “physician” is “**iatros**” and **not “therapon”**. Examples where “iatros” is used to mean physician include Matthew 9:12, Mark 2:17, Mark 5:26, Luke 4:23, Luke 5:31 and Luke 8:43. In Colossians 4:14 Luke himself is referred to as “the beloved physician”, and that is “the beloved **iatros**”.

The Greek noun “**iasis**” is used in verses like Luke 13:32 (“... I cast out demons and I do **cures** today ...”) and in Acts 4:22 (“... this miracle of **healing** was showed ...”). This Greek word “iasis” clearly means “healing”.

The Greek noun “**iama**” is used in verses like 1 Corinthians 12:9 (“... to another the gifts of **healing** by the same spirit”). This word also clearly means “healing”.

What we can see here is that this family of Greek words, based on “iaomai”, all has to do with literal physical “healing”. This meaning is clear.

That brings us to the next group of Greek words.

There is no question that in practice the Greek word “**therapeuo**” in the New Testament **also** refers to **healing**. However, “healing” is not the actual meaning of the word “therapeuo”. Rather, “therapeuo” literally refers to: “**the services of a THERAPON**”, i.e. “the services of a servant or an attendant”.

So we have the following situation:

The exclusive use of “**iaomai**” is “**to heal**”.

The actual meaning of “**therapeuo**” is “**to serve as an attendant**”.

Now one specific area “of service” that is **frequently** involved in the New Testament use of this word “therapeuo” happens to be **the matter of healing**. Thus, of the 44 times this Greek verb “therapeuo” is used in the New Testament, it is used 43 times with the meaning of “to heal” or “to cure”. This application is not in doubt. So while the literal meaning of “therapeuo” is not really “to heal”, this word is in actual practice in the New Testament used overwhelmingly in the context of healing.

But “therapeuo” is also used one time in a context where **it cannot possibly mean “to heal”**, and that context is in Acts 17:25.

Neither **is worshiped** (“**therapeuetai**”, a form of “therapeuo”) with men’s hands, as though He needed any thing, seeing He gives to all life, and breath, and all things; (Acts 17:25)

So here is a key:

When “therapeuo” is used in connection with God as the recipient, then it **never** means “to heal”.

As a point of interest, Acts 17:25 actually contains a mistranslation of the verb “therapeuo”. It should not be translated as “is worshiped”. This is explained in the section that deals with Acts 17:25.

The correct translation of the verb “therapeuo” in Acts 17:25 is as follows:

Neither **is served** with men’s hands, as though He needed any thing, seeing He gives to all life, and breath, and all things; (Acts 17:25)

The mistranslation in Acts 17:25 hides the correct primary meaning of “therapeuo”. Correcting the mistranslation in Acts 17:25 also ties in with the way the Greek noun “**therapon**” is used, which noun appears only once in the New Testament, in Hebrews 3:5. Here is that verse.

And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, **as a servant** (“**therapon**”), for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after (Hebrews 3:5)

So Hebrews 3:5 shows us that the Greek word “therapon” means servant or attendant. “Therapon” has no other meaning. Specifically, “therapon” does not mean “healer”. And Acts 17:25 shows us that the Greek verb “therapeuo” means “to serve”.

The point for us to note is that when any Greek word from the “therapeuo” group of words is used in any context that includes God as a recipient, then it never refers to healing. In any such context with God the “therapeuo” group of Greek words always refers to aspects of “serving”. In such a context, where God or sons of God are the recipients or beneficiaries, healing is simply not an option.

Keep in mind that the primary meaning of “therapeuo” involves serving. And yes, one particular application of serving is healing. So when the focus is from God towards us mortal human beings, then **the meaning is healing**. But when the focus is in any way towards God, then **the meaning is serving**.

Correctly understanding the context of any statement will establish the correct meaning for “therapeuo”.

Now let’s examine the Greek noun “**therapeia**”, which is used only four times in the New Testament. Those four places are: Matthew 24:45, Luke 9:11, Luke 12:42 and Revelation 22:2. To get a sense of what this word means here in Revelation 22:2, we should look at the other three verses where it is used. So let’s do that.

Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord has made ruler over His **household** (“therapeia”), to give them meat in due season? (Matthew 24:45)

And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom *his* lord shall make ruler over His **household** (“therapeia”), to give *them their* portion of meat in due season? (Luke 12:42)

And the people, when they knew *it*, followed Him: and He received them, and spake unto them of the kingdom of God, and **healed** (“**iato**” a form of “**iaomai**”) them that had need of **healing** (“therapeia”). (Luke 9:11)

Matthew 24:45 and Luke 12:42 refer to the same statement made by Jesus Christ. In both places “therapeia” is translated as “household”.

Note that in Luke 9:11 the verb translated “to heal” is “iaomai”. The Greek verb “therapeuo” is not used in this verse.

In the context of Matthew 24:45 the word “therapeia” has a meaning that is far more general than just “healing”. I feel that there in that context Jesus Christ was making the point that He, Jesus Christ, had set two different individuals in succession in a position with power over **the doctrines** of His Church.

Those individuals, one good and one bad, were given a certain responsibility for **the “well-being”** (therapeia) **of the Church members**, by faithfully teaching them the true doctrines of the Bible. One servant did this faithfully and the other servant was evil.

Now in practice the doctrine of healing happened to be the first doctrine that the Church’s new leadership after Mr. Armstrong’s death attacked and discredited. But that new leadership went on to discredit **dozens of other teachings** as well. Instead of providing for the “well-being” (i.e. “therapeia”) of the Church, that leadership actively promoted the scattering of the sheep. And within the prophetic context of Matthew chapter 24 I believe the intended meaning of Christ’s statement is best expressed more or less as follows:

“... Who is then a faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord has made ruler over **the well-being of His people** (i.e. he has authority over the Church’s teachings, including but not limited to the teaching about healing!), to give them (i.e. the Church) meat in due season (i.e. to teach them the truth).”

The point is, in Matthew 24:45 and in Luke 12:42 the Greek word “therapeia” undoubtedly includes the doctrine of healing. But equally clearly it is not limited to that doctrine. In these verses “therapeia” covers **a far greater scope than merely “healing”**. The spiritual well-being of God’s Church was destroyed not by changing one single doctrine (i.e. the truth about divine healing), but by changing and twisting **dozens** of biblically correct teachings.

[COMMENT: When I first examined this Scripture over 20 years ago I thought that the primary focus was intended to be on healing. That’s because the Church’s teaching about healing was the first teaching to be discredited by the new leadership. But that turned out to be only the first of very many teachings that were changed. And so I have since come to believe that the intended application of the word “therapeia” in Matthew 24:45 is **far more general**, certainly including the doctrine about healing, but by no means limited to that narrow application.

Time has demonstrated that the leadership which did away with the Church’s doctrine about healing did away with dozens of other teachings as well. As they say, “the facts on the ground” show that the teaching about healing was just the start for the large number of teachings that were methodically discredited. So it seems inappropriate to attempt to limit the application of “therapeia” in this verse to the subject of healing.]

Now **Luke 9:11** is very interesting. It uses the verb “iaomai” to refer to Jesus Christ’s actions of healing people. And then it uses the noun “therapeia” to express a need. A suitable way to translate this verse is:

“... He spake unto them of the kingdom of God, and **healed** (a form of “**iaomai**”) them that had need of **well-being** (“therapeia”).”

Note that the second part of Luke 9:11 does not use the Greek words “iasis” or “iama”, which would have been the logical Greek words to convey the specific meaning of “healing” in a context where the Greek verb “iaomai” is also used. Clearly the word “therapeia” is used in this verse with a more general meaning than the meaning of the words “iama” and “iasis”.

And that “leaves” us with only Revelation 22:2.

Here is this verse once again.

In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, *was there* the tree of life, which bare twelve *manner of* fruits, *and* yielded her fruit every month: and **the leaves** of the tree *were for the well-being of the nations (of them which are saved!)*.

“The nations” referred to in this verse are all immortal members of the God Family; they are God-Beings. And so “healing” is not the intended meaning.

Here is the point:

God is here in Revelation 22 explaining something by means of an analogy, expressing what will happen “in earthly terms”. To state this analogy plainly:

All members of the Family of God (excepting obviously God the Father and Jesus Christ) will on a regular basis replenish their supply of the power of God’s holy spirit by “eating it” as the fruit and leaves of the tree of life!

We will all regularly have to replenish that power within us, like having to regularly eat our “daily bread” in this life, in order to stay strong. It doesn’t affect our immortality; but it will affect the degree of power to which we will have access!

This is the reason why God in the first place created us in such a way that we need to eat our “daily bread”!

Just because God created us as physical mortal beings, that does not mean that God had to create us to have a need to replenish our strength on a daily basis! Yes, God really could have created us as mortal beings, but without ever having to eat anything! Certainly, that seems strange if not impossible to our way of thinking. But that is because we cannot picture any realistic alternative. But try to understand this point:

God created us human beings with a need for daily food because God had already devised a plan whereby we would eventually, as spirit beings, replenish the power of God within us (i.e. God’s holy spirit) on a regular basis by “taking it in”! Eating physical food is a parallel to that process.

We are told that when we live by God’s laws then the holy spirit “**flows**” out of us (John 7:38, etc.). Now once it has flowed out of us by means of godly conduct, **then it isn’t there any longer!** We will not have the ability to generate any new holy spirit. That ability, to constantly produce new holy spirit, is reserved exclusively to God the Father and to Jesus Christ. That’s what Revelation 22:1 tells us.

But we ourselves cannot generate any new holy spirit. And therefore we must replenish it on a fairly regular basis, like eating physical food on a daily basis. That's what we already have to do in this life. And that is the method which God has planned for us for all future eternity, that we regularly replenish our supply of holy spirit from the tree of life.

Well, that concludes the Scriptures I wanted to cover in this series of articles.

IN CONCLUSION

We have now covered 151 different Scriptures that are mistranslated or easily misinterpreted. Some are major mistranslations. Others are perhaps not quite as significant. But they all work together in creating a whole environment in which there are so many things that are wrong or distorted, that the end result is, that even the people whose minds are open to the truth of God are still likely to be confused on many points.

As I mentioned at the start of this series of articles, all of us, including me, are almost certain to still be sincerely wrong in some of our views. It takes effort to grow in an understanding of God's truth.

God's spirit can help us to understand correctly translated Scriptures that are generally misunderstood by most other people. But mistranslations don't come to our attention as easily, simply because we have God's spirit. God's spirit can help us to understand that some Scriptures just don't seem to be in harmony with certain other Scriptures, thereby prodding us to investigate the matter more closely. This process will at times help us to recognize certain mistranslations.

But other mistranslations don't arouse any suspicions on our part because they support or agree with things we have always accepted as truth. In this regard God's spirit becomes an enormous help when these mistranslations are eventually brought to our attention, because God's spirit will help us to recognize and understand correct explanations for mistranslated Scriptures, when those explanations are presented to us.

In other words, without a certain amount of effort on our part ("seek and you will find ...") God's spirit does not automatically bring mistranslations to our attention. But once they are brought to our attention, then God's spirit will help us to recognize explanations that are true and correct.

You may not agree with all the explanations I have provided in this series of articles. That's your prerogative. I would suggest that you don't worry about those, and instead focus on the explanations that you yourself can see are correct. And bear in mind that in some cases two or three mistranslations work together towards one goal, with some becoming easier to recognize after certain other mistranslations have been cleared up.

Irrespective of which organization you may be a member, these mistranslations are Scriptures of which every member of God's Church in every fellowship should be aware. Satan uses these mistranslations to blind not only the people in the world, but even the people in the churches of God. It is only the truth that can really set us free from Satan's hold over us. Deception enslaves people. The truth is one of our

greatest weapons in overcoming that slavery.

When you consider all of the mistranslations we have examined in this series of articles, and you briefly think about the major consequences of those mistranslations, then you get some idea of how all-pervasive Satan's hold is over the religious views of the majority of people.

There certainly are still many more mistranslations, of which I myself am currently not yet aware. It is my intention to occasionally update this series of articles, as more mistranslations come to my attention. If you are aware of any significant mistranslations that I have not addressed, please send them to the Webmaster of my website, so I can consider them for future updates of this series of seven articles.

Together these seven articles make up about 400 pages on my computer. Perhaps at some point in the future I might combine them into one file as an "e-Book". But for now I'll just stay with the seven individual articles.

Frank W. Nelte