June 2022

Frank W. Nelte

150 MISTRANSLATIONS IN THE BIBLE PART 4

This is the fourth in a series of seven articles, in which the following Scriptures are discussed in a Genesis to Revelation sequence.

61	ISAIAH 1:14
62	ISAIAH 3:4
63	ISAIAH 3:12
64	ISAIAH 9:6-7
65	ISAIAH 14:12
66	ISAIAH 39:7
67	ISAIAH 52:12
68	ISAIAH 55:1
69	LAMENTATIONS 1:7
70	EZEKIEL 28:16
71	EZEKIEL 39:2
72	JOEL 2:2,25

73	JOEL 2:8
74	ZECHARIAH 14:19
75	ZECHARIAH 14:21
76	MATTHEW 4:5
77	MATTHEW 5:44
78	MATTHEW 7:11
79	MATTHEW 10:4 (MARK 3:18)

80 MATTHEW 11:30

81 MATTHEW 13:35

THEW 21:29,32

83 MATTHEW 24:45 (LUKE 12:42)

ATTHEW 25:16

ATTHEW 25:34

86 MATTHEW 27:3

87 MATTHEW 28:1

88 MATTHEW 28:19-20

89 MARK 12:29

90 MARK 16:2

#61 = ISAIAH 1:14

THE VERSE:

your new moons (chodesh) and **your appointed feasts** (mow'ed) My soul hates: they are a trouble unto Me; I am weary to bear *them*.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

People sometimes infer that this is speaking about God hating “the way” the Jews observed their new moons and some of their feasts. But that explanation is completely wrong.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

There is one mistranslation here, and then there is an additional case of a correct translation that actually hides the intended meaning.

The mistranslation involves the words “your appointed feasts”. The Hebrew word used here is “mow’ed”, and this does not mean “feasts”. It refers to “commanded assemblies”, and when used in conjunction with the word for “holy”, then it means “Holy Day”. The meaning of “mow’ed” is discussed in detail in the section that deals with Leviticus 23:2.

The technically correct translation that is involved in this verse is “your new moons”. Here “chodesh” is used to mean something for which biblical Hebrew did not have a word available. So here “new moons” is only **a descriptive reference to what God really means**.

At any rate, for a start this says: “**your** new moons and **your** commanded assemblies (here a reference to Holy Days) My soul hates”. In this context “mow’ed” is a reference to the commanded annual church services. So the questions are: **What** does God “hate” about these Jewish annual church services, and **why** does God hate them?

There are basically two possibilities here.

1) **Either** it is something about **the content** of their church services that God hates.

2) **Or** it is something about **the timing** of these annual church services that God hates.

It could also be a combination of both of these factors.

At any rate, when God tells us that He “**hates**” something, then that should fill us with fear. We don’t want to see God becoming angry with us, do we? So we surely will do our best to **establish exactly what it is that God hates**, so we can carefully avoid getting involved in whatever that hated activity may be, right?

The context of Isaiah 1 is that God is criticizing Judah (verse 1) in extremely strong terms, referring to them as “Sodom” and as “Gomorrah” (verse 10). That is a scary comparison. The text then states that they do appear before God with an outward show of obedience (verses 11-12). But God still disapproves.

Now verses 13 and 14 go together. Here is the point:

In verse 13 God criticizes **their church services**.

And in verse 14 God criticizes **their calendar**!

Verse 13 applies to **the content** of their meetings and verse 14 applies to **the timing** of their meetings. New moons are traditionally used to indicate timing. Let's notice these things.

Here is what God tells us in Verse 13:

1) **Your offerings** are worthless to God ("vain oblations").

2) **Your prayers** ("incense") are an abomination, i.e. prayers at your religious occasions.

3) God can't stand any of **your meetings** (on the "Sabbath" or "new moons" or "calling of assemblies" or "solemn meetings").

With this verse God has covered all of their religious meetings. This verse expresses God's rejection of **the content** of all of these religious meetings, all of them!

God clearly disapproves in the strongest terms of what is being taught or practiced at all of these services in the course of a year. However, notice that in listing all of these different categories of religious occasions in verse 13, God avoided using the word "mow'ed". Holy Days are included by using the expressions "the calling of assemblies" and "the solemn meeting", but the actual word for "Holy Days" has not been mentioned in verse 13.

So far God has said that these meetings are "an abomination" to Him, that they are "iniquity" and that He can't stand them.

Verse 14 then expresses **an escalation** in disapproval. Now God says that He **hates** something. "Hating" is going one stronger than what God has said in verse 13.

We need to recognize that **verse 14 is not a repetition** of what God has already covered in verse 13! Verse 14 addresses something new, something that has not yet been addressed.

Verse 14 addresses **the foundation** on which all of the points in verse 13 are based. Verse 14 addresses the core of the problems. Verse14 is the climax of God's expression of disapproval.

Notice!

God singles out **two** specific things on which His hatred is focused: 1) **new moons**, and 2) **Holy Days**. The question is: are these two connected? Yes, they are. The new moons provide **the foundation for**

all of the Holy Days. If there is a problem with the new moons, then there is automatically also a problem with all the annual “mow’ed” days.

Notice also that, while the Sabbaths and new moons had both been mentioned in verse 13, verse 14 does **not** mention the Sabbath again. Why not? Why mention only the Holy Days (“mow’ed), in addition to mentioning the new moons again?

Verse 14 is making a different point from verse 13.

It is these two things in verse 14 that are “**a trouble to God**”, and that “**weary God**”. These expressions should tell us that God is finding fault with **the way** these things (new moons and Holy Days) are determined!

God is here expressing intense anger and hatred for two very specific things! Now if it was only “the content” of those days (i.e. what was going on in the services) that God was addressing, then all the other days mentioned in verse 13 should also be listed here in verse 14. That is because **the content doesn’t set new moons and Holy Days apart** from the weekly Sabbaths and “solemn meetings”, etc. If the teachings or the conduct are supposed to be the problem for the new moons and the Holy Days, then the teachings for all the other occasions mentioned in verse 13 (Sabbaths, etc.) are surely equally much of a problem.

But verse 14 focuses on two very specific items, where item #2 (Holy Days) is totally dependent on item #1 (new moons). And it is specifically these two things that God is tired of putting up with (“I am weary to bear them”).

For the correct meaning of “chodesh” please refer to the detailed discussion in the section that deals with Exodus 12:2. That information applies equally to this discussion here.

Now while in the Latin language you could clearly distinguish between “new moon” (“**neomenia**”) and “the first day of every month” (“**kalenda**”), in Hebrew both of these concepts are expressed by the one word “**chodesh**”. And even as the Latin word “kalenda” provided the concept of “a calendar” to us, so in Hebrew **the word “chodesh” is the word that conveys the concept of “a calendar”**.

In his Latin Vulgate Translation Jerome translated “**your chodesh**” in this verse with “**kalendas vestras**”. And the Hebrew scholar Gesenius in his “Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon To The Old Testament”, in the section for “chodesh”, writes that **“chodesh” refers to “the calends of a lunar month”**. Gesenius was familiar with Jerome’s Latin Vulgate version.

The Latin expression “kalendas vestras” is one way to say “**your calendar**”.

So let’s understand:

There is no word in biblical Hebrew, other than "chodesh", that is capable of expressing the concept of "a calendar".

And here in Isaiah 1:14 God is really saying: "**I hate your calendar and your Holy Days**, whose determination is based on that calendar. That calendar provides the foundation on which all of your religious activities throughout the year are based. I am tired of putting up with that calendar."

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Your new moons (meaning "**your calendar**") and **your** Holy Days My soul hates; they are a trouble to Me, and I am weary to bear them.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

After in verse 13 expressing total disapproval for all their religious meetings during the year, in verse 14 God then expresses **hatred for the Jewish calendar** and the religious days that are determined based on that calendar.

This verse is not a reference to any supposed "pagan" activities on the new moons and on the Holy Days. Rather, Isaiah 1:14 is a prophetic statement in which God expresses His disapproval in the strongest terms for **the manipulative calendar** (i.e. postponements, etc.) the Jews have devised for determining the dates for their religious observances.

#62 = ISAIAH 3:4

THIS VERSE:

And I will give **children** to be their princes, and **babes** shall rule over them. (Isaiah 3:4)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

"Babes" are not really capable of ruling any society. And there has never been a society anywhere on earth where "babes" were the rulers. And God is not speaking about "babes" in this verse.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

We are dealing with another mistranslation.

In this verse the word "children" refers to young immature people in their 20's and 30's, who today run much of our world. Isaiah 3:4 is what we have in our age today. Many of the new billionaires were only in their 20's when they started their computer companies, or their social media companies, etc. And now they are the leaders in many areas of life, and they have replaced the mature leaders, whom God has taken away. And as a group these young adults are today by far **the most influential group within all**

of society.

Now to the mistranslation.

The Hebrew word translated as "**babes**" (i.e. "ta'aluwl") is only used twice in the whole Old Testament, here and in Isaiah 66:4, where it is translated as "**delusions**". This word does **not** mean "babes" at all!

Rather, it is derived from the Hebrew verb "alal" (also used in verse 12), which verb means "**to act severely**, **wantonly**, **to make a fool of**", etc. So the Hebrew noun "ta'aluwl" really means: wantonness, caprice, vexation, or even delusions, as Isaiah 66:4 implies. But it certainly does not mean "babes"!

At best we could say that **it refers to conduct** which can also be associated with "babes".

Green's Literal Translation recognizes that "babes" is not a good translation. Notice how this verse appears in Green's Translation:

and I will give young boys to be their rulers, **and caprices shall rule over them**. (Isaiah 3:4 LIT)

The focus of the Hebrew word mistranslated as "babes" is not on physical immaturity, but on **the attributes** of **incompetence** and **irrationality**. In other words, the focus is on mental and emotional immaturity! And that is what the word "caprices" conveys, namely: **impulsive** and **unpredictable actions** and conduct, whimsical or delusional behavior.

In Isaiah 3:4 God is telling us that He will take away the real leaders in society, and then allow society to be largely dominated by **both** young people in their 20's and 30's, **and** by capricious leaders who are irrational, incompetent and even delusional. But those leaders can belong to any age group.

This verse is a clear reference to two distinct categories of individuals. Firstly, young people in general will be very influential in society. And secondly, there will be **capricious rulers who may be from any age group**. Satan can exert a far more powerful influence over all people in the absence of mature leaders, who would oppose the worst aspects of his influence. **Irrational, capricious, delusional and incompetent leaders are much more pliable in Satan's hands**. This condition of bad leadership in society will facilitate the buildup to the cataclysmic events that will surely precede Christ's second coming.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Green's Literal Translation, quoted above, is basically fine.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

The words “children” and “babes” imply that leadership is completely controlled by young people. It leaves no room for leaders who are old. But that is not what God is saying in this verse.

Correcting the word “babes” with the word “caprices” makes provision for incompetent, impulsive and irrational leaders of any age. So while young people will occupy many positions of great influence (i.e. be “princes”), the actual rulers can be from any age group; but they will have the bad characteristics of “caprices” ... being delusional, irrational, incompetent, etc.

#63 = ISAIAH 3:12

THIS VERSE:

As for My people, **children** *are* their oppressors, and women rule over them. O My people, they which lead you cause *you* to err, and destroy the way of your paths. (Isaiah 3:12)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

In Isaiah 3:4 “children” are the princes, and here in verse 12 “children” are the oppressors. But that is not what verse 12 is actually telling us.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The word “children” in this verse is another mistranslation, one which none of the translations I have checked has corrected. The English noun “children” here is supposedly the translation of the Hebrew verb “alal”, the root word for the Hebrew noun “ta’aluwl” mistranslated as “babes” in verse 4. We have already seen this Hebrew verb “alal” in the previous section.

This Hebrew verb “**alal**” is used 20 times in the Old Testament. As we have already seen, it means “to act severely, wantonly, to make a fool of”, etc. It is translated in the KJV three times as “**abuse**”, twice as “**mock**”, once as “**defiled**”, etc. This verse here is the only place where “alal” is mistranslated as “children”.

There are several words in biblical Hebrew that mean “children” but “alal” is assuredly not one of them. It does not mean “children”.

For example, in Isaiah 3:4 above the word “children” is a correct translation of the Hebrew word “**na’ar**”, whereas here in Isaiah 3:12 the word “children” is a mistranslation of the Hebrew word “alal”. The Hebrew “na’ar” means “children”, including “young immature adults” in its meaning, as I indicated above.

The correct focus of Isaiah 3:12 is **not** on “children” being the oppressors. The correct focus of this verse is that “**those who act wantonly, severely, recklessly, abusively and perversely**” are the real oppressors of society.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

As for My people, **wanton, reckless people** *are* their oppressors, and women rule over them. O My people, they which lead you cause *you* to err, and destroy the way of your paths. (Isaiah 3:12)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

There is no specific age group implied for those who oppress society in general. Rather, it is **the ungodly character** of the people involved in oppressing society that is the focus of this statement. The people doing the oppressing may be young, or they may be middle-aged, or they may be old. But whatever age they may be, **their selfishness knows no restraints**. That is what God is telling us in the first part of verse 12.

#64 = ISAIAH 9:6-7

THESE VERSES:

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and **the government** shall be upon His shoulder: and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of ***His*** **government** and peace *there shall be* no end, upon the throne of David, and upon His kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

Some people have drawn the conclusion that this speaks about a government that will continue to increase for all future eternity. But that is not the case at all.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

This translation is an example of the original translators trying to please King James himself, by implying that “the government” is intended to be on the shoulders of kings.

The Hebrew word translated as “government” in both these verses is “misrah,” which comes from a primitive root meaning “**to have power**”. This word “misrah” is only used here in these two verses and nowhere else in the Old Testament.

[The only other reference to “government” in the OT is in Isaiah 22:21, where the Hebrew word used is “memshalah”. That word is usually translated as “dominion” and only translated as “government” in Isaiah 22:21. This word “memshalah” need not concern us here.]

These verses here have nothing whatsoever to do with “government” as we understand it. The correct translation for “misrah” is “power”. And the focus of these statements is that **Jesus Christ’s power will**

continue to grow throughout future eternity, as will also the power of God the Father and of the entire Family of God.

The focus of these verses is really the same as the focus of Jesus Christ's statement after His resurrection, recorded in Matthew 28:18. There Jesus Christ said: "**all power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth**"!

Translating "misrah" as "government" was an unfortunate pandering to King James.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and **the power** shall be upon His shoulder: and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of ***His*** **power** and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon His kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

Matthew 28:18 really sums up the meaning of these verses here in Isaiah 9. The power of the entire Family of God will always grow, it will always increase. And God the Father and Jesus Christ will always be supreme.

#65 = ISAIAH 14:12

THE VERSE:

How are you fallen from heaven, **o Lucifer**, son of the morning! *how* are you cut down to the ground, who did weaken the nations!

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

The implication of this translation is that Satan's name, before he sinned and rebelled against God, used to be "Lucifer"!

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

This is a **huge** mistranslation! It is perhaps **the worst mistranslation** in the whole Bible. This translation in fact makes a statement that is blasphemous, a statement that is an insult to God and to Jesus Christ!

I have written a detailed article, available on my website, that exposes this twisting of the truth. "Lucifer" was **never**, at any time in the past, a name for Satan.

Briefly:

The Hebrew word here translated as “Lucifer” is “**heylel**”, which is derived from the verb “halal”. This verb “halal” has a range of meanings, which include: bright and shiny, to praise, to boast, to be mad, etc. Clearly this verb has both, positive meanings and negative meanings.

The translators, following the lead of the Greek LXX and the Latin Vulgate, chose a positive meaning for the noun “heylel”, when they clearly should have chosen one of the negative meanings.

The noun “heylel” really means: **braggart, boaster, arrogant, opinionated fool**, etc. God used the designation “heylel” with a derogatory and contemptuous meaning. God was not praising Satan, but showing contempt and scorn for the one who had rebelled against Him.

God never, at any time, speaks respectfully of the wicked. God laughs at the wicked and holds them in derision (Psalm 2:4; 37:13; 59:8). God hates the wicked (Psalm 11:5-6). God will laugh at and mock the wicked (Proverbs 1:26). Could we really expect anything else?

Now it is **the context** in which this word is used in Isaiah that makes clear beyond any doubts whatsoever that God is showing **scorn** and not respect for Satan. The context is one of unbelievable arrogance and of mind-blowing boasting on the part of Satan. Could any created being ever be so arrogant and so taken up with his own supposed brilliance that he would **dare** to challenge Almighty God? The statements in verses 13-14 (“**I will** ascend into ... **I will** exalt ... **I will** sit ... **I will** ascend above ... **I will** be like ...”) represent the ultimate, supreme and greatest possible boast that any creature could ever make!

It is for that boast that God referred to Satan as “heylel”, because God calls things what they are, and **not what they used to be!**

The word for “light-bringer” is “**Aaron**” in Hebrew, “**Phosphoros**” in Greek, and “**Lucifer**” in Latin. These three words are identical in meaning!

Now it should be easy to understand that if in Hebrew “Aaron” means “light-bringer”, then the Hebrew word “heylel” can’t possibly have the same meaning. These two Hebrew words have nothing in common.

In 2 Peter 1:19 Jesus Christ is called “**Phosphoros**” in the Greek text, and “**Lucifer**” in the Latin Vulgate text. And if 2 Peter 1:19 was translated correctly into Hebrew, then Jesus Christ should there be called “**Aaron**”. The English translation “day star” in that verse is another huge mistranslation, and one that is deliberate! See the section that deals with 2 Peter 1:19 for more details.

2 Peter 1:19 makes quite clear that “Lucifer” is actually a name for Jesus Christ! That’s what Peter tells us in plain words, except that Peter used the Greek word that means “Lucifer”.

Now Jerome in his Latin Vulgate Translation of the whole Bible used the noun “lucifer” in the following three places:

1) **Isaiah 14:12** = as a name for **Satan**. Here this represents a mistranslation of the Hebrew noun “heylel”.

2) **Job 11:17** = the expression “you shall be as the morning” reads in the Vulgate “putaveris orieris ut lucifer”, which literally means “you’ll be reckoned to arise like a lightbringer”. Zophar is here applying the word “lucifer” to **Job**. Here “lucifer” in the Vulgate represents a mistranslation of the Hebrew noun “boqer”, meaning “morning”.

3) **2 Peter 1:19** = as a name for **Jesus Christ**. Here this represents the 100% correct translation of the Greek noun “phosphoros”.

In addition Jerome also used **the adjective “luciferum”**, which means “**light bringing**”, in the following two places:

1) **Job 38:32** = God challenges Job with the question “can you bring for Mazzaroth?” in reference to the heavenly constellations. In the Vulgate this expression reads “numquid producis luciferum”, literally “now lead forth the light-bringing (stars)”. Here this adjective is applied by God to stars. Here “luciferum” represents the Hebrew noun “mazzarah”.

2) **Psalm 110:3** = Here David is speaking **about Jesus Christ**. The expression “from the womb of the morning: you have the dew of your youth” is translated in the Vulgate as “ex utero ante luciferum genui te”, which literally means “from the womb before the light-bringing (one) you give birth”. Here “luciferum” represents the Hebrew noun “mishchar”, meaning “dawn”.

The point with Jerome’s Latin Vulgate Translation is this:

Jerome used the words “lucifer, luciferum” **to refer to Jesus Christ** in the Old Testament (**Psalm 110:3**) and also in the New Testament (**2 Peter 1:19**). Without question the word “lucifer” is the perfect translation of the Greek word “phosphoros” in 2 Peter 1:19.

Yet Jerome had the gall to also translate the obscure Hebrew word “heylel” in Isaiah 14:12 as “Lucifer”, when **he knew full well that Isaiah 14 is speaking about Satan**! Jerome saw no problems whatsoever to use the same name for Jesus Christ and for Satan.

This is **exactly** what Paul meant in 2 Corinthians 11:14, that Satan has transformed himself into a light-bringer (i.e. “angel of light”).

With this Latin Vulgate Translation as a foundation the English translators then did two things:

1) They chose to retain the word “Lucifer” as a name for Satan.

2) But when the word “Lucifer” refers to Jesus Christ, then all of them carefully disguised this fact, by mistranslating 2 Peter 1:19.

These comments here only scratch the surface. There is a great deal more about Satan’s deceitful usurpation of the name “Lucifer” in my article on this subject. And see also the section on 2 Peter 1:19.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

How are you fallen from heaven, **you arrogant boaster**, son of the morning! *how* are you cut down to the ground, who did weaken the nations.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

In plain terms God was saying: “So you opinionated arrogant fool, you think that you can knock Me off My throne and take over from Me, do you? Well, here is what I am going to do to you, sucker!”. See Psalm 2:4 for God’s general tone in this kind of situation.

Understand that God will **never, never, never** speak in respectful tones about those who rebel against Him! God never shows respect for rebels!

The expression “son of the morning” simply shows Satan’s origin, that he was **created** by Jesus Christ, “the morning star” (Revelation 22:16).

#66 = ISAIAH 39:7

THE VERSE:

And of your sons that shall issue from you, which you shall beget, shall they take away; and they shall be **eunuchs** in the palace of the king of Babylon.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

Some people assume that these descendants of Hezekiah would be made eunuchs literally, i.e. they would be castrated. But that is not correct in most cases.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The Hebrew word translated “eunuch” is “**saris**”. Now while this word was indeed derived from an

unused root word meaning “to castrate,” it also became at an early time **a title for high-ranking government officials**. The word “saris” is used 42 times in the Old Testament, and it is translated 17 times as “eunuch,” 13 times as “**chamberlain**,” and 12 times as “**officer**”.

For example, the very first time this word “saris” is used in the Old Testament is in Genesis 37:36, which reads:

And the Midianites sold him into Egypt unto Potiphar, **an officer** (Hebrew “saris”) of Pharaoh’s, and captain of the guard.

Potiphar was a married man, and clearly not a physical eunuch.

So the very first time this word “eunuch” is ever used in the Bible, it did **not** refer to a man who was a physical eunuch. Similarly, Pharaoh’s chief butler and his chief baker are also called “saris” in Hebrew (Genesis 40:2), and they were hardly physical eunuchs.

Already in the days of Jacob this word was used as a title for royal officials.

Coming down to about 700 years later, the people of Israel came to Samuel and wanted a king. In his response Samuel included the following statement in the warning he gave to the people:

And he (the king) will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to **his officers** (Hebrew “saris”), and to his servants” (1 Samuel 8:15 AV)

Samuel was not talking about the king giving things to “his eunuchs,” but to his officers, to the higher officials in his employ. And this meaning was quite clear to the translators. That is why they here translated “saris” appropriately as “officers”.

Israelites were clearly aware of this word “eunuch” being used as a title for high ranking officials in the employ of a king.

Even in New Testament times the word “eunuch” was still being used as a title. This can be seen in Acts 8:27, which refers to “a man of Ethiopia, **a eunuch of great authority** under Candace queen of the Ethiopians”. Once again, the word “eunuch” is used to designate a position of high authority at the royal court, and it did not mean that the man was a eunuch physically.

So from the time of Jacob right down to the New Testament the word “eunuch” was used as **a title** for certain officials. And here in Isaiah 39:7 God was telling Hezekiah that some of his descendants would end up serving as court officials to the king of Babylon. And this was fulfilled by Daniel. Daniel was certainly not a physical eunuch, but he equally certainly was a very high ranking official in Babylon.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

And of your sons that shall issue from you, which you shall beget, shall they take away; and they shall be **officials** in the palace of the king of Babylon.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

After King Hezekiah had foolishly showed the Babylonian ambassadors all his wealth, God told the king that some of his own descendants would end up working for the king of Babylon, as officials in his palace. They were not going to be used as slaves in menial tasks, but as important officials in the affairs of the Babylonian Empire.

But still, they were basically in a state of slavery, i.e. unable to choose for themselves where they wanted to live their lives, or what jobs they would like to be involved in. This prediction was fulfilled by Daniel and his three friends.

As far as being castrated is concerned, Leviticus 21:20 says that men with any of the following defects were to be excluded from the priesthood.

Or crookbacked, or a dwarf, or that has a blemish in his eye, or be scurvy, or scabbed, or **has his stones broken**;

The Hebrew words translated here as “has his stones broken” refer to a man who has one or both testicles missing.

This verse is an instruction from God. So this verse spells out that eunuchs were not to be used as servants for God in a priestly capacity. The same would surely also apply to prophets like Daniel, etc.

It should make clear that Daniel, who was used as a major prophet by God, certainly did not have “his stones broken”! The only sense in which Daniel was a eunuch is in the sense that he was a high ranking government official.

#67 = ISAIAH 52:12

THE VERSE:

For you shall not go out **with haste**, nor go by flight: for the LORD will go before you; and the God of Israel *will be* your rearguard.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This is not really a major issue. It is just that there is a mistranslation. While this mistranslation has no

particular doctrinal impact in this verse, the same mistranslation has a significant impact in Exodus 12:11.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The Hebrew word translated as “with haste” in this verse is “chippazown”. It should be translated as “in fear”, or as “in trepidation”.

This same word is mistranslated in Exodus 12:11, and in the section that deals with Exodus 12:11 this point is explained in detail. Please refer to that section for further details regarding “chippazown”.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

For you shall not go out **with fear**, nor go by flight: for the LORD will go before you; and the God of Israel *will be* your rearguard.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

When God intervenes for His people, then they will not come out of these different areas in a spirit of fear and trepidation. They will not be fleeing from an enemy. God will guard and control the entire process, and Israel will be confident in God’s guidance and protection.

#68 = ISAIAH 55:1

THE VERSE:

Ho, every one that thirsts, come you to the waters, and **he that has no money; come you, buy, and eat**; yes, come, **buy wine and milk without money** and without price. (Isaiah 55:1)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

It should be easy to recognize that we are here dealing with a mistranslation. In English the word “buy” means: to acquire by payment, to obtain in exchange for something. But in this verse it is explicitly stated that **there is no payment**, and nothing is to be given in exchange for what will be received.

So the verb “**buy**” in this verse is obviously **a mistranslation**!

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The Hebrew verb here translated as “buy” is “**shabar**”.

And this verb “shabar” is formed from the noun “**sheber**”, which means “food” in general, and “wheat”

or “grain” specifically. So the Hebrew verb “shabar” literally means either “**get food, get grain**”, or it means “**give food, give grain**”. It is the context in which this Hebrew word is used, that determines whether getting or giving is the intended meaning.

This Hebrew verb “shabar” is used 21 times in the Old Testament. In the KJV it is translated 15 times as “**buy**” and 6 times as “**sell**”. This illustrates that the context determines the intended meaning.

Now in English we don’t have any word that sometimes means “to buy something”, and at other times it means “to sell something”. We view the two sides of the buying/selling transaction as **opposites**.

When an item changes ownership, then we have the seller at the one side, and we have the buyer at the other side. The one transaction requires both a buyer and a seller. And if someone is not prepared to sell something, then you can’t have a buyer for that something. Similarly, if nobody is willing to buy an item, then you don’t have a seller for that item either.

But that’s not how the Hebrew verb “shabar” is used.

The focus of “shabar” is that “**somebody receives food to eat**”. That could be because that person bought the food for money. Or it could be because that food was given to that person without any price attached to what was given. But the result is that someone has received something to eat.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Ho, every one that thirsts, come you to the waters, and he that has **no money**; come you, **receive food and eat**; yes, come, **receive wine and milk without money** and without price. (Isaiah 55:1)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

This is speaking about life during Jesus Christ’s millennial rule. It makes the point that food supplies will be readily available for all people. And it tells us that people will not need to have any money in order to provide food for themselves and their families, because food will be freely available for all people.

No buying or selling is implied in this process.

#69 = LAMENTATIONS 1:7

THE VERSE:

Jerusalem remembered in the days of her affliction and of her miseries all her pleasant things that she had in the days of old, when her people fell into the hand of the enemy, and none did help her: the adversaries saw her, *and* did mock at **her Sabbaths**.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This translation implies a mocking of the religious days being observed. That is not the focus of this verse.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

While this is not of any major consequences, we do have a mistranslation in this verse.

The Hebrew word translated as “her Sabbaths” is “**mishbath**”. This word does not mean “Sabbath”. It really means “**annihilation, ruin**”, etc. This is well known and most translations have corrected this.

Thus: The ASV and JPS read “desolations”, NAS and Darby read “ruin”, RSV, NRSV and NKJV read “downfall”, NIV reads “destruction”, etc.

The source of this wrong translation is Jerome’s **Latin Vulgate**, which translated “mishbath” as “sabbata eius”, Latin for “her Sabbaths”. This is another clear example of the powerful influence the Latin text had on the early translators, including those of the KJV.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Any of the above mentioned translations is acceptable. For example, JPS reads:

“Jerusalem remembereth in the days of her affliction and of her anguish all her treasures that she had from the days of old; now that her people fall by the hand of the adversary, and none doth help her, the adversaries have seen her, they have mocked at **her desolations**.” (Lamentations 1:7 JPS)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

The enemies are shown mocking Jerusalem’s ruin and desolations, rather than her religious days.

#70 = EZEKIEL 28:16

THE VERSE:

By the multitude of your merchandise they have filled the midst of you with violence, and you have sinned: therefore I will cast you as profane out of the mountain of God: and I **will destroy you**, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This verse is addressed to Satan and the implication is that God will “destroy” Satan, i.e. blot him out.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

Here we have an example where the translators due to a lack of understanding chose to apply the not-intended meaning of a word.

The Hebrew verb here translated as “destroy” is “**abad**”. This verb “abad” is formed from a primitive root, and it literally means: **to wander away, to lose oneself**.

It is only by the extension of these literal meanings that the meaning “to destroy” is derived. So yes, in the Old Testament the word “abad” frequently means “to destroy”. But it also still retains its literal meaning of “to wander away”.

Thus, in the 184 places where “abad” is used in the Old Testament, there are many places where it means something like “destroy”, and there are also many other places where the intended meaning is the literal meaning of “abad”, namely “to wander away”, or “to drive away”, or “to lose oneself”.

Thus, many times when we read that God would “destroy” (“abad”) certain nations, it really means that God would cause those nations to be “driven away”, as God explained, for example, in Exodus 23:28 (“hornets shall drive out those nations”), rather than those nations being “blotted out”.

Here in Ezekiel 28:16 the intended meaning is “to wander away and get lost”.

The proof for this intended meaning is **the ceremony** that was enacted every year **on the Day of Atonement**. The goat that represented Satan (see the section dealing with Leviticus 16:8-10) was driven away into the wilderness; it was **not** killed. God used that goat (the one for Azazel) to represent Satan’s fate. The word “abad” describes exactly what happened to that goat; it was to be driven away from any possible contact with anyone else.

That is what will happen to Satan and the demons. This same fate is also spelled out in Jude 1:13, where Satan and the demons are referred to as “wandering stars (literally “stars that wander deceitfully”) **to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever**”. That is precisely what “abad” means.

The Hebrew noun “abaddon” is an intensive form of the verb “abad”. This noun is used six times in the books of Job, Psalms and Proverbs, and it is always translated as “destruction”. These references are not to any specific person or being, and so “destruction” is a suitable translation in those six places. However, at the end of the New Testament God gave John the visions of the Book of Revelation. And in **that** context God chose to use this Hebrew noun “Abaddon” as one name for Satan (Revelation 9:11).

So when “Abaddon” is used as a name for Satan, then its intended meaning is “**the one** who is destined to be driven away”. See the section on Revelation 9:11 for more details.

Thus God chose to reveal Satan's ultimate fate in the following ways:

1) The ceremony on the Day of Atonement reveals that Satan will not be "killed" or "destroyed", but that he will be "**driven away**".

2) God revealed this same destiny for Satan by using the verb "**abad**" in Ezekiel 28:16.

3) God revealed that same destiny in Jude 1:13, pointing out that Satan and the demons will wander "**in the blackness of darkness for ever**".

4) God then sealed that destiny by, at the end of the book, giving Satan the name "**Abaddon**".

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

By the multitude of your merchandise they have filled the midst of you with violence, and you have sinned: therefore I will cast you as profane out of the mountain of God: and I **will cause you to wander away and get lost**, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

Satan's fate is to be driven away from any possible contact with anyone or anything, other than contact with all the demons that will share "the blackness of darkness for ever" with him. In this verse "destroy" is not an appropriate translation for "abad".

#71 = EZEKIEL 39:2

There is considerable confusion regarding what is the correct translation for Ezekiel 39:2. Here are a number of **different translations** for this verse, including some very old translations.

THIS VERSE:

Here is one group of translations that all talk about "the sixth part":

The **King James Version** for this verse reads:

And I will turn you back, and **leave but the sixth part of you**, and will cause you to come up from the north parts, and will bring you upon the mountains of Israel: (Ezekiel 39:2)

The **2000 Jubilee Bible** for this verse reads:

and I will break thee, and **leave but the sixth part of thee** and will cause thee to come up from the north

parts and will bring thee upon the mountains of Israel: (Ezekiel 39:2 JB2000)

Geneva Bible of **1587** reads:

And **I will destroy thee and leave but the sixth part of thee**, and will cause thee to come up from the North parts and will bring thee upon the mountains of Israel: (Ezekiel 39:2, Geneva Bible)

Webster Bible of **1833** reads:

And **I will turn thee back, and leave but the sixth part of thee**, and will cause thee to come from the north parts, and will bring thee upon the mountains of Israel: (Ezekiel 39:2, Webster)

And here is another group of translations that does not mention “the sixth part”:

Jewish Publication Society of **1916** reads:

and **I will turn thee about and lead thee on**, and will cause thee to come up from the uttermost parts of the north; and I will bring thee upon the mountains of Israel; (Ezekiel 39:2, Jewish Publication Society, 1916)

The **American Standard Version** for this verse reads:

and I will turn thee about, and **will lead thee on**, and will cause thee to come up from the uttermost parts of the north; and I will bring thee upon the mountains of Israel; (Ezekiel 39:2 ASV)

The **New Revised Standard Version** for this verse reads:

I will turn you around and **drive you forward**, and bring you up from the remotest parts of the north, and lead you against the mountains of Israel. (Ezekiel 39:2 NRSV)

Coverdale Bible of **1535** reads:

I will upon thee, **and turn thee about**, and **carry thee forth**, and lead thee from the north parts, and bring thee up to the mountains of Israel. (Ezekiel 39:2, Coverdale Bible)

Bishops Bible of **1568** reads:

And I will turn thee about, and **I will provoke thee forward**, and cause thee to come up from the north parts, and bring thee up to the mountains of Israel. (Ezekiel 39:2, Bishops)

Modern King James Version reads:

And I will turn you back, **and lead you on**. And I will bring you up from the recesses of the north, and I

will bring you on the mountains of Israel. (Ezekiel 39:2, MKJV)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THESE DIFFERENT TRANSLATIONS:

The issue with this verse revolves around either having an expression like “**leave but the sixth part of you**” or having an expression like “**will lead you on**” or “**drive you forward**”. Which option is correct? What does the Hebrew text say? Does a sixth part of this army survive or not? And if so, why would a sixth part survive?

Notice that the Modern King James Version has switched sides, away from the original King James Version Translation. Instead of “leave but the sixth part of you”, the MKJV reads “and lead you on”.

How can we know what is correct for this verse?

THE PROBLEMS WITH THESE TRANSLATIONS:

This problem is explained in great detail in my 24-page 2017 article “The Meaning Of Ezekiel 39:2".

The cause for the two vastly different translations for the identical Hebrew text (i.e. “leave but the sixth part of you” vs. “will lead you on”) involves serious technicalities of Hebrew grammar. My 24-page article explains in great detail how scholars came to attach completely different meanings to one specific Hebrew word.

CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

The KJV and those translations that agree with it are correct.

And I will turn you back, and **leave but the sixth part of you**, and will cause you to come up from the north parts, and will bring you upon the mountains of Israel: (Ezekiel 39:2)

The article explains why the other set of translations is wrong.

#72 = JOEL 2:2, 25

THESE VERSES:

A day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains: **a great people and a strong**; there has not been ever the like, neither shall be any more after it, *even* to the years of many generations.

And I will restore to you the years that the locust has eaten, the cankerworm, and the caterpillar, and the

palmerworm, **My great army** which I sent among you.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This is an example of a correct translation for verse 2, coupled with the omission of a conjunction that is clearly implied in verse 25, which has led some people to read a wrong meaning into these verses.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

Based on these verses there are people, including various Bible commentators (Adam Clarke, etc.), who believe that these verses are speaking about "**an army of locusts**". That is totally wrong.

For a start, Exodus 10:14 makes clear that verse 2 cannot possibly be a reference to locusts. Exodus 10:14 describes **the locust plague in Egypt** as follows: "before them there were no such locusts as they, **neither after them shall be such**".

And here Joel 2:2 says: "**there has not been ever the like**, neither shall be any more after it ...".

The wording in these two verses makes these two events (the plague of locusts in Egypt, and this event here in Joel 2:2) mutually exclusive. They cannot both be references to a plague of locusts. And since Exodus 10 does speak about locusts, therefore **Joel 2:2 must be a reference to something else**.

Next, in the expression "a great **people**" the Hebrew word for "great" really means "great in number", and here the Hebrew word for "people" is "am". Now **"am" always refers to human beings**, not to animals or to insects.

Consider the three Hebrew words that are relevant in this context:

- "goy" refers to "**a nation**",

- "le'om" refers to "**race**", and

- "am" refers to "**people in general**".

Because this huge army will transcend national and racial boundaries (i.e. it will include people from different nations and different races), therefore the term "am" was the most appropriate one to use here. But "am" does **not** refer to insects or to animals.

People who interpret Joel 2 as a reference to locusts do not understand the references to locusts in Joel 1:4 and Joel 2:25 in their correct context. They wrongly assume that the discussion between those two verses is just about locusts.

The Book of Joel is one of the earliest places where God reveals the chronological sequence of end-time events. In Joel the sequence is still incomplete, when compared to the Book of Revelation, but it is there.

We should see Revelation as the ultimate refinement in revealing this sequence, and the Book of Joel is one of the steps along the way. God's revelation throughout the Bible is always progressive, and that also applies to revealing the exact sequence of end-time events.

Here, seen in terms of the Book of Revelation, is the sequence of end-time events that is revealed in the Book of Joel. See if you can identify all of these events.

JOEL 1:4-5 = the 3rd Seal of Revelation

JOEL 1:6-7 = the 5th Seal of Revelation

JOEL 1:15 = the 7th Seal of Revelation

JOEL 1:17-19 = 1st Trumpet of Revelation

JOEL 1:20 = 3rd Trumpet of Revelation

JOEL 2:1-10 = 6th Trumpet of Revelation

JOEL 2:15-27 = 7th Trumpet of Revelation

JOEL 3:2-14 = 6th Plague of Revelation

JOEL 3:16 = 7th Plague of Revelation

JOEL 3:17-21 = Millennium and Beyond

When we understand this chronological, though still incomplete sequence, then we can see that "locusts" in Joel 1:4 are a reference to the 3rd Seal, the famine. The focus in Joel 1:4 is that these insects, starting with locusts, "**have eaten**" all the food supplies. That's a discussion of famine.

The reference to locusts in Joel 2:25 is contextually near the end of the discussion of the 7th Trumpet, when Jesus Christ returns with His army and the first resurrection takes place. Once Christ returns, He promises to repair all the damage that was caused by these events and to restore prosperity to this earth.

In this verse the translators really **should have provided** the conjunction "**and**", as they have done in hundreds of other places in the Bible. In most cases the translators could immediately see that in English such a conjunction is clearly needed, and therefore they provided it (printed in italics in the KJV). Here they did not provide the conjunction "and" because they didn't really understand this verse.

By "**My great army**" Jesus Christ does not mean "a bunch of locusts"! By "My great army" Jesus

Christ means “**the armies which are in heaven**” and which follow Him at His coming (see Revelation 19:14). Those armies appear in power and great glory (Matthew 24:30). Christ’s army consists of **all** the holy angels coming with Him (Matthew 25:31). That is what “My great army” means! But a bunch of locusts never has, and never will, qualify to be called “My great army”.

We need to recognize that interpreting the term ‘My great army” in Joel 2:25 as a reference to locusts is just one more of those major deceptions Satan has palmed off on mankind. It is an insult to God’s great power to think of “God’s army” in terms of locusts.

Now the context of Joel 2:25 is that Jesus Christ has just returned at the 7th Trumpet (verse 15), and that He will restore **everything** that was damaged or destroyed during the events leading up to His return.

Verse 25 should read (Jesus Christ speaking):

And I will restore to you the years that the locust has eaten, the cankerworm, and the caterpillar, and the palmerworm **and** My great army which I sent among you.

Christ is saying: “**I will restore everything from A to Z**”, everything from the very first catastrophe mentioned in Joel (the locust plague causing a famine) to the very last event mentioned in Joel (i.e. the devastation that will result when Christ and His army put down all human opposition).

This verse is not intended to refer to locusts and cankerworms and caterpillars and palmerworms as “God’s army”. That idea is completely wrong. This verse focuses on the first major event and the last major event, with the understanding that everything in between those two extremes is also included in the restoration.

And this promise to “restore” also applies to the destruction that will immediately follow Christ’s return (i.e. the 7 plagues). Specifically, it will also include restoring the damage done by the huge army at the 6th Trumpet (which was discussed in the first ten verses of this chapter).

To be clear, by “My great army” Jesus Christ is referring to the army of spirit beings that comes with Him at His second coming. And those in the first resurrection will actually join that army! That army will be involved in the final destructions that occur before Jesus Christ begins to restore all those things that were damaged.

With this as background, we should be able to see that Joel 2:1-10 is indeed the discussion of a vast human army with artillery and air support and vast numbers of soldiers.

<u>CORRECT TRANSLATIONS OF THESE VERSES:</u>

As far as verse 2 is concerned, no changes are needed.

And I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten, the cankerworm, and the caterpillar, and the palmerworm **and** My great army which I sent among you. (Verse 25)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THESE VERSES:

The first ten verses of Joel 2 are a discussion of the second woe, seen from the perspective of Palestine. The whole comparison to locusts is absurd! The reference to “My great army” in verse 25, on the other hand, is a reference to the holy angels that accompany Jesus Christ at His return. Joel 2:2 and Joel 2:25 are in fact separated by one trumpet, which is blown in verse 15. So where verse 2 applies to Trumpet #6, verse 25 applies to Trumpet #7.

And Joel 2:2 has nothing to do with the reference to locusts in Joel 1:4. Joel 1:4 and Joel 2:2 are also separated by (at least) one trumpet, which is blown in Joel 2:1. The trumpets in Joel need to be identified with the trumpets that are blown in Revelation.

#73 = JOEL 2:8

THE VERSE:

Neither shall one thrust another; they shall walk every one in his path: and *when* they fall upon the sword, **they shall not be wounded**.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

Because the members of this army supposedly cannot be wounded by swords, some people feel this describes locusts, which also cannot be killed with swords. Or perhaps they are immortal?

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

Here we are dealing with another mistranslation. The Hebrew verb here translated as “wounded” is “**batsa**”.

This verb is used 16 times in the Old Testament, and in those 16 occurrences it is translated 12 different ways. It is translated as:

“cut off, gained, given, greedy, covet, covetous, cut, finish, fulfilled, get, performed, and wounded”.

I mention these 12 different ways these 16 occurrences of “batsa” are translated to illustrate that **“wounded” is hardly an appropriate translation for this word**. “Wounded” is in fact the least likely option amongst those 12 different ways “batsa” has been translated.

When this Hebrew verb “batsa” is used with the qal stem, as it is here, its meaning is “**to cut off**” or “**to stop**”. And that is the meaning that is intended here in this verse.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Neither shall one thrust another; they shall walk every one in his path: and *when* they fall upon the sword **they shall not be stopped** (i.e. they shall not be finished).

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

This is describing an incredibly huge human army (Trumpet #6), the likes of which this earth has never seen before. The message of this particular verse is that there is no way that **anything human** can stop that army from reaching its goal.

When they are engaged in combat, many of them will die, certainly. But that army as a whole cannot be stopped by any weapons. No matter how many casualties they suffer, their numbers are so huge (200 million, Revelation 9:16), that they will just keep on advancing. Losses of twenty million men, or even fifty million men, cannot deter them from their goal; the remaining one hundred and fifty million (or however many?) will just keep on coming. **That is the point this verse is making**!

The concept of “wounded” is totally inappropriate here in Joel 2:8. The translators chose “wounded” primarily because in their minds this was supposed to be a reference to locusts. Had they viewed this account as a discussion of a human army, then most likely they would have chosen a different way to translate “batsa” in this verse.

The point to understand is that **“they” as a whole** are not going to be stopped or be finished, even though individual members comprising that greater “they” end up dying in the process. This verse is not focusing on individual members of that huge army, but on that army as an entity. Those individuals who do “fall upon the sword” die, certainly! But “**they**” (i.e. the army) **just keep coming**, with every gap in the ranks being filled by an endless supply of replacements.

#74 = ZECHARIAH 14:19

THE VERSE:

This shall be **the punishment** of Egypt, and **the punishment** of all nations that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This translation creates a focus on punishment. But that focus is not correct.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

This verse contains a mistranslation. The Hebrew word that is twice in this verse translated as “punishment” is “**chattah**”. This is the normal Hebrew word for “**sin**”, being derived from a verb that means “to miss the mark”.

Since this meaning of “chattah” is well-known, we might ask: how did this mistranslation get into our English versions of the Bible. Here is how this happened.

In the Greek language LXX “chattah” is correctly translated as “sin”. The same is true for the Latin Vulgate. Thus it is also correctly rendered as “sin” in John Wycliffe’s Translation (made from the Vulgate). Similarly, it is also correctly translated into German by Martin Luther, and thus in the Dutch language translations that are based on Luther’s German version.

“Chattah” was always translated correctly as “sin” until we come to **the Geneva Bible Translation**. It is the Geneva Bible that introduced the expression “this shall be the **punishment** of Egypt” into this verse.

Following after the Geneva Bible, the **Bishops Bible** rendered this as “this shall be the **plague** of Egypt”. Then came the King James translators. They accepted the wording of the Geneva Bible (i.e. “punishment”), and from there it has found almost universal acceptance in the English language translations.

The driving force behind the Geneva Bible was John Calvin. And this verse is an example of John Calvin’s influence affecting the views of most Protestant religions.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

This shall be **the sin** of Egypt, and **the sin** of all nations that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

John Calvin had a very aggressively punitive view of life; he wanted to see punishments dished out for everything. Calvin himself personally handed out his share of punishments to people who disagreed with him (e.g. imprisoning some men who had laughed in church, putting another man to death for rejecting the trinity teaching, etc.). Our mistranslations reflect Calvin’s view of a stern and harsh God.

The wrong focus created by the mistranslation is on punishing. That wrong focus actually turns this verse into a threat! That focus is: here is the penalty that you can expect if you don’t toe the line.

The focus of the correct translation for this verse is on the right form of conduct before God, by stating that neglect to do certain things is sin. Yes, there are still penalties for transgressions. But the focus is: those nations that don’t keep the Feast **are missing the mark** (literal meaning of “chattah”), without issuing an additional threat in this verse.

This mistranslation is not a major issue. But it illustrates how a slight change here and another slight change there can contribute towards creating a distorted perception of God and His dealings with mankind.

#75 = ZECHARIAH 14:21

THE VERSE:

Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness unto the LORD of hosts: and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them, and seethe therein: and in that day there shall be no more **the Canaanite** in the house of the LORD of hosts. (Zechariah 14:21)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This verse implies that in the past there had been Canaanites in God's house. But that is not true.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

This verse contains a technically correct translation that in fact amounts to a mistranslation. It involves the Hebrew word translated as "Canaanite".

While the Hebrew word "**Kenaani**" does refer to someone who was racially a Canaanite, i.e. a descendent of the man Canaan, its primary meaning from early on in the Old Testament was "**a merchant**, **a trader**".

In Job 41:6 God Himself used this word in speaking to Job, i.e. before the time of Moses. And in this verse the translators rendered it correctly as "**merchants**". And in Proverbs 31:24 the account of the virtuous woman uses this Hebrew word, and there it is also correctly translated as "merchant".

As far as "merchants" being found in the Temple is concerned, we need only consider the sellers of oxen, sheep and doves, and the money changers, who had set up their businesses within the Temple precinct, as recorded in John 2:14-16. That was the incident when Jesus Christ drove all the animals out, and at the same time chased these traders out of the Temple area.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness unto the LORD of hosts: and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them, and seethe therein: and in that day there shall be no more **the merchant** in the house of the LORD of hosts. (Zechariah 14:21)

Comment: The Hebrew word involved here in Zechariah 14:21 is not at all related to the Greek word that is used in Matthew 10:4. See also the section dealing with Matthew 10:4.

#76 = MATTHEW 4:5

THE VERSE:

Then the devil takes Him up into the holy city, and sets Him **on a pinnacle** of the temple ...

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

The implication here is that the Temple had spires or towers or a dome of some kind, like most of the churches of this world. This implication is wrong.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The word “pinnacle” is a mistranslation based on the **Latin Vulgate**. The Temple had a flat roof. There simply were no “pinnacles” on the Temple, as there are on most buildings for religious worship in our world.

The Latin Vulgate text here reads “**pinnaculum**”, and the English translators turned this into the English word “pinnacle”.

What happened on this occasion in Matthew 4 is that Satan took Jesus Christ to a corner of the flat roof of the Temple, in an attempt to get Jesus Christ to commit suicide.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Then the devil takes Him up into the holy city, and sets Him **on a corner of the roof** of the temple ...

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

There were no pinnacles and no spires or towers on the Temple. Those features (pinnacles, spires, etc.) are identifying marks for the false religions and their religious services. Here the translators were influenced by their own religious views in providing the word “pinnacle” in their English translations of this verse.

#77 = MATTHEW 5:44

THE VERSE:

But I say unto you, **love** your enemies, **bless** them that curse you, **do good** to them that hate you, and **pray for** them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

There is no mistranslation here. This is an example of where the correct meaning of a correct translation has been effectively hidden by the correct meanings of words having been almost completely obscured.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The problem is that **the meaning of the word "love"** has been almost totally obscured and distorted. When we say that we "love" playing golf or eating cheese cake or driving a sports car or going on vacation, etc., then we are totally and completely missing the meaning of the word "love".

The Bible tells us that "God is love" (1 John 4:8). For this reason Satan wants to deceive us and confuse us about what love really is. If we don't understand love, then we are also unlikely to understand God. And in this effort to deceive people Satan has succeeded to a very large degree.

The reason why I chose this particular reference to "love" is that **this verse actually defines love** from God's perspective. It spells out the meaning of love.

Love is not a feeling or an emotion. Love is not something that is beyond our control. We have total control over whom we determine to love and whom we decide not to love. The statement "I don't love you any more" really means "**I have decided that I will no longer love you**".

This verse tells us that **love consists of three things**, and none of them are a feeling of some kind. If we were to present an equation for love, it would look as follows:

Love = **say good** + **do good** + **pray for**

The word "bless" literally means "say good words to people".

So: **Love** = **Right** (**words** + **actions** + **attitude**) towards somebody. This obviously can't apply to golf and cheese cake and a sports car, etc. So we cannot really "love" those things.

This definition is what love always means. The correct meaning of love never changes, whether we talk about loving our spouse or children or parents or neighbors or enemies. It always comes back to: say good + do good + pray for, i.e. having the right words + actions + attitude in our dealings with people. And if we do these three things, then we will indeed have "an attitude of outgoing concern for other people".

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

The translation we have is fine.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

This verse presents how Jesus Christ chose to define “love” in the basic teachings, which He presented in “the sermon on the mount”. And it is always within our power to decide whether to love someone or not. The most suitable synonym for “love” is “**commitment**”. And it is always within our own power to decide whom we will love, and whom we will not love. It is never a case of love for someone “somehow happening to us”. Nobody has ever “fallen in love”, because love has nothing to do with “falling”. And likewise, nobody has ever “fallen out of love”.

#78 = MATTHEW 7:11

THIS VERSE:

If you then, being evil, know how to give **good gifts** unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven **give good *things*** to them that ask Him? (Matthew 7:11)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

The implication here is that Christ said that God gives us “**things**” that are good. But that is not what Jesus Christ actually said.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The context for verse 11 starts in verse 7. When we seek help from God in our lives, then we are to “ask ... seek ... knock”. We are to do this boldly and then God will intervene for us. Jesus Christ then mentioned the example of our children asking us for food, requests that we very eagerly fulfill.

That brings us to verse 11.

In this verse Jesus Christ presented a comparison between how we respond to requests from our own children, and how God responds to our requests. Now there is something in this comparison that most people easily overlook.

Jesus Christ said that we human beings give “good gifts” (Greek “domata agatha”) to our children. The Greek noun “doma” means “a gift”, and the Greek adjective “agathos” means “good”. Jesus Christ said that **we give tangible things** to our children, and He was referring to food and to other necessities of life. So Christ used one word for “gifts” and another word for “good”.

However, when Christ spoke about **what God gives to us**, then Christ did not use any word for “things”. So the expression “good things” is supposed to be a translation for the one Greek word “agatha”.

But “good things” is not really a correct translation for the Greek adjective “agatha”. Christ did not use any word for “things”! Christ wasn’t necessarily referring to God the Father giving us anything tangible

at all. Christ simply said that God will grant good to us.

Yes, “granting good” can certainly include God giving us “our daily bread”. But that is not really the primary focus of Christ’s statement here. The primary focus of what Jesus Christ said here is on the **non-tangible good** that God will give to those of His children who ask Him. Christ was not speaking about “things” at all! That is why He didn’t use any noun to go with the word “good”. Christ used the adjective “good” in a stand-alone construction.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

If you then, being evil, know how to give **good gifts** unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven **grant good** to them that ask Him? (Matthew 7:11)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

Jesus Christ was making a much more general statement than talking about tangible “things” that God may give us. When God “grants us good”, then that includes things like **favor** with other people, **protection** in dangerous circumstances, **opportunities** to have certain experiences, giving us true **understanding**, etc.

All of these are good, even though they are not tangible.

Matthew 7:11 is one instance where the translators should not have provided any additional words like “things”.

#79 = MATTHEW 10:4 and MARK 3:18

THESE VERSES:

Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him. (Matthew 10:4)

And Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the *son* of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus, and **Simon the Canaanite**, (Mark 3:18)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

These translations imply that one of the twelve apostles was a Canaanite. But this is false.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

This man was correctly known as “Simon called Zelotes”. This is recorded accurately in Luke 6:15 and in Acts 1:13.

“Zelotes” was not the man’s name. Rather, this word indicates that the man had previously been a member of an extreme religious faction called “Zealots”. They had been started by Judas of Galilee, and, among other things, they refused to pay taxes to the Romans.

Here in Matthew 10:4 and in Mark 3:18 “Canaanite” is a translation of the Greek word “Kananites”, which comes from the Hebrew word “qana”, and its Aramaic equivalent “kanna”. These Hebrew and Aramaic words both mean “zealous”.

Instead of translating the meaning of this Aramaic designation for the followers of Judas of Galilee into Greek, this designation was **simply transliterated** into Greek as “**Kananites**”.

This transliterated designation had no connection whatsoever to the word for the people known as “Canaanites”. This transliteration simply sounds similar to the word “Canaanite”, but it referred to a Jewish sect known as “Zealots”.

When in New Testament Greek the writers wanted to refer to Canaanites, they used a different word. That can be seen in Matthew 15:22.

And, behold, **a woman of Canaan** came out of the same coasts, and cried unto Him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, Son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a demon. (Matthew 15:22)

The Greek word here translated “Canaan” is “Chananaia”, a form of the noun “**Chanaanaios**”. This word has nothing at all to do with the word that means “Zealot”.

Back to Matthew 10:4. When our English translators then came along, they in turn didn’t translate the Aramaic root word into English as “Zealots”, as they should have done. No, in these two verses they also simply transliterated the Greek language designation “Kananite” into English as “Canaanite”. That was a very unfortunate mistranslation.

This designation “Kananites” should really have been translated as “Zealot”, indicating the man’s prior religious affiliation. In our terms, this was like saying: Simon the Baptist, or the Methodist, or the Catholic. But it says nothing about the man’s racial heritage.

<u>A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THESE VERSES:</u>

Simon **the Zealot**, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him. (Matthew 10:4)

And Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the *son* of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus, and Simon **the Zealot**, (Mark 3:18)

<u>THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:</u>

Prior to becoming a disciple of Jesus Christ, this Simon had been a member of an extreme faction of Jews known as “Zealots”, who looked for the coming of the Messiah, and who also rejected Roman taxation. The man was most likely **a Jew from Galilee**, as were all the other apostles.

#80 = MATTHEW 11:30

THE VERSES:

For my yoke *is* **easy**, and my burden is **light**. (Matthew 11:30)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

Even before we examine the Greek text of this verse, the above statement just doesn’t sound right, and it doesn’t make sense. All the other Scriptures that refer to the Christian life tell us the opposite ... that the Christian life will be filled with trials and with difficulties and with persecution. See Scriptures like Matthew 10:36-37, Matthew 16:24, John 15:20, John 16:33, etc.

So what does Matthew 11:30 really mean?

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The mistranslations in this verse are examined in detail in my 2021 short article entitled “My Yoke Is Easy And My Burden Is Light”. See that article for all the supporting evidence. Here I will just provide the correct answers.

There are two mistranslations in our English text.

1) The Greek word “**chrestos**” used here does **not** mean “**easy**”. It means “**good**”.

So the first part of this verse tells us: Jesus Christ’s yoke is good, whereas the world’s yoke is bad. This statement is not a comparison of easy versus difficult, or of heavy versus light. **It is a comparison of value!**

2) The Greek conjunction “**kai**” is here inappropriately translated as “and”. In this context it should really be translated as “**but**”.

3) The Greek adjective “**elaphron**” which is here translated as “light” really means “**driven**”. The above-mentioned article explains this in detail.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

A correct translation looks something like this:

My yoke is **good**, but My burden is **driven**.

What this statement means is:

My yoke is good (compared to the world's yoke, which is bad), but the burden, which My yoke will put on you, is driven towards a very specific goal.

In plain language, Jesus Christ was saying: what I will put on you is good, **but you will have to work hard**, like trying to row your boat in a strong storm. In other words, that yoke will demand our maximum effort. In return, there will be the reward of immortal life in the Family of God.

It is easy to trace the origin of our English mistranslations back to the Latin Vulgate Translation of the New Testament Greek text. See the article for more information.

#81 = MATTHEW 13:35

THE VERSE:

That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret **from the foundation of the world**. (Matthew 13:35)

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:

That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret **from the throwing down of human society**. (Matthew 13:35)

#82 = MATTHEW 21:29, 32

THE VERSES:

He answered and said, I will not: but afterward **he repented**, and went.

For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and you believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and you, when **you** had seen *it*, **repented not** afterward, that you might believe him.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This translation downgrades the correct meaning of repentance. While the differences we will examine may seem to be slight, this is in fact another mistranslation with huge consequences.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

In the New Testament there are two different Greek verbs, with distinctly different meanings, which are both translated into English as “repent”. Only one of those two words means “repent”. Translating them both as “repent” has the effect of hiding the correct meaning of “repent” from most people.

As a result, none of the world’s scholars really understand true repentance. So don’t expect Bible translators and commentators to grasp the difference between the two Greek words involved in this matter; they treat them as synonyms, which is wrong. The two Greek words involved are:

1) **Metanoeo** means **to repent**.

This word literally means: to change the way we think; **to change the way our minds work**. This word is used 34 times in the NT, and it is always translated in the KJV as “repent”. (In the Old Testament the Hebrew word “shuwb” has the same meaning as the Greek word “metanoeo”. “Shuwb” is typically translated as “turn” or as “return”. It involves a change of mind.)

2) **Metamellomai** means **to be sorry, to have regrets**.

This word literally means: **to afterwards take care**, i.e. to regret. This word is used 6 times in the NT, and in the KJV it is also always translated as “repent”. (In the Old Testament the Hebrew word “nacham” has the same meaning as the Greek word “metamellomai”. “Nacham” means “to be sorry, to have regrets”, and it is consistently mistranslated as “repent”.)

Here is the distinction in the meanings of these two Greek verbs:

A godly repentance (i.e. “**metanoeo**”) involves changing the way we think, and as a consequence to that changed way of thinking our wrong conduct also changes (we stop doing things we understand are wrong, and start doing those things we understand are right). The motivation underlying that changed way of thinking is the realization that we have sinned against God, that we are therefore guilty and in need of forgiveness from God.

Our changed way of thinking and, where required, changed way of behaving does not earn us anything, but it is nevertheless a prerequisite for receiving undeserved forgiveness for “sins that are past” (Romans 3:25). A godly repentance involves seeing our relationship to God in the correct perspective.

The sorrow in godly repentance concerns our realization that we have sinned against God and are therefore responsible for the death of Jesus Christ.

A worldly repentance (i.e. "**metamellomai**") involves changing some of our actions. The focus is on the things we do or have done. The sorrow in worldly repentance is typically focused on self! People are sorry because they are now suffering a penalty which they don't like. Typically they are not sorry because the things they did are wrong, or because those things were hurtful to other people.

There is no change at all in the way the mind works and thinks. The view of self is largely unaffected by a worldly repentance. And it should not really be called "repentance".

This word "metamellomai" really describes an emotion that **everybody** experiences at various times: we are sorry for something we did, or sorry for the way the things we did turned out, i.e. we have some regrets. This is independent of our relationship to God.

Unrepentant people also experience this emotion expressed by "metamellomai", and "metamellomai" is never evidence of real repentance. At the other extreme, people who make a point of actively suppressing all feelings of "metamellomai" in their lives are in a really, really bad shape! They are searing their conscience, and they are getting as close as is humanly possible to Satan's mindset.

To put it another way:

"**Metamellomai**" is an emotional response to certain situations. It is typically the result of feelings of guilt or remorse. It is expressed by the words "I am sorry". The emotions are the key, and the thinking mind takes a backseat in this process. This process does not necessarily affect the person's future actions and conduct, because there is no committed setting of the mind to in future carefully avoid doing whatever we are sorry about right now. It may have a positive effect on future conduct, but there is no real commitment in this regard.

"**Metanoeo**", on the other hand, is a consciously thought-out mental response to actions and to attitudes we have come to see are wrong before God. The mind comes first in this process, and the emotions take second place. Real repentance must always be driven by the mind, not by the emotions. The mind makes a commitment to in future avoid the wrong actions and attitudes. The mind is guided in this process by a desire to please God in all we do.

Real repentance ("metanoeo") certainly includes being sorry for certain things (i.e. "metamellomai"), but being sorry ("metamellomai") by itself is on a far lower level than real repentance ("metanoeo").

However, here is the point we need to realize:

Without God's spirit people cannot see or understand the difference between "metanoeo" and "metamellomai"!

And people can't understand that when there are no wrong actions committed, but there is already a wrong attitude present, then **already** there is a need for real repentance. With worldly repentance the focus is on wrong actions and conduct; with godly repentance the focus is on wrong attitudes, totally independent of whether or not wrong actions are also involved.

Because they can't understand this distinction between these two concepts, expressed by these two Greek verbs, that is why translators simply translate both these words into English as "repent". In this regard 1 Corinthians 2:11 is the deciding factor: unrepentant people cannot really understand what real repentance is.

The thing that "metanoeo" and "metamellomai" have in common is that they both represent steps in the same right direction. "Metamellomai" represents **a small step** in the right direction, and "metanoeo" represents **a very big step** in that same right direction.

For the people who really "repent" ("metanoeo"), having regrets and being sorry for certain things ("metamellomai") is often a first step that precedes or goes hand-in-hand with their actual repentance ("metanoeo"). It is not that "metamellomai" is somehow wrong or bad, not at all. "Metamellomai" expresses a **good** step in the right direction; it is just that we need to understand that "metamellomai" on its own still falls far short of real repentance.

[COMMENT: To keep things simple, I have not introduced the Greek noun for "repentance"; I have simply continued to use the Greek verb "metanoeo" in its place.]

Can you imagine the magnitude of the problems that were created when, in the course of centuries, the men who were responsible for baptizing new members into the Church of God themselves didn't grasp the great distinction between "metanoeo" and "metamellomai"?

As a result, very many people were baptized because they exhibited "metamellomai", but at no stage did they ever experience "metanoeo". This has always been a problem for the Church of God. This is the reason why "tares" manage to come into the Church. This is the reason why Jude wrote that "there are certain men crept in (i.e. into the body of the Church) unawares" (Jude 1:4). In many cases people have come into the Church because they demonstrated "metamellomai". That is fine as a start, but it is never enough. Without "metanoeo" nobody can ever become a true member of God's Church. Without "metanoeo" nobody will ever receive God's holy spirit.

The 6 places (in 5 verses) where "metamellomai" has been incorrectly translated as "repent" are: Matthew 21:29, 32; Matthew 27:3; 2 Corinthians 7:8 (2 times); Hebrews 7:21. Here we are examining the first two occurrences. The other occurrences are discussed in their proper locations.

<u>A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THESE VERSES:</u>

He answered and said, I will not: but afterward **he was sorry** and went. (verse 29)

For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and you believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and you, when you had seen *it*, **were not sorry** afterwards, that you might believe him. (verse 32)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THESE VERSES:

In this parable Jesus Christ was not speaking about real repentance at all. He was not speaking about that giant step of real repentance, which we must take in order to establish a right relationship with God.

Jesus Christ was simply using **ordinary everyday regret**, or being sorry for having made a mistake, to illustrate the hardness of heart of the Pharisees. They weren't even prepared to take the smallest of steps in the right direction, the step of at least acknowledging that they had been wrong, the step of showing some regret. That is what this parable was designed to illustrate.

We should never confuse remorse and regret with real repentance. Those emotions are fine, and they are great attributes, and they represent a small step in the right direction. But real repentance requires a lot more than some remorse or regret. Amongst other things real repentance requires commitment.

#83 = MATTHEW 24:45 (also LUKE 12:42)

THE VERSE:

Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord **has made ruler over His household**, to give them meat in due season?

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This sounds like a logical translation, indicating that this verse is speaking about a ruler over a household. But that is not exactly the case.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

Here we are dealing with **two mistranslations** in this one verse.

Let's start with some basic New Testament Greek.

1) The Greek words for "**house**" are "**oikos**" and "**oikia**".

2) The Greek word for "**household**" is "**oikiakos**".

3) The Greek word for **a steward** (manager) **of a household** is "**oikonomos**".

Thus for example, the Greek word for “household” in Matthew 10:25, 36 is “**oikiakos**”, and the context of those two verses makes clear that there it is really speaking about “a household”. Those verses also show that Matthew himself was well aware of the correct Greek word for “household”.

I mention these things because **none of the above Greek words are used** in Matthew 24:45.

So the first thing we should note is that this is **not** speaking about “a household”! Secondly, **there is no word for “ruler”** in the Greek text. So this verse is also not necessarily speaking about anyone who is “a ruler”, though that possibility is also not excluded. But the Greek word for “a ruler over a household” is not used in this verse.

Now here are two key Greek words which **are** used in this verse.

1) The Greek word translated as “**household**” is “**therapeia**”. This word means “**service**”, commonly in connection with healing and well-being. It is the source of our English word “therapeutic”. This word is discussed at length in the section that deals with Revelation 22:2, where “therapeia” is also used. This word most assuredly does **not** mean “**household**”.

2) The three English words “**has made ruler**” are a translation of the one Greek **verb** “**kathistemi**”. This Greek verb means “**to appoint**, **to set**, **to place**”, etc. While this verb may refer to “ruling”, it does not really require the word “ruler” to be used in its translation.

This verb “kathistemi” is translated as”’**ordain**” in Titus 1:5, Hebrews 5:1 and in Hebrews 8:3. It is translated simply as “**make**” in Hebrews 7:28 and in 2 Peter 1:8. It is translated simply as “**is**” in James 4:4 (“... friend of the world **is** the enemy of God”). As already mentioned, the translation of this verb does not require the noun “ruler” to be used.

The translators were trying to make sense out of the Greek text, and the translation they provided is primarily an expression of how they **interpreted** this verse, i.e. how they tried to find a possible meaning. But that is not the same as providing an accurate and faithful translation of the Greek text.

We should note that **the only reason** various dictionaries of biblical Greek state that “household” is supposedly one of the meanings of the word “therapeia” is because it is used in Matthew 24:45 and in the parallel verse in Luke 12:42. Without the word “therapeia” in these two verses nobody would ever have suggested that “therapeia” supposedly means “household”, since all Greek scholars know that “oikiakos” is the correct Greek word for “household”.

The above comments regarding “kathistemi” also apply to verse 47; and all of the above comments also apply to the parallel verses in Luke 12:42, 44.

<u>A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:</u>

Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord **has appointed over His service**, to give them meat in due season?

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

There is obviously a big difference between the expression “has made ruler over His household” and the expression “has appointed over His service”. The expression “has made ruler over” implies **authority** and **power**. On the other hand, the expression “has appointed over” focuses on **responsibility** rather than on authority.

It is not that this particular servant is given authority over “therapeia”. It is really a matter of this particular servant being appointed **to faithfully present the truth about all teachings to God’s people**. “The Lord” in this verse is conferring responsibility rather than power to this servant.

The “service” is focused on God; it is “**His** service”. And the servant here has no power or authority over God’s teachings; but he does have a responsibility to present them correctly, and to make the truth clear for God’s people.

Now one of “God’s teachings” deals with divine healing, and teaching the truth about divine healing is certainly included in this regard. The word “therapeia” is a general term that applies to all “beneficial services”. Healing is one specific form of service, but the word “therapeia” refers to much more than just healing.

Consider our English word “therapeutic”.

When something is described as “therapeutic”, it implies that the thing so described has a beneficial effect in dealing with some or other health problem. That might include things like certain foods that have been shown to have certain health benefits. Or it might refer to certain activities like exercise. It might even refer to certain ways we use our minds, like avoiding negative feelings and emotions. It might also refer to certain nutritional supplements. All these things might be considered to be beneficial for people who are experiencing certain health problems.

But here is the point:

Simply because certain foods or certain exercises are beneficial for people with certain health issues, that doesn’t mean that **people who are healthy** and who don’t have any health issues somehow cannot eat those foods with “therapeutic benefits”, or engage in specific exercises that promote healing for specific health problems.

When you eat something or do something that has therapeutic benefits, it doesn’t mean that you are sick or injured. Even people in perfect health can enjoy things that are known to have therapeutic benefits ... they just happen to like the foods that have therapeutic effects on our health; and they like to do the exercises that promote healing after certain injuries.

In considering this Greek word “therapeia” people sometimes confuse the word “therapeutic” with the word “medicine”. A medicine is also something that is supposed to affect a person’s well-being. In other words, a medicine is supposed to have a therapeutic effect. But here is the distinction:

A medicine is only taken by people who are sick, or who already have some underlying health issues. People who are not sick in any way should not take any medicines. So when someone does take a medicine this implies that the person has some kind of health issue.

Medicines do not have a preventative function when there are no immediate or underlying health issues present. The sole function of medicines is to deal with specific health problems, or to prevent already-present symptoms from developing into full-blown health problems. People who don’t have any kind of pain don’t take pain killer medicines to prevent experiencing pain in the future.

In simple terms: medicines are **only for people who have some health issues**.

But things that are “**therapeutic**” are not at all restricted to people who are sick in some way, or who may have existing pre-conditions for certain illnesses. In most cases we can replace the word “therapeutic” with the word “**beneficial**”. Food items and physical activities that are beneficial for our health and well-being are not only for people who are sick. People who are in perfect health can freely eat such foods and engage in such physical activities, without implying that they have some kind of health problem.

So when people take medicines, then we can assume that they have some or other health problem. But when people eat foods that have therapeutic benefits, then we cannot make such an assumption. People who eat foods with therapeutic benefits may do so because they have certain health problems. But they equally well may not have any health problems at all. Such foods also provide benefits for people who are in good health.

I mention these things so that we in our minds don’t restrict the Greek word “therapeia” to the matter of only dealing with health problems. The word “service” expresses the meaning of “therapeia” more appropriately than just focusing on “healing”, though healing is certainly one very significant part of “God’s service”.

Now a correct translation of this verse didn’t make any sense to the translators. After all, what is the expression “appointed over His service” supposed to mean?

The difficulty in understanding this text lies at the root of our wrong translations.

The context of these verses refers to the end time, shortly before the second coming of Christ. That timing is made clear by the evil servant’s attitude of “my Lord delays His coming”. In that time context Jesus Christ spoke about **two** distinct servants, and implied is that they are in similar positions or

situations of authority. The first one is “faithful and wise”, while the second one is “evil”. That is the sequence Jesus Christ presented.

It means that both of these servants had been, or will be, “appointed over God’s service”. When it says that these two servants are to “give them meat in due season”, this means that these two servants are supposed to **provide right teaching** (i.e. spiritual meat) for God’s people, rather than this referring to them providing physical food for someone. And “therapeia” ties into this responsibility in a very significant way.

The expression “appointed over His service” I take to mean that these two servants had (or have, or will have?) a certain amount of control over teaching “all the truths of God”. The “meat in due season” that these servants are to provide for God’s people involves teaching all the true doctrines, including, but not limited to, **the truth about divine healing**.

These verses (Matthew 24:41-51) are really an introduction for the parable about “the ten virgins” in Matthew 25. And even as in this introduction there are two servants (a wise and faithful one, and an evil servant), so in this parable these ten virgins fall into two equal groups (five are wise, and five are foolish).

Putting these things together, it seems likely that “the five wise virgins” are the recipients of the spiritual food provided by the “faithful and wise servant”; and “the five foolish virgins” are the recipients of the spiritual food provided by the “evil servant”.

#84 = MATTHEW 25:16

THE VERSE:

Then he that had received the five talents went and **traded** (Greek = ergazomai) with the same, and **made** (*them)* other five talents. (Matthew 25:16)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

The word “traded” implies that this servant engaged in a very specific activity ... trading. Now while in this present age trading is certainly an acceptable form of making a living, it is in practice not a particularly productive activity. It is really the activity of a middleman. Commonly a trader used to make a profit in selling something in one location, that other people in a different location had produced. The trader simply transported goods from the producer/seller to the buyer in another location, and sold them at a profit to the buyer.

I mention this because in the Book of Ezekiel God tells us that **Satan invented trading** (see Ezekiel 28:16), and in verse 18 God speaks about “the iniquity of your (Satan’s) trading”. It seems to me that these statements in Ezekiel 28 express God’s feelings about the subject of trading.

One consideration with “trading” is that **there is always an element of risk in trading**, something that is

also true for certain other occupations. Trading may at times lead to losses, and in trading there are both winners and losers. The good traders are the winners, and the bad traders are the losers.

The way Matthew 25:16 is presented to us, it makes it look like God **expected** these servants to engage in “trading”. But that is not the case at all.

My concern with this translation is that I don’t think that Jesus Christ would have wanted His servant to use those five talents (a very large amount of wealth) in any activity that included **the possibility of huge losses**.

Trading never guarantees a profit. The potential for losses is always present in trading. And I don’t think God would recommend trading as a first choice activity for His servants, ahead of actually producing something tangible through hard work.

In other words, telling us that God’s servant went and “traded” just looks a little suspicious to me. So this verse merits closer examination.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

As it turns out, the Greek verb here translated as “traded” (Greek “ergazomai”) doesn’t mean traded at all.

As far as “trading” is concerned, we find the following Greek words in the New Testament:

1) “**Emporeuomai**” is the verb that means “**to trade**”. In James 4:13 this verb is translated as “buy and sell”.

2) “**Emporos**” is the noun that means “**trader**”. In Revelation 18:3 this noun is translated as “merchants”.

3) “**Emporia**” is the noun that refers to **the goods** that are traded. In Matthew 22:5 this noun is translated as “merchandise”.

4) “**Emporion**” is the noun that refers to **the place** where the trading takes place, like a market place. In John 2:16 this noun, together with the word for “house”, is translated as “a house of merchandise”. This word has come down to us via the Latin language as “Emporium”.

The point is that New Testament Greek had words that specifically meant trading, and all the things associated with trading. And all the writers of the New Testament were aware of these Greek words. They are common words. But none of these words were used by Jesus Christ in this parable.

Rather, Jesus Christ used the word “ergazomai”. This verb means “**to work**, **to produce**, **to labor**”. That is not the same as trading. Trading does not produce anything new, whereas working and laboring produces growth and development.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Then he that had received the five talents went and **worked** with the same, and **produced** five more talents.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

The servants who had received the talents (and the same applies to the parable of the pounds in Luke 19:12-27) were expected **to work** with that money, using it **to produce** goods of value. And that’s what the good servants did; they worked hard, and they did produce new value.

And that also applies to the problem with the servant who buried his master’s talent, supposedly for safekeeping. That servant was simply **not prepared to work** with what had been entrusted to him. He was lazy (see Matthew 25:26). He did not do any work at all. He didn’t do anything that could be called “productive”.

#85 = MATTHEW 25:34

THE VERSE:

Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, you blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you **from the foundation of the world**: (Matthew 25:34)

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:

Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, you blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you **from the throwing down of human society**: (Matthew 25:34)

#86 = MATTHEW 27:3

THE VERSE:

Then Judas, who had betrayed Him, when he saw that He was condemned, **repented himself**, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders,

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This translation almost sounds like Judas repented. But that is not the case.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The Greek word here translated as “repented himself” is “metamellomai”. It does not mean “repent”; it only means “to regret” or “to be sorry”, which is not what “repent” means.

For a detailed discussion of the meaning of “metamellomai” please see the section dealing with Matthew 21:29.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Then Judas, who had betrayed Him, when he saw that He was condemned, **regretted what he had done**, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders,

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

Once Jesus Christ had been condemned to death, Judas regretted what he had done. His was not a true repentance but a worldly sorrow or regret, which focused on Judas himself. This self-centered focus is proved by Judas then committing suicide, the ultimate expression of not being willing to face up to one’s problems.

#87 = MATTHEW 28:1

THE VERSE:

In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first *day* of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This translation is used to support a Sunday morning resurrection scenario. But that is not correct.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

There are a number of problems with this translation. First some general comments.

As far as the events surrounding the resurrection are concerned, the different gospel accounts approach this from different perspectives. They record some things that are also recorded by other writers, and in some cases they record things not mentioned by other writers. They also don't always point out how much time had passed before the next event which they record actually took place. In some cases one or more days elapse between consecutive statements in their accounts. This is not always immediately apparent.

Here is something that may perhaps be hard for some people to understand:

The Bible records the words of God. It also records the words of very many human beings. It even records some of the words of Satan. It also records **descriptions of events** and situations based on the personal human perceptions of the people providing those descriptions. And it also records the words which God inspired some of His servants to say to the people of Israel. It also records certain judgments that God inspired some of His servants to make.

The point is that the Bible presents the words of God, and it also presents statements that are clearly inspired by God. But **the Bible also includes many things that were not specifically inspired by God**. Things that were not inspired by God include the words of Satan and the words of many human beings. And things that were not specifically inspired by God also include **the descriptions of events** that took place during biblical times.

Now obviously, the writers who present various descriptions of events that took place did their very best to be as accurate as possible. Their descriptions represent how they themselves understood the events they describe. But **their descriptions are not "inspired by God"**. Their descriptions only represent how they themselves understood those events. And obviously, their descriptions will be more accurate if they themselves were eyewitnesses to the things they describe, than when they record the things they themselves had not witnessed personally.

Now simply because their descriptions are not divinely inspired, this does not mean that those descriptions could not be 100% correct. They could be perfectly correct. But their descriptions could also contain minor discrepancies regarding what actually took place. Their descriptions could contain some details that are technically speaking not correct.

In my 2007 article "Understanding the Gospel of Luke" I list over 70 examples where Luke's descriptions are technically speaking not in agreement with the other gospel accounts.

Here's one example from that article. In Matthew 8:5-6 **a centurion came personally** to Jesus Christ to ask Christ to heal his sick servant. That same account is recorded by Luke in Luke 7:2-3. But Luke's account states that **the centurion himself did not come** to Jesus Christ. Rather, Luke states that the centurion sent "the elders of the Jews" to Jesus Christ to present this request for healing the sick servant.

Now both descriptions can't be right. Matthew was an eyewitness of that event, and Luke was not an eyewitness of that event. So Matthew's version is correct, and Luke's version contains a technical error in the description of this event. But that technical error is really inconsequential, as far as the lesson we

are to learn from this incident is concerned.

We need to understand that God has allowed such technical discrepancies amongst different accounts in the Bible.

As far as the timing of events is concerned, here is another example:

Matthew 26:26-28 states that at His last Passover observance Jesus Christ **first** presented **the bread**, and secondly the wine. But Luke 22:17-19 states that Jesus Christ **first** presented **the wine**, and secondly the bread. Again, Matthew was present at that Passover, and Luke was not present. So Matthew's version is correct, and Luke's version contains a technical error in the description of that particular Passover.

The point is that God has allowed such discrepancies in the descriptions of certain events to be recorded. They don't really change anything overall, and God has also given us sufficient information to figure out such discrepancies. They are simply not a big deal.

The Book of Revelation presents another example of this approach. Revelation 1:2 tells us that John recorded three different things in this book:

1) the words of God the Father,

2) the words of Jesus Christ,

3) **John's own descriptions** of all the things he saw.

These three things are not all on the same level of "inspiration".

In Revelation 1:19 Jesus Christ instructed John to "write all the things which you have seen". So all the descriptions we have in the Book of Revelation represent how John himself personally saw those things. Specifically, God did not say: "write, thus says the LORD". John was to use his own words in describing the things he would see. And he did. A different servant of God might have described things slightly differently here or there. And that would also have been acceptable to Jesus Christ.

The point we need to understand is that the descriptions of events are not as important to God as are the things we are to do, and the things we are not to do, and how we are to conduct our lives. So **God Himself presents the things we are to do and not do**, and providing the description of events God has largely left to some of His servants to provide in their own words.

In so doing God made allowance for certain technical points in descriptions to not always be presented 100% technically correct. **That's inevitable** when God delegates the responsibility to describe events to human beings, because human beings always only have limited understanding. The only way to avoid

that possibility would be for God to inspire every single word into the minds of those servants who wrote the books of the Bible. But that would have turned those servants into mere robots, who were not allowed to use their own minds. And God chose not to use that approach.

God brought all the animals to Adam, so that Adam would give them names (Genesis 2:19-20). Now did Adam give all the animals the same names that God would have given them? Probably not. But that doesn't make a difference. And God wanted Adam to begin using his own mind. So God delegated the responsibility to name all the animals to Adam.

Now amongst the people of God there are some arguments about what God tells us to do, and what we are not to do. But there are far more disagreements about **the descriptions of certain events**. Can we now understand why that is the case? We argue about things which God delegated to some of His servants to provide (descriptions), and we then draw different conclusions from how we evaluate those descriptions.

Matthew 28:1 is an example of such a descriptive statement.

Matthew 28:1 is not an inspired statement; it is simply an expression of how Matthew personally understood that specific event, based on the information that was available to him. That doesn't somehow make it incorrect. But it is just not "inspired".

I have mentioned these things here, not because they affect the mistranslations in this verse, which they don't. I have mentioned these things because people compare this verse to similar statements in the other three gospel accounts, and then sometimes reach some wrong conclusions in their attempts to reconstruct a time-line for the events of the crucifixion week.

Now let's consider a point which does affect Matthew 28:1.

The concept of **a seven-day week** was well-established in Jewish culture and thinking. Back in the days of Moses Hebrew already had a distinct word for "week" (i.e. "shabuwa"). In fact, this Hebrew word for "week" is not even related to the Hebrew word for "Sabbath" (i.e. "shabbath"), though to us English speakers those Hebrew words may sound similar. In Hebrew the word for "week" is derived from the word for "seven", but the word for "Sabbath" has no connection at all to the word for "seven". Rather, the Hebrew word "shabbath" comes from a verb that means "to stop doing something". In Hebrew the meaning of "Sabbath" has nothing at all to do with "seven".

By contrast, the seven-day week is a concept with which neither the Greeks nor the Romans were familiar. Consequently even 1500 years after Moses (i.e. in NT times) Greek and Latin still did not have a word for expressing the idea of a 7-day week. This lack of a Greek word for "week" placed a constraint on the NT writers, who used the Greek language. How could they convey the idea of a repeating cycle of seven days in a language that had no previous experience of the 7-day week? At the same time those writers had to convey the idea of **a specific day** (i.e. the Sabbath) also being repeated in a consistent and uninterrupted pattern.

The lack of Greek and Roman familiarity with a 7-day week becomes apparent from the following things:

1) In the New Testament there are 9 references to “week/s”. They are: Matthew 28:1; Mark 16:2, 9; Luke 18:12; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7; and 1 Corinthians 16:2.

2) In all 9 places the Greek NT text has the word “sabbaton”.

3) In all 9 places the Latin Vulgate has the Latin word “sabbatum, sabbati”.

4) Where the Hebrew word for “week” (i.e. “shabuwa”) is used in the OT, the Greek language **LXX** typically translates this as “**hebdoma**”, a word that literally means “**seventh**”.

5) The modern Latin word for “week” is **hebdomas**”, and it is clearly taken over from the Greek word that is used in the LXX. But this word “hebdomas” is **never used in the Latin Vulgate**. Why not? It is not used in the Vulgate because this word wasn’t yet a part of the Latin language when Jerome wrote the Vulgate.

6) It was the Roman Emperor Constantine who eventually established the 7-day week in the Roman world. This Constantine did in 321 A.D. Before that time the 7-day week was not a part of Roman life.

Here is what the above information tells us:

1) While in Hebrew the word for “week” (“shabuwa”) had already been around for over 1500 years, at the time of the New Testament **neither Greek nor Latin** yet had a distinct word for the concept of a 7-day week.

where Pontius Pilate had set a watch over the tomb, **two Sabbaths had almost passed**. This means that **the Thursday** was the first of those two Sabbaths (i.e. it was the First Holy Day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread), and **the Saturday** was the second of those two Sabbaths.

There is no other possible meaning for the expression “towards the end of the Sabbaths”. One day was an annual Sabbath (the Thursday), and the other day was a weekly Sabbath (Saturday). And between those two Sabbaths was one regular weekday (Friday).

The Greek text does not allow for any other explanation.

Now “late in the period specified” (the meaning of “opse” with the genitive) means that this could **only be late on Saturday afternoon**, very shortly before sunset. That is the exact time identified by the first three Greek words in this verse. It could **not** possibly have been “**very early Sunday morning**”. Sunday

morning would have been **after** that specific period, **not** "**late in**" that specific period of two Sabbaths. Do you follow?

6) The Greek "epiphoskouse" is a form of the verb "epiphosko". This verb is only used twice in the NT, the other place being Luke 23:54, where it is translated as "drew on" in the expression "and the Sabbath drew on". There the meaning is that the Sabbath was "**approaching**", i.e. it was Friday afternoon just before sunset.

This Greek verb has the same meaning here in Matthew 28:1, that the first of (seven) weeks "**was approaching**". But that first of weeks hadn't yet started. Once the first of (seven) weeks "has started", then the word "**approaching**" **loses its meaning**.

7) Next, the Greek expression "eis mian sabbaton" means "into the first of weeks", a reference to **the first of seven weeks**. Of interest is the Greek preposition "eis", which denotes two things. First of all "eis" denotes "movement towards an object". But "eis" also implies that the object towards which "eis" is moving **has not yet been reached**!

A week starts with sunset at the end of the Sabbath. So this Greek expression also means that **this was just before sunset** at the end of the weekly Sabbath. At that sunset the first of seven weeks started, and therefore **shortly before that sunset** the first of those seven weeks was still "approaching". It was Saturday afternoon very shortly before sunset.

We are dealing with the plural "weeks" and not the singular "week". This plural "weeks" tells us that the Sunday, which would start a few minutes later at sunset, was going to be **the start of counting seven weeks** towards Pentecost, as per Deuteronomy 16:9. [Comment: Deuteronomy 16:9 counts weeks, while Leviticus 23:15 counts Sabbath Days. The discussion in Matthew 28:1 is based on Deuteronomy 16:9, and not on Leviticus 23:15.]

8) We should also note that Matthew 28:1 **does not contain the word for "day"**. The focus is **not** on "the **first day** of weeks". The correct focus is on "the first of weeks".

9) So the whole Greek text we looked at above for the first part of this verse literally means:

and towards the end of the Sabbaths, as the first of weeks was approaching (but it had not yet been reached).

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

"And **towards the end of the Sabbaths**, as the first of weeks was approaching, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher."

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

In this verse Matthew is telling us about something that took place after **two** Sabbaths had almost passed. The time was **shortly before sunset** on a Saturday evening. The two Marys left their lodgings a few minutes before sunset and then arrived at the sepulcher quite possibly a few minutes after sunset.

When they left their lodgings the time was moving **towards** the first of the (seven) weeks, and by the time they reached the sepulcher the sun was either setting or had perhaps just set, and the first of the (seven) weeks towards Pentecost was starting.

Keep in mind that here Matthew is recording something he himself had not witnessed. He is recording what one of the women had told them (all the apostles).

Regarding the timing presented in this verse:

“The first of (seven) weeks” started with “the first **day** of the first of those seven weeks”, i.e. a Sunday. And that Sunday started Saturday evening at sunset.

In Jewish society at that time **it was more significant** to identify that particular Day 1 of the week with the fact that it started **the countdown of seven weeks** towards Pentecost, **than it was to identify that day as the first day of a week**.

The first day of the week you have every week, but the day that starts the countdown of seven weeks for Pentecost you only have once a year.

So Matthew did not use the word “day” at all in Matthew 28:1.

Matthew was identifying the time when the women first went to the sepulcher with **the very start of the countdown** of seven weeks for Pentecost. In practice that countdown **always starts** with the sunset on a Saturday evening. That countdown always starts with the first day of a week.

Needless to say, the translators of the Gospel of Matthew didn’t understand this focus in verse 1. And that is why they added the word “day” in their translations. But the word “day” should not be in the text, because Matthew wasn’t speaking about “days”; he was speaking about “weeks”.

According to Matthew’s account here the purpose of the women’s visit to the sepulcher on this Saturday evening would not have been to embalm the body, but merely “to see the sepulcher”, i.e. to familiarize themselves with the exact location. In this account they didn’t bring all the items for embalming with them.

Rather, having correctly identified the exact place, they would have intended to return the next morning around sunrise to then do the embalming.

This is different from Mark's account, which presents a scene around sunrise on Sunday morning, when the women came with embalming spices. See also the section dealing with Mark 16:2.

#88 = MATTHEW 28:19-20

THE VERSES:

Go you therefore, and teach all nations, **baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy spirit: Teaching them to observe** all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, *even* unto the end of the world. Amen. (Matthew 28:19-20)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

These verses are the one and only endorsement for the trinitarian baptism formula. They are also one of the main supports for the trinity-teaching of the world's religions.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

These two verses were altered at some point in the Middle Ages. All of the words above in **the bolded text** are not a part of the Gospel of Matthew. Those words must be deleted.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THESE VERSES:

The correct text for verses 19-20 should read:

Go you therefore, and teach all nations all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, *even* unto the end of the age. Amen. (Matthew 28:19-20)

The mistranslation in these verses is explained in great detail in my July 2015 110-page article titled "Our Trinitarian Baptism Formula". See that article for more information.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

Without this fraudulent addition to the Greek text of Matthew 28 there is **no biblical authority** or example **for the trinitarian baptism formula,** which God's Church in our age has always used. Every other reference to baptism only mentions "in the name of Jesus Christ".

#89 = MARK 12:29

THE VERSE:

And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments *is*, **Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is**

one Lord: (Mark 12:29)

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

This is supposed to be a quotation from Deuteronomy 6:4. And it is a mistranslation of the Greek text, in the same way that Deuteronomy 6:4 has been mistranslated.

Mark 12:29 is thoroughly examined in my 2009 30-page article titled "**Deuteronomy 6:4 and Mark 12:29 Explained**". See that article for more details.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments *is*: **O Israel, obey the Lord our God, who only is Lord**. (Mark 12:29)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

Jesus Christ was in effect telling this scribe, a scholar of the sect of the Pharisees, that in Old Testament times He, Jesus Christ, was the God whom Israel had been commanded to obey.

See also the section that deals with Deuteronomy 6:4.

#90 = MARK 16:2

THE VERSE:

And very early in the morning **the first *day* of the week**, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun. (Mark 16:2)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This verse contains a mistranslation.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

Mark 16:2 ties in with Matthew 28:1. Matthew 28:1 describes a visit on Saturday late afternoon just before sunset, for the purpose of identifying the correct location of the tomb, so that they could then do the embalming early the next morning.

Mark 16:2 describes a later visit on Sunday morning around sunrise, coming with the spices to do the actual embalming. Mark 16:2 presents a later time than Matthew 28:1. Both Matthew and Mark wrote their respective accounts based on what other people had told them, since neither Matthew nor Mark

had personally witnessed the events at the tomb. So there may be some differences in their respective accounts.

Coming to the Greek text of this verse:

The Greek text for the English expression "**early in the morning**" is the one word "**proi**". This Greek word means "early". Our translation **implies** that "early" means "early in the morning", but that isn't stated. This Greek word just means "early", and that it how it is translated in places like Mark 16:9 and in John 20:1. So the words "**in the morning**" should correctly be deleted from this verse, though they can be implied by the reference to "at the rising of the sun".

Next, the Greek text here mistranslated as "the first day of the week" is "**tes mias sabbaton**". Again, here "sabbaton" is the genitive plural, and this expression really means "the first of (seven) weeks", in accordance with the counting presented in Deuteronomy 16:9.

Now theoretically "tes mias sabbaton" can mean either "the first of weeks" or "the first of Sabbaths". But both options must be plural. However, since this refers to a Sunday morning around sunrise, it cannot mean "the first of Sabbaths". It is no longer a Sabbath day. Therefore the only possible meaning of "tes mias sabbaton" in this specific context is "**the first of weeks**". As also in Matthew 28:1, this expression refers the start of counting seven weeks towards Pentecost.

And as in Matthew 28:1, the Greek text here also does **not** contain a word for "**day**". So likewise the focus of this statement here is not on "days".

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

And very early **the first of weeks**, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun. (Mark 16:2)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

In practice this also refers to a Sunday morning at around sunrise. But the above translation is an accurate representation of the Greek text. The focus is on this being the start of counting towards Pentecost. Many of the comments in the section dealing with Matthew 28:1 also apply in this context.

Here in Mark 16:2 the women did not come to "see" the place. Here they came to do the actual embalming. It was now close to sunrise on Sunday morning.

Keep in mind that both Matthew and Mark only recorded things that other people had told them. They had no firsthand knowledge of these events. Here I have focused on translating this verse correctly. Reconciling some of the differences between the different gospel accounts in regard to Jesus Christ's resurrection is not the subject of this section.

- - -

This concludes Part 4 in this series of 7 articles. Part 5 starts with mistranslations in the Book of Luke.

Frank W. Nelte