

What Saith The Scriptures?

by
R.K. Phillips

Table of Contents

1. WHAT SAITH THE SCRIPTURES?	1
1.1. FACT 1	3
1.2. FACT 2	3
1.3. FACT 3	4
1.4. FACT 4	5
1.5. FACT 5	6
1.6. FACT 6	6
1.7. FACT 7	7
1.7.1. <i>John 3:3</i>	7
1.7.2. <i>1John 3:9</i>	8
1.7.3. <i>1Cor 4:1,5 and Philemon 10</i>	9
1.8. FACT 8	10
1.9. FACT 9	10
1.10. FACT 10	11
1.11. FACT 11	13
1.12. FACT 12	14
1.13. FACT 13	15
1.14. FACT 14	16
1.15. FACT 15	17
1.16. FACT 16	18
1.17. FACT 17	19
1.18. FACT 18	19
1.19. FACT 19	20
1.19.1. <i>The Anointed People</i>	20
1.19.2. <i>Xristo – “christ”</i>	22
1.20. ADDITIONAL NOTES	24
1.20.1. <i>Mark 16:15</i>	25
1.20.2. <i>2Cor 5:17</i>	27
1.20.3. <i>Acts 8:27</i>	27
1.20.4. <i>Acts 10:1</i>	27
1.20.5. <i>National Baptism</i>	28
1.20.6. <i>The Samaritans, Acts 8:14</i>	29
1.21. CONCLUSION	29

1. What Saith The Scriptures?

This paper is adapted from a reply to criticisms of an early paper, *The Incontrovertible Facts of the Bible*.

My booklet, *The Incontrovertible Facts of the Bible* ^(A) has done what it was designed to do: make people examine Scripture more closely. My thanks are extended to those who have taken the trouble to examine my 'Facts', but unfortunately they have not examined The Scriptures closely enough.

I do not wish to engage in any dispute as to what a person or group of persons say they believe. I have only one belief – that is I believe God and Jesus Christ. But because of the conflicting translations of Holy Writ I have found it necessary to go back to the Hebrew and Greek texts in order to find out what God caused to be **written** there, because until one knows what God **did** say, one is in no position to say "I believe".

Just as our versions of the Bible are translated in most cases in accordance with the religious bias of their authors, so also this religious bias is reflected to some extent in the way that the lexicons are compiled, for most of these have been produced by members of the clergy.

I am not a Greek or Hebrew scholar in the accepted sense so I cannot give **another** translation of my own to compete with those in our popular Bibles. But I have enough knowledge of both languages and of God's word to emulate those in Acts 17:11 who daily examine the **written** Scriptures to sift and judge if what is said in modern Bibles agrees with what is **written** in the "original" texts.

To do this I simply use the works of those eminent Greek and Hebrew scholars in the References list at the end of this paper to verify their own translations, in the same way that I would use the Oxford Dictionary and Roget's Thesaurus to verify the use and meaning of English words and phrases.

Thus when a statement in one of our popular versions of the Bible is being examined then each word of the "**original text**" is traced through the relevant references works volumes to determine as closely as possible, **based on the rules of grammar, exactly** what the scholars **say it means**. These results are then resolved to form the corrected passage. The translation is not my own "invention", for **anybody** using the same references and the same rules **should get the same answers**. By "original text" I mean the three principal New Testament Codices – the Alexandrinus, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus – plus any additional corrections since discovered, which are usually printed as version under the name of an individual or organisation, Westcott and Hort.

Most of you will have already read my paper *It is Written* ^(B). In this booklet I set down five rules which **impartial** translators must follow when translating the Greek or Hebrew text. To these should be added a further three rules which, although implicit in the five already given, are made necessary because of the continual failure of students and translators to give them their true status and importance. So the rules are re-stated as follows:

1. That it is God's words we are dealing with and not the words of men.
2. That God does not use words in the careless and inaccurate way that mankind uses them.
3. The Word of God never contradicts itself.
4. God's words are used precisely and the grammar is perfect.
5. God's words, that is, the words God caused to be written in the Hebrew and Greek texts, mean what they say and say what they mean.
6. "All God's works and all His words are perfect, in their choice, order and place – so perfect (are they) that if one word or expression is used there is a reason why **no other would have done.**" Dr. E.W. Bullinger, *The Apocalypse* ^(C).

7. In both Hebrew and Greek, “the **definite article, *the***, is used to designate the particular person or thing spoken of, or referred to, **in contradistinction** to all other individuals (or things) of the same class.” Dunbar’s Greek Lexicon ^(D).
8. “For a true understanding of the New Testament a thorough knowledge of the Greek prepositions, both as to their meaning and their use, is essential.” Dr. E.W. Bullinger, *The Companion Bible* ^(E), Appendix 104 (my paraphrasing).

Insufficient attention is given to these last 3 rules by most translators. Students should read the preface to Panin’s *Numeric English New Testament* ^(F) for further comment on these aspects, also Dr. E.W. Bullinger’s *Critical Lexicon and Concordance*, page 17 ^(G), where he says:

The (Definite) Article is the symbol of what was uppermost in the writer’s mind, either already mentioned, or about to become the object of an assertion. It is strictly anticipative, though with the aid of its predicate it may be retrospective.

But also check the statements of other lexicographers for confirmation – or otherwise.

Members of the B.I.W.F. will appreciate the fact that my paper, *The Incontrovertible Facts of the Bible* was designed to be given as a 55 minute talk at meetings in the UK. It covered a wide range of key facts and a range of common objections to those facts. There was, therefore, very little time available for detailed explanations. Second, there were some texts which did not give the full picture, the missing detail being supplied by the context, and in these cases it was necessary, for the, sake of brevity, to paraphrase the text slightly to allow for the context. Third, as stated by me, at the C.P.W.C. Conference and at Swanwick, that while I did not ask people to believe me, I did expect them to check the abundant references so that they could verify for themselves what I had said.

Finally, my booklet was written in the hope that the United Kingdom B.I.W.F. and other Branches would cease printing a platform of “beliefs” which, at best, are controversial and instead would state only that we **believe God and Jesus Christ**, with occasional statements of historical **facts** which support that belief. To this end, a new book, *That Incredible Book, The Bible* ^(H), would provide innumerable historical and archaeological proofs.

What I do **not** want to see is the present statement of beliefs replaced by a different statement of beliefs which may be accepted by some but repudiated by others. Let the 200-odd Christian sects tie themselves to their beliefs. If we are not a sect then let us refuse to copy what the sects do. So now to the criticisms of my booklet. To begin with, each one of those **Facts** could be expanded into a full 60-minute talk, or several talks, but this is not the time and place to go into these in such detail.

1.1. FACT I

This Fact draws a sharp distinction between Israel and the other peoples of **the** Earth. In Deut 28:10 God says:

... and all peoples of The Earth shall see that thou art called by the name of JEHOVAH and they shall be afraid of thee.

The question is: Is that a fact or isn't it? Does the Hebrew text say exactly that? If so, and I maintain that it does so, then that Fact is established and, in accordance with Rule #3, no other people or nations of **the** Earth are the equivalent of Israel because God did **not, and has not**, put His name on any other people. This does not make Israel a master race. God created them to be a **servant** race – **HIS** servants, and the Bible tells us how He trained them. **The** Earth may only apply to the Holy **Land**. Also this fact only applies **fully** when Israel is obeying God and officially bears the name of Israel. This name of Jehovah was called (named) upon the Children of Israel in Numbers 6:26 at God's express command.

I do not wish to discuss religious beliefs as some people have done, but for their information the Hebrew text of Deut 28:10 does not say ... *all the peoples of the earth*. It says ... *all peoples of **The** Earth*. There is no definite article in front of *people*. I will show later that *the people* are the people of Israel. Some critics quote (in rebuttal) Romans 5:18 which is a different subject altogether, but if they read all of Romans 5, they will find that Paul is talking about *we* and *us* all the time. Who are the *we* and *us*? Paul's Epistle is written to all God's beloved ones in Rome **called Saints**. Who are the Saints? Acts 9:13 refers to those at Jerusalem. Daniel 7:18,22 refers to them as God's people Israel (see marginal notes in the *Companion Bible* ^(D)). Thus the *all men* that Paul refers to simply means *all men of Israel*. If this is not so then why would the good news of the birth of Jesus Christ be restricted to the people of Israel only – Luke 2:10?

In this verse the Authorised Version has the Angel saying ... *I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to "all" people*. But the Greek text says that these tidings of great joy are for all **the people**. Rule #7 thus makes it clear that these tidings are only for one people, Israel. Bullinger's marginal notes ^(D) confirms this, and Davidson's *Analytical Greek-English Lexicon* ^(D), under *laos* says *Ho laos, the people of Israel* and it quotes Luke 2:10. Incidentally, one critic asserted that *laos* is a neuter noun. That is not correct, for here in the Lexicon it is shown as *ho laos* with the Definite Article in its **masculine** form, agreeing with the noun in number (singular), gender and case. But of that, more later.

1.2. FACT 2

Israel is My Son even My first-born (because begotten from above by the work of the Spirit of God). It is generally agreed that this statement is correct. So Fact 2 is also an established Fact. *Israel* covers all 12 tribes but it does not cover any other peoples outside of Israel. I do not agree with other objections because I have already covered this matter of John 3:16,17 in the paper, *It is Written* ^(B), and I will say some more on this under Facts 7, 9, 10 and 11. In Col 1: 15 Jesus is **not the first-born of creation**, see Ferrar Fenton's translation ^(J). Jesus existed before "creation" began – Col 1:16, John 1:3.

1.3. FACT 3

The critics do not deny the truth of this Fact, so I take it this Fact is established. They just do not like my translation of *hierateuma* and accuse me of stating that *hierosune* and *hierateuma* come from two different roots. I did not state that at all. I agree, on re-reading my booklet, that there **might** be an implication to that effect but it was not intended. In the New Testament the word *hierosune* is translated *priesthood* in Heb 7:11,12,24 and *hierateuma* is also translated as *priesthood* in 1Pet 2:5,9. Now in accordance with Rule #6, God has used two different words so they must have two different meanings. I went looking for that difference.

Two questions required answers:

1. Why did God use *hierateuma* in 1Pet 2:5,9 instead of *hierosune*?
2. Why did the LXX (The Seventy) translate the Hebrew word *kohanim* as *hierateuma* in Exo 19:6 but translated the same word, *kohanim* as *hiereis* (priests) in verses 22 and 24 and in many other places?

The lexicons were of no help at all; they just quoted the LXX, the AV, or copied each other. In academic circles this is known as *quarrying*, that is to say *digging up other people's work instead of doing your own research*.

Only two books gave any clue as to the meaning of *hierateuma*. One, the *Soncino* Edition of the Pentateuch commentary ^(K), rendered it as an adjective – *priestly* – the second, the Concordant Greek, New Testament ^(L), also used it as an adjective, rendering it *sacred-effect*. The Concordant Greek lexicon ^(M) defines *effect* as the meaning of the Greek ending *ma* as in *hierateu-ma* and defines *effect* as *effulgence; from-radiance*, and it uses *from-radiance* to define *the brightness of Christ's glory* in Hebrews 12.

In the Authorised Version of 1 Peter 2:5 and 2:9 the word is used as a noun for which *priesthood* is a ready made solution, but it is apparent that the word is meant to be used as an adjective. This can be expressed in the Greek without any difficulty but in an English translation it is necessary to insert the noun to which the adjective refers. A further difficulty arises from the fact that there is now no suitable English word which will express *the brightness of Christ's glory* or to *reflect the power and the glory and the majesty of God* – the attributes (virtues) of God which the nation in 1 Peter is to do. The English words *awesome* and *aw(e)ful* used to have this meaning but not these days.

Now in both 1 Peter 2:5 & 9 it is the people that are being addressed.

Verse 9 starts: *Ye are a chosen race*, then the AV has simply has *a royal priesthood*. The Concordant Greek has *King-ish sacred-effect*. But both of these words are adjectives describing this chosen race, hence to translate them into idiomatic English, a noun must be inserted:

a kingly (people) radiating divine power

Verse 5 can be freely translated as:

... and ye also, as living stones, are being built up as a spiritual temple into an awesome (radiant) holy (people) ...

In verse 9, I used the translation *a kingly people radiating divine power*. My own invention? Not at all. It is the outcome of persistent research. It fits the context of 1 Peter 2:9 and it obeys Rule #6, which *priesthood* does not.

However, no vital point of Scripture is at stake here and the reader can have it either way he chooses. But I see no valid reason to change the translation I gave in *The Incontrovertible Facts*. The concept of Israel as a Nation of Priests ministering to the other nations of the world is purely a religious idea, hence the religious translators of our Bibles favour the word ‘priesthood’. But 1 Peter 2:5 states that Israel is being built up as a holy **people to serve God – NOT** other nations – hence I prefer my own rendering as being closer to the meaning of *hierateuma*. Rev 5:9 confirms the fact that Israel was created to serve God, **NOT** other nations (see also Fact 18 comments).

1.4. FACT 4

In this Fact the critics and I seem to be talking at cross-purposes. They are talking of *land* and *earth* in the careless way these words are used by our translators, while I was trying to show how God discriminates between one land and another and between the people that live in them. God does this by using the Definite Article or by defining what land He means by labelling it, or by using His Name to discriminate between one and another.

For example – Genesis 4:16, 12:5, 13:10, 36:20; 2Kings 15:29 are quoted as “proof” that the Hebrew word *eretz* means *land* as well as *earth*. No! We must first translate each of God’s words one way, and then let the context determine how God intended to use them. The Hebrew text does not read *The land of Nod* etc, it says *earth of Nod*, and *earth of Canaan*, and *earth of Egypt*, *earth of Naphtali* all except Genesis 36:20 which does not read *the earth of Edom*. This verse reads:

... *these are the sons of Seir, the Horite who inhabited The Earth.*

The Horites were the Nephilim. *The Earth* is the Holy Land in this verse because the Horites did not inhabit the whole world. Let us take careful note – it is not *earth of Seir* or *earth of Horite*, it is ***The Earth*** (singular) and it was only to Abraham’s seed that God promised to give *This The Earth* (singular) in Genesis 12:7, and Isaac’s seed were promised a lot of other *earths* as well in Gen 26:4.

In their references to Deut 14:2 and Genesis 12:3, some critics say, “If one only consults the concordance, one will see the word *adamah* means ***land as well as earth***”. These critics need to learn that a concordance is not an authority on the meaning of a word. A concordance only groups together all “translations” of a Hebrew or Greek word, regardless of whether those “**translations**” are good, bad or misleading. *Adamah* in the lexicon, means *soil*, *ground* and *land* in reference to ***cultivated land***. *Eretz* has the meaning of *a country* in reference to ***national boundaries*** and the ***world***. Both words are further modified in scope and meaning by use of the Definite Article and other means.

In Genesis 12:1 **Jehovah** told Abram

... *to get out from thy earth ... (and go) unto THE earth which I will show thee.*

In Genesis 13:15 Jehovah speaks to Abram and the Hebrew text says:

... *and all THE Earth which thou seest I will give thee.*

Genesis 13:17 says,

... *arise and walk in THE earth, the length and the breadth of it, for unto thee will I give it.*

So *THE earth* here refers to the Holy Land. In my Note to Fact 4, I did not wish to dwell on the Definite Article aspect because there is enough in this alone for a separate talk. I was only emphasising the fact that the name **Jehovah** cannot be used in relation to any other peoples than Israel, and Fact 5 confirms this.

Now that this other aspect has been brought up, I should restore my translation of Genesis 12:3 which actually reads *all families of THE ground* and Genesis 18:18 reads *all nations of THE earth*. In view of the foregoing references to *THE ground* and *THE earth*, it would **appear** that both these terms apply to the Land of Israel. A detailed study of this matter of *earths, land and ground* is in the paper, *The Families of the Ground* ^(N).

1.5. FACT 5

I do not agree with the view of one critic on Fact 5. Genesis 12:3 is a complete contradiction in terms if *all families of THE Ground* refers to non-Israel peoples.

God said He would have war with Amalek from generation to generation, Exodus 17:6, to wipe them out of existence, Deut 25:19, so how would it be possible for Abraham, or his seed, to be a blessing to the families of Amalek? Or to the families of those nations which God said He would curse for cursing Israel? Or for the families of those nations God said He would cast out of the way of Israel (Exodus 34:24, Deut 4:38, Deut 7:1,2)? And of those He will destroy altogether, Jer 30:11? What blessings did Israel bring to the Red Indians, the Eskimo, the Maori and the Australian Aboriginal?

True. Israel has been a blessing to many peoples of the Earth but not to all families without some exceptions being listed. There are no exceptions listed in Genesis 12:3, therefore, this verse can only apply to a group of families where there can be no buts and exceptions. Therefore it can only apply to Israel families and Jeremiah 31:1 confirms this. No! Fact 5 remains unaltered.

1.6. FACT 6

Again the critics and I seem to be talking at cross-purposes. I wished to draw attention to the distinction between the **creation** of natural man (*create* – Hebrew: *bara*) in Genesis 1 and the **forming** of the Adamic (or Edomic) race (*yatsar*) in Genesis 2:7 and also the forming of Israel from that Adamic line by God (**Jehovah**). The words used in Genesis 1 up to the middle of verse 4 of Genesis 2 (which is the real end of Chapter 1), are very different to those used in Genesis 2:

- a. In Genesis 1 it is **created**;
in Genesis 2 it is **formed** (*yatsar*).
- b. In Genesis 1 it is God (*Elohim*);
in Genesis 2 it is God (*Jehovah-Elohim*).
- c. In Genesis 1 it is *mankind, male and female* (*zakar and nekebar*);
in Genesis 2 it is *mankind* (*ish and ishah*).
- d. The order of creation (*bara*) in Genesis 1 is the reverse of the order of formation (*yatsar*) in Genesis 2, where man is formed first.

The reason for this repeated and continuous contrast is to emphasize the fact that here we are faced with two entirely different orders of creation. In point of fact there is evidence to show that there are four **different** orders of human beings created and formed in the first two chapters of Genesis, but that is another story.

Psalms 49:2 refers to the *low man* and the *high man*. The *low* are the sons of *adam* (mankind of Genesis 1), the *high* are the sons of *ish* (mankind of Genesis 2). See the marginal notes in the *Companion Bible* ^(E). Psalm 62:9 repeats this distinction. Isaiah 2:9, 5:15, 31:8 carries this on. Paul refers to this distinction in 1Co 2:12-14.

In both Facts 6 and 7 it was the fact that **God (Jehovah)** was doing the forming (*yatsar*), not the word *forming* by itself that was important. **God (ELOHIM)** is God in association with creation. **God (JEHOVAH-ELOHIM)** indicates a more personal relationship and the word *forming* also implies a personal handling because the word also means *to frame* and *to mould*, whereas *create* does not necessarily give the same personal impression. Things can be created by the power of God's word, for example. **God (JEHOVAH)** is a different and more personal name again and is not used **except** in relation to Israel and Israel only, Exodus 6:2,3,6-8. Repeated **5 times** because of the Spirit of God associated with the birth of Isaac and the forming of Israel (Jacob). (Fact 1, Note.)

Now please don't rush off to your concordances and point out that the name JEHOVAH is used many times before Exodus 6:2. Don't be in a hurry to call God a liar for HE said in this verse that He was NOT **known** to the Patriarchs by **that** Name. Remember first that there was no Mr. Genesis who wrote the book of Genesis. It was Moses who wrote these books and who inserted the name of **Jehovah** into the appropriate places where it appears before Exodus 6:2 to show that **Jehovah** did not just come into existence at the time of Exodus 6:2. **Jehovah WAS Jehovah** in Genesis 2 but He did not begin manifesting to anyone as **Jehovah** until Exodus 6:2. Just as a man cannot manifest to anyone as a father or grandfather until the existence of his children and grand-children allow him to do so.

I had no intention of discussing the Names of God in *The Incontrovertible Facts of the Bible* and have no intention of saying any more now, for it is a deep and complex subject. I wished to show that Facts 6 and 7 relate **Jehovah** and the forming or moulding of Israel and that these Facts are not in conflict with any of the other Facts. They relate to Israel only.

1.7. FACT 7

In my Note to Fact 7, I stressed the authority and importance of this *being begotten from above* as distinguishing Israel from non-Israel peoples. I will have more to say on this matter when dealing with Fact 10 later on, but the comments by some students on Fact 7 are so far astray that it is necessary to clear up the meaning of John 3:3,5, 8 at once and in detail.

1.7.1. John 3:3

... unless anyone is begotten from above, he is not able to perceive the Kingdom of God

This is one of the key verses in the whole of the Bible. It is one verse where every one of the rules of translation must be rigidly applied. If these rules are not applied and the results accepted, then one may as well use Hans Andersen's *Fairy Tales* for Scripture as use the Bible. The great stumbling block to understanding this verse is the tenses and the voice of the verbs used in it and of the adverb, *anohen*. So, analysing this verse, we have:

- a. The verb *begotten* is in the Aorist tense which has **no reference** to time.
- b. The verb *dunatai* (*is not able*) is in the **present** tense, NOT the future tense which it would **have** to be if *begotten from above* meant *to be born again at some future date*. If *born again* were correct, then John 3:3 would **have** to read, *unless a man is begotten again* (or *anew*) *he WILL NOT BE able to perceive the Kingdom of God*. But *dunatai* is present tense, **IS NOT ABLE**, hence the person begotten from above must already have been begotten from above **at the time of birth**.
- c. The adverb *anohen*, in reference to time, **always** refers to **past** time or **former** time.
- d. the verb *begotten* is in the Passive Voice. This means that the **person concerned** cannot get himself *born again, anew*, or any other way at any future date'. He has **NO active part to play** at all.

Now all this grammatical precision means three vital things:

1. That the person *begotten from above* (*anōthen*) was so begotten by PAST action, therefore he or she **is so begotten** at the **time of birth** and NOT later.
2. That it is not what a man is that is important, but where he came from.
3. That you cannot be *born again*, *born anew* or *begotten again* without doing grammatical and textual murder of the Greek text of John 3:3.

Jesus is referring to individual birth because begetting is an individual act and a woman cannot give birth to a nation all at once, but she can be the mother of a nation as Sarah was. The adverb, *anōthen*, refers us to a past act of begetting and this can only refer to the supernatural birth of Isaac where the Spirit of God was sown (in the Israel race) in Sarah's womb. There is no other place anywhere in the Bible where this could have happened.

Mr. J.O. Adams dealt with the first 22 verses of John 3 in **minute** detail in his booklet *Is there a Need to be Born Again?* ⁽⁹⁾. Every single word and particle in these 22 verses is dealt with analytically. I have checked his work for myself and I am satisfied that the translation he gives is grammatically and textually correct. Verse 23 onward begins a new subject altogether.

Now some critics have quoted in refutation, 1Cor 4:15, where Paul speaks of *begetting* the Corinthians, and in Philemon 10 of *begetting* Onesimus. Begetting from **above** means being **begotten by God**, not by Paul or any human being on earth. What Paul is talking about is a very different thing and is tied up with a proper understanding of 1John 3:9 and 1Peter 1:23.

1.7.2. 1John 3:9

First, in the case of 1John 3:9. Yes, this verse is written in the masculine singular, *pas ho gegennemenos*. But if you pursue this masculine singular motive too far you will have the Women's Lib. Movement wanting to know where the women come into it and you will be forced to back pedal in order to accommodate them. But both men **and** women are included in this phrase *pas ho gegennemenos*, because the masculine Definite Article *ho* refers to the masculine singular noun *laos* – *people*. *Laos* is **not** a neuter noun as is asserted by one critic and this is where his mistaken views arise.

Now when making my translation of this verse I wanted to use the word *people*, which **in Greek** agrees in number, gender and case with *pas ho*, but when we write of *people* in this day and age **in English**, we mostly refer to *people* as *they* which is plural. I would then be faced with objections from many others who would point out that the Greek phrase was singular. So in order to obviate longwinded explanations I chose to use the singular term *seed* or *race* (of Israel) as being synonymous in English with *people* but fitting better into the singular term *pas ho*. So for the purists, and I am one of them, my translation of 1John 3:9 should read:

“The whole of the one (people, seed or race) having been begotten out of The God does not practise sin because the seed of God endures within it.

Peter is addressing all Israel for the Analytical Greek Lexicon ⁽¹⁰⁾ states that the word *pas* can **only** be translated as *every* when used **without** the Definite Article before a substantive. But here *pas* is used **with** the Definite Article, therefore it refers to a whole people or race – not to individuals.

I said in my Note to Fact 7 that Matt 8:34 has a similar phrase to 1John 3:9. It is *pasa he polis*. *Pasa he* is the same *pas ho*, dressed in its feminine form, to agree with the feminine noun *polis* – *city*. And the translation, correctly given in the AV, is *the whole of the* (one) *city* (not any city or every city but that particular city only) *came out to meet Jesus*. Now no one will argue that the buildings, streets and

pavements came out to meet Jesus; it was the men, women and children that came out, even though a feminine symbol is used to represent them. Similarly in 1Jo 3: 9 the phrase *pas ho* must be translated *whole of THE* (one). The Greek text leaves it to the Greek reader to supply the noun referred to by the preceding context. That noun is the Israel people – *ho laos* – *THE* (one) *people*.

One study group accuses me as saying *the whole seed or race of Israel cannot sin* I did **NOT** say that. I said it does not **practise** sin. The word, *practise*, in English means to pursue and perform **habitually and deliberately**.

The Israel people do not deliberately practise evil and wrongdoing and have not done so for the past 2000 years or so, not since they went into captivity for **deliberately practising evil**. It doesn't mean they don't commit sin, in ignorance, both individually and nationally, but they don't knowingly do so as a national policy or as a personal way of life. Look carefully at the word for *sin* in this verse. It means *to miss the mark or aim, to wander from the right path*. The Israel people as a whole do not deliberately try to deviate from the right path. There are more than a dozen other words for *sin* in the New Testament which include *wickedness, lawlessness, ungodliness, disobedience, transgression, iniquity, error and fault*, but **none** of these words are used in 1John 3:9. God is NOT referring to National *sins* of that kind.

1.7.3. 1Cor 4:15 and Philemon 10

The second case, understanding 1Cor 4:15 and Philemon 10 is found in 1Peter 1:22,23 and please take very careful note of the words which, from the Greek text, read as follows:

“Having purified your lives in obedience to the truth, with sincere brotherly affection love one another earnestly from the heart, having been up-begotten (revived) to the (hope) – Verse 3 – of eternal life, not out of an original sowing of corruptible seed but out of an original incorruptible (sowing) through the living and enduring Word of God.

A *spirit* seed (God's seed of the Spirit) gives rise to eternal spirit life. Now this sowing of an incorruptible seed of God which quickens into our own life-spirit is not the Greek word, *sperma*, which would mean a fresh seed from God for every new convert. It is the word *sporas*, which has the meaning of an **original sowing** away back in the past. God told us that Israel was His first-born son and this was because of the sowing of the seed of God's Spirit in Sarah's womb. This **seed of the Spirit** is passed on to each Israelite **at conception** and this is precisely what Jesus was telling Nicodemus in John 3:3,5.

Now we are told in 1Peter 1:23 that we are being revived to a new hope of eternal life **out of** an incorruptible seed of God (that is already within us if we are Israelites). But just as a seed in the ground does not germinate unless it is watered, so also this seed of God's spirit lies dormant within us and is only triggered into action **through** the **hearing** of the living (life giving) and enduring Word of God. **This seed then comes to life and enables us to understand or perceive** (with the mind's eye) the **Kingdom of God**. Now this is exactly what Jesus said to Nicodemus in John 3:3:

If anyone is not begotten from above, he NOT ABLE to perceive (understand) the Kingdom of God.

In other words, if a man, individually, has not inherited this original sowing of the seed of God in the Israel people, then he will not, and CANNOT, be quickened or re-stored to the expectation of **eternal life** by resurrection, no matter how much of the Word of God he hears. His only response will be sooner or later, to despise and reject what he hears and Paul confirms this in 1Co 2:12-14 inclusive. He says natural man (the non-Israelite) cannot understand the Words of God for they can only be discerned **with the aid of the Spirit of God** and natural man, Paul says, does NOT **receive this Spirit**, so he **cannot** discern spiritual things. The reference to Nicodemus being **unconverted** at the time Jesus spoke to him is quite true, but as an Israelite he had the **capability** of understanding and of being converted because of the seed of the Spirit already in him.

Hence the reference to the *begetting* of other men by Paul in Philemon 10 and 1Cor 4:15 can now be seen in its true perspective. Paul was the first to **convert** Onesimus and the Corinthians *through the Gospel* – through the Word of God. Thus he claims to have *begotten* them – **not from above** – but in the same sense of 1Peter 1:23, that is, by proclaiming the glad tidings to them thus awakening or quickening that seed of God’s Spirit which God had already sown in them, through Sarah’s womb. By which means **only** was it possible for them to understand the good news preached by men and so to become converted. This is not a second birth, it is not being “born again” or “anew”, it is an awakening from within – a revival of our own seed of God’s Spirit which is already there and by which the Holy Spirit Itself can **recognise** us and so **bear witness** that we **are** God’s children.

The reference to *carnal* brothers is not to actual **physical** brotherhood with Paul. Of course all Israelites are not Paul’s **physical** brothers. But because they were all Israelites and all have inherited the seed of the Spirit of God, they did, in fact, have equal incorruptible *seed of God’s Spirit brotherhood* deriving from the same womb, which is Sarah’s womb, where this seed of the Spirit was first sown. They were therefore literally *brothers of the womb* in the real sense of having one common Father of their spirit life, which the New Testament regards as more important than our physical life.

Fact 7 therefore remains unshaken. It is an incontrovertible Fact pertaining to Israel only. It is precisely because of this **equal** seed of God’s Spirit inherited by every Israelite that ... *there is neither Judean or Greek nor bond or free in The Kingdom*. There is no distinction or rank or status because all are **equally** sons of God.

1.8. FACT 8

I wished to establish that Jesus was a *Goel* and was sent only as a redeemer of His kinsmen (Israel), for that is the sole function of a *Goel*. **THIS IS A FACT**. Whether the execution of that task is to have a direct and similar flow-on effect to other non-Israel peoples as some people say, is a matter of conjecture or of personal beliefs and I have no wish to enter into that field. The BIBLE doesn’t **say** it flows on, nor does it say in 1Co 15:28:

That God may be all in all.

A better reading is *that God maybe (over) all things in all (places)*. *Panta* and *pasin* are **neuter** gender – see the Companion Bible notes ^(E). There is no word *and* in this phrase; it doesn’t apply to people.

1.9. FACT 9

Israel is not the first born NATION. Israel is God’s first-born SON and Israelites are therefore God’s children, grandchildren, great ... great grandchildren, etc. This is why Jesus taught Israelites to say *Our Father Which art in The Heaven*. No other race has the right to call God their Father – their Creator perhaps, but NOT their Father. This is why, in John 3:16, Jesus said God so loves the (Israel) Order; they are God’s own seed of His Spirit, His own family; that is why He gave His *wholly begotten Son* to redeem them. This is why Paul says in Romans 8:16 that the Holy Spirit Itself testifies with our Spirit that we are the actual offspring of God. His children, by laws of natural descent.

Israel is a KingDOM, not a “sovereignty”. God told David he would never lack a man on David’s throne so long as day and night continued to exist, Jeremiah 33:21. The word for *to reign* is *molake* and it is an active participle in the present tense and it means *reigning* right here and now. Jesus takes over that throne when He comes to set up His KingDOM on the earth. The only form of government recognised by God is a monarchy – one king.

The words *Kingdom* and *sovereignty* have some things in common, but in Acts 1:6, the Disciples were asking if Jesus was going to establish Israel as it was before. That was not as a sovereignty; it was as a Kingdom with one king over it. In the Lord's Prayer we do not ask for a sovereignty. We say *Thy Kingdom come ...*. A Kingdom is a Monarchical State, whereas a sovereignty is an independent Power. Thus a Republic is a Sovereignty but it is not, and it cannot be, a Kingdom. Fact 9 therefore requires no change. It is in agreement with the Written Word.

1.10. FACT 10

Several study groups claim that I have failed to prove why the *begotten from above* of John 3:3 refers to the begetting of Isaac. I have done so under Fact 7 earlier but there is plenty more.

Starting from scratch.

God changed Abraham's and Sarah's names by putting the 5th letter of the Hebrew alphabet in both their names, thus signifying the active presence of the Holy Spirit in both these people. Then God waited till both these people had passed the age of normal reproductive ability just so they – and anyone else – could NOT say that Isaac was begotten by Abraham **of his own free will**. God said HE formed Israel in the womb; God said Israel was HIS first-born. Nevertheless, God caused Isaac to be born, and Jacob (Israel) to be formed, through the **agency** of Abraham and Sarah and in Rebekah's womb. This was a new kind of life just as Genesis 2:7 was different from Genesis 1:26, and God emphasises this fact in John 3:16, which states:

God so loves The Order that He gives The Son, the ONE BEGOTTEN ONLY OF HIMSELF

If God had **not begotten** other **sons** then there would not have been any necessity to put this clause in at all.

God calls Israel His **first-born** son, not as is claimed to distinguish Israel from any "later-borns" (of which the Bible makes no mention), but to distinguish Israel from the Sons of God, Gen 6:2, and from Jesus, the **alone** begotten Son, and from Adam of Gen 2:7, his first-formed son. John 1:11-13 sums all this up very neatly. To analyse these verses in detail would require an hour, so I can only translate them freely from the Greek text and give a very brief explanation. The *Amplified Bible* ^(P) gives a fairly good translation of these verses, but the true sense of the Greek text is:

Verse 11: *He (Jesus) came to His own things (neuter gender), but the ones (people) of His own (domain) did not receive Him (in their midst – associate with Him).*

Literally Jesus came, **not to all and sundry**, but only to what belonged to Him, what was His own rightful possession, His domain, His Temple, His City, etc, but the people in that domain, as a whole, did not welcome Him into their midst. These were the Pharisees etc; Jesus called them *the Synagogue of Satan*. They were not truly His Own. Those that did receive Him **were** HIS people, and of these John says:

Verse 12: *But to all (of those people) who understood and received Him, He gave authority (for them) to become children (offspring) of God – to those believing toward His Name.*

These, and **only** these, **were able** (John 3:3) to believe and understand toward His Name. And **the reason** they were **able to believe** is given in the next verse:

Verse 13: (Those people) who were begotten OUT OF GOD, not out of bloods (normal human procreation), *nor even out of will of flesh (human will), nor yet out of will of a man (Abraham).*

Isaac was NOT born out of Abraham's will but OUT OF GOD'S WILL, (Genesis 18:11-14). Thus *begotten from above*.

This verse (John 1:13) deals with the origin of the **believers** in The Lord's Domain. Not only from whence they came, but from whence they could not have come. Jesus was sent by God as a *Goel*, Fact 8. Jesus said He was sent to no one *except the lost sheep of the House of Israel*, Fact 9. John 1:11-13 says He came to His own possessions, His Domain, but was rejected by the majority of those living there, but those who did believe Him were those who were **begotten out of God**. That Greek word means **literally** begotten.

Furthermore under God's **Law** of Leviticus 25:47-49, only a **Kinsman** can redeem **his kin** from the trouble they are in. This is why Jesus had to be born as a baby into an Israelite family. It was done to establish His **legal** right to redeem that race, and that race only, of which He became a legal member by birth and by the subsequent act of circumcision, on the 8th day after birth, which officially recognised Him as an Israelite by **RACE**. A fact which Jesus Himself states in Rev 22:16 – *I am the root and the race of David*. This is why Jesus could NOT be sent to redeem anybody but *The Lost Sheep* – His own kin!

The ability to **believe God** must be **developed**, by the Israelite of his own desire. If he does not read and study and listen then that seed of God's Spirit remains stunted and lacking in growth and that man's understanding of things spiritual will remain at the level of a child, a baby. Paul refers to this in 1Cor 3:1,2 where he says:

And I, brethren, could not speak to you as spiritual (men) but as carnal (men), as to babies in an Anointed (People). I fed you milk, not meat, for ye were not able (to bear the meat).

Jesus said in John 8:47:

He that is (begotten) out of THE God understands the words of THE God. Ye (Pharisees) do not understand (the words of God) for this reason that ye are not (begotten) out of THE God.

Note: in verse 33 the Pharisees identified themselves as that seed of Abraham which never went into bondage – the seed of Esau. They also claimed – verse 41 – that **they** were begotten out of God. Jesus acknowledged their first claim – verse 37 – but declared, in verse 44, they followed the will of Satan and so were neither the spiritual children of God or of Abraham and quoted as proof their **inability to understand** – verse 47, above.

Jesus thus proves that Israel **was** begotten out of God (through Abraham and Sarah) and reveals why God hated Esau, before the child was born, Rom 9:11-13. Esau despised his birthright and sold it and he rejected God's Law and married foreign women.

John 3:3,5,8 are the key to the whole of the Bible, (and John 1:11-13 are the introduction to them). They are the words of Jesus Himself. If the Christian reader is horrified at the implications of what I have shown to be the **actual meaning of these verses** then let him **show** where they are wrong, but:

- a. NOT by appeals to (human) reason
- b. NOT by quoting other passages of Scripture
- c. NOR by accusations of Racism, or Talmudism, or circular reasoning
- d. OR any other kind of declamation.

Let him show where the grammar, meaning and usage of each word of the Greek or Hebrew text as given by the Lexicons, and the context of the Bible, is different from that which I have given, and **then** quote his supporting texts of Scripture **if** they are still applicable (and he has also checked them out by the same procedure).

I am not interested in beliefs, opinions, dogma or religion. My aim is to show exactly and precisely what God has **written**. When that has been established then what individuals do with it or make of it is entirely their own affair.

On this basis Fact 10, as given in my booklet, is a proven, unshakeable FACT.

1.11. FACT 11

It has been claimed by some, that if the seed of God's Spirit is hereditary and cannot be acquired later in life then all Israelites, without exception, would become, sooner or later, converted people and that all the apostles and missionary work would have been senseless. That may be closer to the truth on one point than those people suspect. Paul says in Romans 11:25-27:

*that blindness in part hath befallen Israel until **the fullness of THE Nations** be come in and so shall all Israel be saved ...*

All **Israel** please note, not *all nations*. The *multitude* of THE Nations refers to Genesis 48:19 where Jacob tells Joseph that Ephraim shall become *a fullness of nations* (Israel nations). Paul quotes the exact words that Jacob said to Joseph in Hebrew:

... his seed shall become a fullness – a full hand – of nations; not a multitude of nations.

The aim of the Israelite Christian is, or should be, to take part in the first resurrection and for this he must be awakened to spiritual life and believe God, not just believe IN God. Hence there is the need for the Apostles and for missionaries to proclaim the Gospel wherever **Israelites** might be found. As for missionaries to other lands, what have they achieved? In most cases the church has been thrown out of these lands and Christianity has reverted to witchcraft and paganism. Until recently, one village in the Solomon Islands had been Christian for decades. But Hurricane Ada swept through the area a short time ago and flattened everything in its path. As a result of this the villagers have now rejected Christianity and reverted to Shark Worship. Such is the depth of “belief” and the “understanding” of God of “converts” who are not of Israel stock and have not got the seed of God in them. There is no seed in them which can be awakened to spirit life.

1.12. FACT 12

Several students claim that *pneo* is an intransitive verb which cannot have an object. Well, I have two Lexicons which say it can. Arndt & Gingrich's *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* ^(Q), page 686, devotes one paragraph to the use of *pneo* with the Accusative case. They quote Homer plus 2 Maccabees 9:7, Enoch 29:2, *breathe something out*. The anointing of Jesus had for its purpose *ina pnee te ekklesia aphtharsian – that he might breathe immortality upon (and therefore) into the “church”*. St. Ignatius' Epistle to the Ephesians 17:1 has *pneo tini ti – instill something into someone*.

Dunbars Lexicon ^(D) says *pneo* was used metaphorically by Sophocles to *breathe rage, anger, vengeance etc*. Aristophanes used it for *will blow a gale* and *breathing a Spartan spirit*. Aeschylus used it for *breathing kindness* – and others.

So it seems that the ancient Greeks and early Christian writers used *pneo* as a transitive verb when they chose to do so and on their authority there is no valid reason for changing the translation I gave and which I obtained from Mr. J.O. Adam's work and checked for myself.

But if John 3:8 is translated **correctly** it makes little difference whether *pneo* is used transitively or intransitively. The word *pneuma* is *spirit*. It is translated 484 times as *spirit* in the New Testament and only once as *wind* (in this verse). Dr. Bullinger says it should have been translated *spirit* at the beginning of this verse, as it is at the end. The references quoted in refutation – Matt 7:25,27, John 6:18 etc, all have the word ***anemos*** for *wind*. So in accordance with Rule #6, *anemos* is *wind* and *pneuma* is *spirit*, so the AV translators deliberately mistranslated *pneuma* as *wind* when they already had a word for *wind* and when they had already translated *pneuma* on 484 other occasions as *spirit*.

Having done this atrocity to the Greek text, the AV translators were forced to mistranslate the word *phone* as *sound* in order to force this word to agree with their mistranslated *wind*. They had already translated *phone* as *voice* 128 times in the New Testament and as *sound* 8 times. Panin's *Numeric New Testament* ^(F) rejects one of these *sound* occurrences as not being in the Greek text. He restores the translation to *voice* in four places, to *noise* in one place and leaves two in Rev 9:9 as *sound*. Ferrar Fenton translates one of these as *roar* and *note* could have been used for the other. The actual meaning of *phone* is an ***articulated sound*** – *a vibration of chords*.

What Jesus said in this verse **astounded** Nicodemus but the simple observation on the *wind* given in the AV text wouldn't have astounded a 12-year old child. Using *pneo* **in**transitively, the verse reads:

The Spirit breathes (lives) where he wills and thou hearest His voice but knowest not whence he comes nor whom he controls. So is everyone who has been begotten out of the Spirit.

However, the Greek form of the word *pneuma* is such that it can be used in the Nominative case with an **in**transitive verb as above or it can be used in the Accusative case with a transitive verb. Since two of my Lexicons quote several examples of *pneo* being used transitively with *breathing* then I feel I am in good company using *pneo* in this way and particularly as I do not think a spirit really “breathes”. The better rendering is therefore the one given in Fact 12, *He (God) breathes the Spirit where He wills... . It is God's Spirit. It is His pleasure and right to place it where He wills and it is useless for man to try to get it any other way. A man born with His Spirit within him is a spirit-man, able to understand spirit things and so eventually able to enter the Kingdom of God. Nicodemus thought only the Jews had this ability and right, hence his consternation at being told that all the Dispersion had it as well.*

Fact 12 is therefore confirmed.

1.13. FACT 13

One critic stated that “any schoolboy, with a knowledge of Greek grammar, could tell you that *In the presence of* is a false translation of the Greek word *enopion*. He also said my whole translation of Acts 9:15 is wrong. Let’s look at *enopion* first:

1. Davidson’s Analytical Lexicon ⁽¹⁾ defines it as before, *in the presence of*
2. Dunbar’s Greek Lexicon ^(D) defines it as *in the presence of*
3. Ferrar Fenton’s Bible ^(J) uses *in the presence of* in his translation of Acts 9:15.
4. In the marginal notes of the Companion Bible ^(E), Bullinger has *before, in the presence of*.
5. The same word is translated *in the presence of* in **nine** other places in the AV

So in company with these eminent dunces. I also translated it *in the presence of* because, to me, it is the more explicit of the two expressions. But the use of either one has no real significance in revealing the point in question, which is whether nations, kings and sons of Israel are all one people or three separate entities.

The Concordant Greek New Testament ^(L) is one of the most literal Greek-English translations you can get and it translates Acts 9:15 as:

In-view of THE Nations besides and kings sons besides (of) Israel”.

The Greek text reads:

enopion ton ethnon te kai basileon huion te Israel

The *Companion Lexicon to the Concordant Greek New Testament* ^(M) defines the Greek word *te* as follows:

Te, Besides, a particle of **annexation** as **AND** is (a particle) of conjunction. ‘AND’ adds **externally**, ‘BESIDES’ **unites internally**

Dunbar’s Lexicon ^(D) states that *te*:

when followed by *kai*, it signifies *both*, that is, the one and the other.

This usage is confirmed in other Lexicons. *Te* and *kai* are translated as *both* in many other passages in Acts. For example, Acts 1:13 – *Both Peter and James*; Acts 19:10 – *both Judeans and Greeks*. In Acts 26:22, a similar usage of *te kai te*, in sequence, occurs as in Acts 9:15 and both the R.S.V. and the *Emphatic Diaglott Interlinear Greek-English New Testaments* ^(R) translate the first *te-kai* as *both* and the last *te* is also translated as *both* in the interlinear section as being the true literal meaning, or a common usage of these particles.

So in Acts 9:15 we have:

<i>Enopion</i>	in the presence of, or before, or in-view of
<i>Ton ethnon</i>	THE Nations
<i>Te kai</i>	besides and
<i>Basileon</i>	kings
<i>Huion</i>	sons
<i>Te Israel</i>	besides (of) Israel

My translation of this reads:

in the presence of both nations and Kings (of) the Sons of Israel

Alternatively this could be translated as:

in the presence of Nations and Kings, both descendants of Israel (or which are descendants of Israel).

Some critics say these are 3 distinct categories: nations, kings and Sons of Israel. But kings do not roam about on their own and nations don't exist without people in them. God said Abraham would become a nation and company of nations, and He told David he would never lack a man reigning over the House of Israel. The Lord said in this verse that Paul was to bear His name before **the Nations**, nations with the Definite Article, which are Israel in most cases, as far as I can find out.

But if these 3 categories are linked **externally** by *kai*, then what about the word *te* which unites them internally? These categories are united internally by the particle *te* so that makes THE Nations, their Kings and the Sons of Israel all one and the same nation and/or group of nations. Thus I see no reason to change my translation of Acts 9:15. That translation agrees with the Word of God, and with the most literal translations, and with the Lexicons.

1.14. FACT 14

Several critics do not like my translation of Acts 13:26 – well, I don't like theirs, so let's clear up this word *adelphos* first.

Davidson ^(D): *Adelphos* (a plus *delphus*, the womb) a **brother, a near kinsman** or relative; **one of the same nation** or nature

Vine ^(S): *Adelphos* – denotes a **brother or near kinsman**. In the plural, a community **based on identity of origin or life**.

Liddell & Scott ^(T): *Adelphos* – son of the same mother.

Therefore:

Adelphos **brother**, or generally, **near kinsman**, then, in plural, a **vital community** based on **identity of origin**

The critic's definition of *adelphos* as *fellow-believers* is a religious definition and is unacceptable. Paul uses the word frequently in his Epistles and he defines what he means by it in Romans 9:3, which reads:

For I, myself, used to wish to be (anathema) from The Anointed (one) in the interest of my brethren (adelphon), my kinsmen according to the FLESH

In accordance with Rule #6, this is the definition of brethren, at least when Paul was speaking to or about Israelites. And when was he not doing this? Since Paul calls all Israelites his *adelphon* then literally he is calling them *sons of the same mother* hence the only *mother* who could be common to all Israelites is Sarah.

In Acts 13:26 Paul is speaking to the race of Abraham and nobody else. The phrase which the AV fulsomely translates *and whosoever among you* is *kai hoi en humin*, which literally reads *and the (ones) in-you*. The preposition *in* (*en* in Greek) means *being in* or *remaining within*, with the **primary** idea of *rest in any place or thing*. It can be translated as *among*, but there is already a perfectly good word for *among* – *entos* and Jesus uses it in Luke 17:21, where He told the Pharisees the Kingdom of God is *entos* – *in the midst of you*. In the Lord’s Prayer the Greek text reads:

Our Father Who art in (en) the Heavens. Thy will be done as in (en) Heaven

NOT *amongst* Heaven. Hence Paul is referring to those in the race of Abraham only. The whole impression of Acts 13:26 is that Paul WAS addressing a homogeneous group consisting of his own brethren, his kinsmen of the flesh.

Acts 13:32,33 bear out my statements because they make no mention of supposed other “believers” being present in that group. True, I left out the words *fearing the God*. This phrase does not refer to any mythical gentiles in Paul’s audience. It simply provides further proof that Paul was speaking to Israelites only. It was the special character of the Saints (Israel) under the Law to *fear* the Lord (Jehovah) Josh 24:14, 1Sam 12:24, both these chapters being addressed to all Israel. See also Ps 115:9-11, Ps 135:19-21. The Name *Jehovah* is applicable to Israelites only. In Acts 13:26 Paul is addressing Jews and Israelites in the Synagogue (who were still under the Law) in the same way that Joshua and Samuel spoke to Israelites in their day.

Fact 14 is therefore proved by the Lexicons and by Rule #6 to be correct as I stated it.

Critics may make what they wish of the word *us* in Acts 13:26 but to English readers it includes Paul and his audience. If it was only Paul and Barnabas what was the point of telling the Israelites, except to boast? The whole of chapter 13 refers to Israel only whether non-Israelites were present or not. Verse 48 says:

those who were ordained to everlasting life believed

Only Israel was appointed to everlasting life, Isaiah 44:7. The *Ancient People* reads in the Hebrew text, the *Everlasting People*. Note carefully that verse 48 does not say *those who believed were ordained*. No! it is only those who were predestinated to everlasting life who believed and so were converted.

1.15. FACT 15

In *It is Written* ^(B), I dealt with the subjects of *ethne*, *kosmos*, the Definite Article and how to analyse the context in which a verse or phrase is written. There is nothing in the references mentioned by some critics under Fact 15 which will stand up to this kind of examination and alter, in anyway, Fact 15 as given. God’s use of the Definite Article identify which *ethne* is which in most cases but sometimes the context does it. Their reference to Romans 15:10, however, is worthy of mention.

In Romans 15:10 Paul quotes from Deut 32:43. This verse commences:

Rejoice, O ye Nations HIS People ...

There is **no** preposition *with* in the Hebrew text of this sentence. Deuteronomy is the book of the Law **to Israel** and nowhere in this whole chapter 32 is there any mention of any people other than Israel and there is nothing in this quotation to suggest that any mythical Gentiles were to “rejoice” **with His People**, or to rejoice at all.

The preposition *with* is definitely a part of **Paul's** quotation in Romans 15:10, and Panin's *Numeric New Testament* ^(F) confirms it . Equally definitely it is NOT in Deuteronomy 32:43 which Paul quotes. But at the time Paul was writing this Epistle, Judea was still, **officially**, God's People. The Kingdom had not yet been taken from them and given to Dispersed Israel who were at that time still *Lo-ammi, not My People*. Paul, whose commission was to bear the name of Jesus to the nations of Israel to bring them back towards being God's People (Acts 9:15), was calling on them to rejoice **with** those in Judea who **were** officially His People. Paul was a lawyer and he would not alter one tittle of the Law of Deuteronomy to include people not entitled to be included. The names Phoenician and Samaritan are not racial terms but national terms and refer to Israelites in those countries.

With regard to the other references given by various critics, Matt 19:29, Luke 18:30, John 3:36, etc. All these must, and I repeat, must, be subject to John 3:3:

Unless anyone is begotten from above, he is not able to see (perceive with the mind's eye)

...

and John 3:5:

... or enter the Kingdom of Heaven

The *everyones* and the *whosoEVERS* must all be of those *begotten from above*, otherwise they are not able to believe **in the sense that Jesus means**. There is no reference **anywhere that** I can find where God called anyone other than Israel His Children, or said He formed them in the womb or used any other term which implies that they are begotten from above, and John 1:13 confirms this, for it shows **who is NOT** included.

Fact 15, therefore, stands unassailable.

1.16. FACT 16

If, as one critic declares, Paul was not referring to Abraham and Sarah in Eph 6:2, why didn't he use the word *parents* as he did in the previous verse? Paul taught from the Old Testament and he was reminding his listeners/readers of the 5th Commandment and of Isaiah 51:1,2 where God says

HEARKEN to Me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord, look unto the hollow of the quarry whence ye are digged Look unto Abraham YOUR FATHER, and to SARAH that bare you: for I called him alone and blessed him and increased him.

God thus calls Abraham and Sarah the **father and mother** of Israelites of every generation. Paul would not tell Israelites to *honour* their own fathers and mothers when God had already declared that **Abraham** is their Father, and therefore Sarah is their mother. This is further proof that Isaac and all Israelites were begotten from above. Abraham's seed was corruptible but the spirit seed God sowed in Abraham comes down to us undiminished because it is incorruptible. This makes Abraham and Sarah the father and mother from whom we received that incorruptible seed.

The 5th Commandment is therefore to honour Abraham and Sarah, and God gives the reason in Isa 51:2. He did not call **our parents** and bless **them**. He called Abraham **alone** and blessed him, and increased him, and honoured him in the process. Therefore we, also, are commanded to honour him who, because of his obedience and faith, did so much for us in the past, now, and in the future. My statement is not far fetched, it is not nonsense, it is not artificial; it is based on hard, incontrovertible FACT.

1.17. FACT 17

I have already dealt with the objections to Israel becoming a *kingly people, radiating Divine Power in the service of God*, in my translation under Fact 3. Israel was formed to be a priestly Kingdom serving God. NOT serving other nations. That is a religious concept not supported by the true texts.

1.18. FACT 18

Since many critics will not accept my reasoning for this Fact, let me first quote Panin's *Numeric New Testament* ^(F) translation of Rev 5:9, and then Bullinger's comments on this verse from page 243 of his book, *The Apocalypse* ^(C):

Panin: *Worthy art thou to take the booklet, and to open the seals thereof, – because thou wast slain and didst purchase to THE God with thy THE Blood (men) (out) of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and madest them a Kingdom and priests to our THE God; and they reign upon the earth.*

In line 3 Panin has *men* in brackets and Dr. Bullinger (who quotes the same verse on page 242) has *a people*. There is no actual word here in the Greek text because it is not necessary, but in a translation into English it is necessary to have a noun here as the antecedent for the masculine pronoun *autous, them*, in line 4.

Panin has *of every tribe*; Bullinger has *out of every tribe* and I agree with him because the preposition is *ek* which means *out of*. It is the singers, the Zoa and the Elders in Heaven who are singing this song – not the redeemed. There is no pronoun *us* in the Greek text of this verse.

Bullinger's comment reads:

This is the theme of the New Song. The worthiness of the Lamb to take the Book, because of the Redemption He had accomplished. The People had been once redeemed from Egypt, for it is in connection with the Exodus that Redemption is first mentioned in the Bible, in the Song of Exodus 15:13 – *Thou in thy mercy hast led forth (the) people which thou hast redeemed: Thou hast guided them by thy strength unto thy holy habitation.*

But now the People have been scattered among every kindred, and tongue, and people and nation and therefore they must be redeemed from out of these *the second time, like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt*, Isaiah 11:11,16

Thus Bullinger, who was not a believer in the Anglo-Israel theme, translates this verse, with different emphasis to mine, but still relates the whole of this verse exclusively to Israel just as I do. Rev 7:4 does not refer to the whole nation of Israel at all. It refers only to the 12,000 of each of the tribes of Israel (of which **Dan and Ephraim are excluded**) who will be preserved (from hurt) **on the earth, during the great tribulation**, from the onslaught of the Beast. There will be many others of all these tribes on the earth who may not survive or survive **without hurt during** the great Tribulation.

In verse 9 the word for *multitude* is *oxlos* which means *a multitude of the same class* as the 144,000 who are clearly identified as Israelites. In verse 13 one of the Elders asks John if he knows who this great multitude are and he is told in verse 14 that they are the ones who came out of the *Great Tribulation*. This is the Great Tribulation foretold by Jesus in Matt 24:2 1 and called in Dan 12:1 *the Time of Great Trouble* when Daniel's people (of Israel) would be delivered. This vision from verses 9-17 is in Heaven, after the Resurrection has taken place, and in Rev 18:20 all those in heaven are called upon to look down and rejoice over the total destruction of Babylon. But the only ones mentioned in that verse as being in Heaven are *the Saints*, which are Israel, the Prophets of Israel and the Apostles of Israel. Hence the great multitude of Rev 7:9 is identified again and again as being the people of Israel only.

With regard to *genos*, the Lexicons have *birth, a race, stock, kind, family, a tribe, kindred, nation, people, offspring*. The basic meaning of *genos* is that of a *separate category*, so any word that satisfies this meaning of separateness will suffice, provided there is no other Greek word in the Bible that uses one of those words. In the above example, *tribe* and *nation* and *people* and *offspring* have already been used in the New Testament, so none of these words should be used as a translation for *genos*. *Race, breed* or *kind* are acceptable and do not murder the text. Matt 17:21 does not exist in the Greek text.

Fact 18 is thus confirmed by textual examination.

1.19. FACT 19

1.19.1. The Anointed People

Many Christians think that “there is no Bible text for an anointed people, at all”. The reference I gave in my booklet was Habakkuk 3:13, which reads from the Hebrew text thus:

Thou art come forth for the deliverance of Thy People, for the deliverance of Thine Anointed

The Hebrew word *for the deliverance of* is exactly the same in both lines. *The Soncino Books of the Bible* ^(U) comment on verse 13 is, *Thine anointed: the parallelism shows that Israel is intended, The Kingdom of Priests, Psalm 28:8.*

In *The Companion Bible* ^(E) Dr. Bullinger’s marginal note says: *Anointed, i.e., for the salvation of Jehovah’s anointed People (sing.), see Psalm 105:15.*

Bishop Ellicott’s *Old Testament Commentary* ^(V) on Hab 3:13 is:

even for salvation ... better, even for the salvation of Thine Anointed – scil. Thy Chosen People as also, perhaps, Psalm 105:15. The rendering of the AV has the support of Aquila and the Quinta. It is a possible rendering but few impartial Hebraists will deny that the other is preferable.

Thus three authorities agree that Hab 3:13 refers to Israel as *the Anointed People*. Psalm 28:8 is somewhat corrupt. Some ancient versions indicate that this also refers to Israel as the Anointed People, including the Septuagint and the Syriac texts. The Septuagint reads: *The Lord is the strength of His People and the defender of the salvation of His Anointed.*

1Chronicles 16:22 is the Scripture quoted in Psalm 105:15 and it reads: *Touch not mine Anointed Ones, and do my Prophets no harm.*

The whole of chapter 16 describes the thanksgiving of David and the People of Israel to God and from verse 18-22 specifically refers to the whole people, not to the monarchy alone. The RV translation reads:

“When ye were but few in number, yea, and sojourners in it, and they went from nation to nation, and from one kingdom to another people. He suffered no man to do them wrong. Yea, He reproveth kings for their sakes saying ‘Touch not mine Anointed Ones and do my Prophets no harm’.

In *The Companion Bible* ^(E) marginal notes, Dr. Bullinger has: *Mine Anointed: Israel was regarded as a Kingdom of Anointed Kings and Priests (Exodus 119:6).*

Thus there is ample authority in the Old Testament to show that Israel is God's Anointed People. In the New Testament there are dozens of references to Israel being an Anointed People, of which 2Cor 1:21 is a clear example. This verse reads:

The One confirming us with you into an Anointed People, and anointing us, is God.

I will deal in a few moments with the correct translation of the Greek word *xristo*, which has been mistranslated as *Christ* in many places, but first let us complete Fact 19.

Rev 11:15 begins the period of the 7th trumpet which lasts right through till chapter 20. The verse opens with a trumpet blast and loud voices in Heaven saying:

The Kingdom of THE Order is become (the Kingdom) of our Lord and of His Anointed People.

This is the culmination of that foretold in Daniel 7:13,14,18 concerning Jesus and the Holy People. There is therefore no ambiguity about the pronoun *He*, in verse 15. It cannot apply to the Anointed People. It can only apply to *Our Lord*.

In Rev 11:16, the 24 Elders add their voices and worship *tou theou* (THE God) not *tou kuriou* (THE Lord, of verse 15) and they identify *tou theou* as our Lord God Almighty in verse 17. John was being very careful here to distinguish between the parties concerned by using a different title for each one. If the verse 15 reading is taken as *The Lord – as God – and His Anointed – as Jesus*, then the 24 Elders pointedly ignore Jesus in their worship of **God alone** in verse 16 & 17 and this is neither reasonable nor acceptable.

Fact 19 therefore remains unchanged.

The objections raised against my translations are based on inability to recognise any Bible references to an Anointed People, but I have shown that there are several in the Old Testament and there are many more in the New Testament. To understand why the critics may not have been able to find any references themselves, we must understand the way the Greek language is written. For example, the Greek word *agathos* is an adjective and it means *good*. But it can also represent a noun and be translated *a good* (man):

a. Because it is masculine

and

b. IF the context refers to people.

It could be *a good (one)* if it referred to something else which was masculine. But *ho agathos* means *THE GOOD* (man) or *THE good* (one), because it has the Definite Article in front of it.

So the Greek word *xristos* (*Christ* in our popular Bibles) simply means *anointed* and if it is found by itself in a verse of the Bible then in accordance with the context it may mean the adjective *anointed* or *an anointed* (something) and the *something* must be supplied by the context in which it appears. It could be *Jesus, people, one, King* or anything masculine. *ho xristos* is *THE anointed* (something) and again it can be *Jesus, people, King, one*, though in the New Testament it is usually *THE Anointed One* (Jesus) or *THE Anointed People* (of Israel).

Now many Christians believe that Jesus is the **One Seed** of Galatians 3:16. No! Jacob (Israel) is the **One Seed which is anointed!** Abraham had 7 other sons – *the seeds as of many* – and these are excluded. Jesus cannot be the One Seed, for verse 16 says the Covenant was made to Abraham and his seed (his *sperma*). This refers to Genesis 17:7, where God says:

and I will establish My Covenant between Me and thee and thy seed after thee IN THEIR GENERATIONS

If Jesus is the *One Seed* then **ALL the generations** between Abraham and Jesus have been disinherited from the Covenant. The *One Seed* has to be Jacob (Israel) or God's Covenant is a deceitful fraud. Jacob is the '*One Seed*', out of Abraham's seed which is anointed, and this is another proof that Israel is God's Anointed People. Furthermore, the word for *seed* in Gal 3:16 is *sperma* and Jesus is NOT, repeat NOT, the *sperma* of Abraham – otherwise Jesus would be the seed of fallen man and would have no power to redeem anybody. He is God's *sperma* or all Scripture is false. Israelites have a dual nature, being the physical *sperma* of Abraham, and having also the spirit seed of God in them. Thus they are begotten out of God but not alone-begotten as was Jesus.

1.19.2. Xristo – “christ”

In *The Incontrovertible Facts of the Bible* ^(A), I did not wish to go too deeply into Galatians 3:26-29 or the true translation of *xristo* and *en xristo lesou*, for it is more complex than most Christians suspect and exclusively for Israel only, which most Christians are not prepared to accept if this is their first encounter with this level of detail and analysis. But how many serious students of the Bible have looked into the reasons why the word for *Christ* has never been **translated** in the New Testament? And why Paul, and **only** Paul, uses the term which has been “translated” *Christ Jesus*? Because it does not mean, *Jesus Christ* at all. When Paul means **Jesus Christ**, he says so. Also, for those who don't know it, *Christ* is not the surname of Jesus.

But now that this issue has been forced by several attempts to “translate” this passage without such knowledge, so it must be dealt with fully and completely. This time by **translating** the word *xristos* instead of **transliterating** it in the usual religious manner. The Greek text then reads:

verse 26: *For ye are all Sons of God through faith, in an Anointed (People) of (belonging to) Jesus (xristo is representing a noun in this phrase).*

verse 27: *For as many as were (accepted) by baptism (naturalisation) into an Anointed (People) did put on the identity/nationality of that Anointed (People).*

verse 28: *Neither Jew nor Greek is within it (the Anointed People).*

Neither bond nor free is within it (the Anointed People).

In it there is NO male and female (Male and Female are in the Accusative Case here and refer to the races of mankind created in Genesis 1:27 where they are specifically named Male and Female – zakar and nekebah. Adam and Eve are named Ish and Ishah, Man and Woman).

For ye are all one and the same (people or race) in an Anointed (People) belonging to Jesus.

verse 29: *And if ye belong to an Anointed (People) then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to the promise.*

Thus there is no sudden change of identity, because Paul is not speaking about Jesus but about Israel. These verses form a continuous and intelligent whole which anybody can understand, and there is no conflict with the *Incontrovertible Facts* ^(A), which remain as firm now as when I first presented them in England in 1973. To translate *xristou* in this verse as *Christ* is not logical. Paul is talking of literal descendants of Abraham – seed, his *sperma*. To say that “if you belong to Jesus” you are a **literal** descendant of Abraham – irrespective of your racial origin – is nonsense.

It is important to note that the true Greek text of Gal 3:14 reads as follows:

In order that the blessings of Abraham might come unto the nations (Abraham's seed) in an Anointed People of (belonging to) Jesus that we might receive the promise (to Abraham) of the Spirit through THE Faith.

The “change of identity” which some people complain about in my earlier translation of Gal 3:29, arises from:

- a. Failure, in their own translation, to **translate** the word *xristo*
- b. Failure to supply the appropriate noun after *xristo* (which is not required by the Greek reader but is necessary for the translation into English)
- c. Failure to rightly divide the Dative of *xristo* from the Genitive of *iesou* in the term *en xristo lesou*, which is translated in most Bibles as *in Christ Jesus*.

Now before anybody rises up in wrath and indignation, let me agree at once that *lesou* is the same for the Dative form as for the Genitive form, so *en xristo lesou* has two possible translations:

1. *in an Anointed (One) Jesus* (which simply means Jesus “Christ”)
2. *in an Anointed (People) of (belonging to) Jesus.*

Now it is up to you, the reader, to decide which one fits the context. But in order to assist you in your deliberations, let me ask a few very awkward questions:

1. What excuse is there for not **TRANSLATING** the word *xristo/s/u*?
2. And how do you know what you are **in** if you don't translate it in accordance with the context?

If you were asked to translate the sentence: *Il est dans le village avec ma mere (he is in the village with my mother)*, and you **transliterated** a word or two and put *he is dansing in the village with my mare*, would that convey the true sense of the sentence?

(A transliterated word means **NOTHING** in another language except as evidence of **textual incompetence** in translation, or **deliberate** alteration of God's word.)

3. The word *Jesus* occurs 683 times in the Bible and the word *xristos* approximately 300 times, so why is it that the Bible **NEVER** says **we** are “**in Jesus**” where it has twice as many opportunities to do so, but only says *in xristo*?

Can it be because being *in xristo* has nothing to do with Jesus in the way our religious translators try to make out?

(And please don't quote 1Thess 4:14 at me; the preposition there is *through* Jesus not *in Jesus*. An accurate Greek text is essential for reference in these cases, both for the prepositions used and for incorrect transpositions of *xristo* and *lesou*).

Because our religious translators almost invariably transliterated the word *xristos* wherever it appears they have, in many cases, completely destroyed the true sense of the passages concerned. In some places, such as Heb 11:26, we have such idiotic “translations” as:

Moses esteemed the “reproach” of “Christ” greater riches than the treasures of Egypt.

What did Moses know of the “reproach” of “Christ” who lived about 1500 years after Moses died? The verse should read:

Having judged the reviling of the Anointed (something) greater riches ...

What is the *something* in this verse? To any **unbiased** translator it MUST refer to the *People of God* of the preceding verse; hence *the anointed (something)* in this verse only makes sense when translated *the Anointed People of God*.

So the translation of *en xristo iesou* as *in an Anointed People of (belonging to) Jesus* is the only one that makes sense of this expression in Gal 3:26-28 and other contexts in which it is applicable. It obeys Rule #6 and is in agreement with the 19 established FACTS and the whole story of the Bible. The Anointed People belong to Jesus by right of redemption. That is what He said He came for, and that is what Paul said He accomplished and he emphasises this fact again by the use of this expression which he coined himself to drive home that fact to all those Israelites in the Dispersion.

Beware of rushing to concordances for proof to the contrary, because concordances only repeat the errors of the translators. For example, there is no word in the Greek text for *xristos* before *iesou* in Acts 9:14 and Hebrews 3:1. The word *xriston* should come after Jesus in 2Cor 4:5 but as there is no preposition *en* before it, the translation can be *an Anointed (One) Jesus* or *Jesus, an Anointed (One)*.

Romans 8:39 (and others) has the words *our the Lord* in the Dative Case after Jesus but this whole phrase, *en xristo iesou to kurio hemon* should be translated differently again. For example, *in an Anointed (One), Jesus the Lord of us (or our Lord)*. In these phrases, the Dative Case is grammatically correct for both *xristo* and *iesou*. The two references in 1Peter and one in Col 1:28 have no word *iesou* after *xristo* in the Greek text.

I have not checked all references so there may be other variations designed to meet the context in which they appear.

Where *xristos* appears, with or without the Definite Article, a noun should always be added to the English translation, such as *one, people* etc, if the context demands it. For example, how could Paul have said in 1Thess 4:16 that the dead in *Christ* shall rise first? Is Jesus the Lord of the dead? And will dead Christians rise before Abraham and Isaac and Jacob? But to say the dead *in an Anointed People* shall rise first includes both groups and makes sense of the context.

1.20. Additional Notes

I have already dealt with most of the arguments raised against *The Incontrovertible Facts of the Bible*, partly in *It is Written* ^(B) and partly by the evidence already given showing why none of the 19 Facts are in any way affected by the attacks on them. They are firmly established and unshakeable so all attempts to include non-Israel peoples in the Kingdom are just contradictions of God's FACTS!

Because our translators ruined the meaning of Galatians 3:16 by making Jesus "the One Seed which is Anointed", they were then forced to translate verse 19 into the mess that we have in most Bibles today. This verse should read,

Why then the Law (of Ordinances)? Because of the transgressions (of God's Commandments, Statutes and Laws - Gen 26:5 - by Israel) it was added (alongside the Promise) wheresoever the seed, to whom (the promise) had been proclaimed should wander, having been given (indirectly) through the (double) mediation of Angels and the hand (of Moses)

There is NO reference to Jesus anywhere in this verse.

And the failure of some Christians to understand my comments on *Male and Female* (Gal 3:28) derives from their failure to understand Fact 6. Israel are the descendants of the race formed by Jehovah-Elohim in Genesis 2:7 and formed again into a new race in Sarah's and Rebekah's wombs.

The *Male and Female* of Gal 3:28 refers to the race of mankind **created** by Elohim in Genesis 1:26, those Paul calls natural man in 1Cor 2:14. Paul is therefore saying that there are no representatives of that creation in the people of the Kingdom – which is what I have been saying all the time. NOT because I want it that way but because that is the way God’s words come out when they are **properly** translated.

1.20.1. Mark 16:15

Now for general objections to my translation of Mark 16:15. Jesus said to His disciples,

Having gone into all THE Order (which I still maintain is Israel) **proclaim**...

The word used here is *keruxo*. It is the same word used in 1Peter 3:9 where we are told that Jesus, in His resurrected state, went and *announced His triumph* to the spirits in prison. There is not the slightest idea of *teaching* or *preaching* in this word. It was a triumphant **proclamation** that was to be made, not a “preaching”. Then we come to this vexed word *creature* or *ktizei* in the Greek. First let me quote what the Lexicons have to say:

W. E. Vine, M.A., *Dictionary of New Testament Words* ^(S), under *creature* says (with my emphasis added):

Verb:

Ktiso: used among the Greeks to mean the founding of a place, a city or a colony, signifies, in Scripture, to create, always of the act of God, a colony whether (a) in the natural creation, Mark 13:18, Rom 1:25 (where the title ‘the creator’ translates the Definite Article with the Aorist participle of the verb) 1Cor 11:9, Eph 3:9 etc. or (b) in the spiritual creation, Eph 2:10,15; 4:24; Col 3:10.

Nouns:

Ktisis: primarily the act of creating, or of the creative act in process, or has this meaning in Rom 1:20 and Gal 6:15. Like the English word ‘creation’ it also signifies the product of the creative act, the creature as in Mark 16:15, etc. etc.

Ktistes: among the Greeks, the founder of a city, etc., denotes in Scripture ‘the creator’, 1Pet 4:19. Compare Rom 1:20 above.

At the end of all these definitions Vine has the following note,

It is a significant confirmation of Romans 1:20 that in all non-Christian Greek literature, these words are NEVER used by the Greeks to convey the idea of a creator, or of a creative act by any of their gods. The words are confined by them to the acts of human beings.

Dunbar’s Lexicon ^(D) and Davidson’s ^(I) and Liddell & Scott’s ^(T) all agree with Vine, giving the Greek meaning as *founder, founding, foundation, frame, framing, builder, building, structure, make a tomb, plant a colony, found a State*, and pointing to the New Testament as the **only place** where it is suddenly translated *create! creature! creator! creation!*

And who translated the New Testament? It was done by men who made a travesty of translating *kosmos* and *pneuma* and *phone* and *ethne* and who never bothered to translate the word *xristos* at all. Are these men, then the “authority” for the meaning of *ktizei* as being “creature”? Since God chose to use the Greek language for His message then I prefer to use His words as the Greeks of that day used them, not as religious translators misused them to suit their own religious bias.

Thus in Mark 16:15 a proclamation was to be made to *pase te ktisei*. Now *pase te* is our old friend *pas ho* in its feminine form to agree with the feminine noun *xtisei*. Thus this proclamation is to be made to *the whole of the* (one) *xtisei*. A proclamation is not made to an individual, it is something made to a whole group of people which would be intelligible to those people. Also this group of people is a single *xtisei* or unit, formation, structure, entity, organisation, constitution, framework, people, corn m unity. (*Pase te* is the **Dative** feminine form. Matt 8:34 is Nominative.)

Thus *kosmos*, in this verse, and *ktisei*, refer to Israel but some critics do not like this and accuse me of “circular reasoning”. Well let them do a little reasoning on this verse themselves. Of all the races in the world at that time, what people were looking, and longing for, the coming of the Saviour? Only **Israel** was expecting to hear such a **proclamation**. To the rest of the world it would mean nothing! Once the religious translations of *keruxo* as “preach” and *xtisei* as “creature” are stripped away then Jesus’ instructions in this verse carry on the **announcement** made by the angels to the shepherds in Luke 2:10:

tidings of great joy which shall be to all THE (one) People

Davidson’s *Analytical Lexicon* ⁽¹⁾ quotes this verse and says: *ho laos*, the people of Israel, Luke 2:10.

Jesus said, *having gone into all THE Order*. If He meant:

- a. The whole wide world, why didn’t He use the word *ge* which means *the whole earth* including the occupants?
- b. The whole civilised world, why didn’t He use the word *oikoumene* which is used of the Roman World, the Greek World and the civilised inhabited world?

Rather, Jesus used the word *kosmos* which as I showed in *It is Written* ^(B), means many different *orders* which can only be translated sensibly by the context in which it is written.

Jesus went further and said, *to go only into THE (one) kosmos*. *THE (one) Order*, and I have shown elsewhere that *THE (one) Land*, *THE (one) EARTH*, *THE (one) PEOPLE* and *THE (one) ORDER* refer in many cases to Israel only and I am convinced that it does here also in Mark 16:15. There is no valid reason, circular or otherwise, to change the translation I gave in *The Incontrovertible Facts of the Bible*. I used city (or colony) to illustrate my meaning of the whole of the Israel people, the total structure, wherever they were scattered.

Romans 1:25 does refer to God in this verse. But if we translate the words the way the Greeks used them then the verse applies to any maker, man or god. If a man makes an idol why then worship the idol and not the man who formed it? There is no actual word for “creator” in this verse, as Vine said in his comments earlier under *ktizo*. The verse reads

and revered and served te ktisei (the formation or the thing formed) *beyond the One forming* (it)

Col 1:15 reads:

(the) *origin* (beginning) *of the whole foundation* (structure, framework)

Jesus could not be the *first-born* of all that was made **through** Him. See Proverbs 8:22-32 in the *Amplified Bible* ^(P) for a definition of *xtiseos* in relation to the creative act, the notes to *The Companion Bible* ^(E) are very good on *foundation*. I don’t object to “creature” and “creator” being used in Rom 1:25 provided it is understood that these words are being used as synonyms and not as the only meaning.

1.20.2. 2Cor 5:17

2Cor 5:17 reads:

so if anyone is in an Anointed (People) (he is in) a new state (relationship) the old (Lo-ammi state or condition) having passed away: Lo it has become new (in character and quality)

Reed the rest of this chapter substituting *an Anointed People* for *Christ* in almost every verse. There is no word *Jesus* in the Greek text of verse 18 (and 19,20) reads:

That is, through (the death of) an Anointed (one) God was reconciling the Israel Order to Himself, not accounting to them their offences (or faults) and assigning us (Paul and Timothy) the presentation of the reconciliation. (Same word as used in Rom 5:11.) We are therefore ambassadors for an Anointed People, since God, as it were, make His appeal through us. We beg you, in the interests of an Anointed People, – be gathered to God.

1.20.3. Acts 8:27

The most frequent question asked by Christians is “Can I prove that the Eunuch was not an Ethiopian?” Can they prove that he was? Because the Bible calls him an Ethiopian? The Bible also says Paul was a Roman (Acts 22:26). But these are not racial terms, they are **national** terms. We know that Paul was **Greek** by birth, **Roman** by citizenship, a **Jew** by religion, **Christian** by conversion – but **Benjamite by race** – one of those *begotten from above* and therefore containing the spirit seed, without which **Jesus said**, a person is **not able** to understand the Word of God. WHEN are we going to start BELIEVING Jesus?

The Eunuch showed his ability to understand Scripture, therefore by Jesus’ own words he must have been an Israelite even though of Ethiopian **nationality** because of having been born there or taken there. The Israelites were, and are, people of high intelligence and when Israel went into captivity, foreign kings often bought them to serve in their courts – after making eunuchs of them. Nebuchadnezzar did precisely this with Daniel and his companions. How else would the Queen of Ethiopia learn so much about Judea except through Israelite Ministers, such as this Eunuch she had put in charge of all her treasury?

1.20.4. Acts 10:1

Cornelius was a Roman by birth, but Peter called him one of *allo-phulos*. *Allo* means *another of the same kind* and *phulos* means *a tribe*. Another Israelite. This was the whole point of the Vision of the Unclean Food, which Peter saw. At that time the Israelites of Judea regarded all those Israelites in the Dispersion as heathen, uncircumcised, unclean and the dirt beneath their feet. If Jesus had sent His Disciples to them without any preparation they would have gone with an air of superiority and even disdain, as Peter was doing with Cornelius. Look at the way the rest of the Disciples and converts in Jerusalem ‘contended’ with Peter for mixing with such ‘uncircumcised outcasts’ as Cornelius!

This attitude would have offended the Dispersed Israelites and they might have rejected the Gospel message that was brought under these conditions. God had to do something drastic to change that attitude. First came the Vision of Unclean Food which Peter rejected as common and unclean. The voice then said *What (things) God has **cleansed** make not thou **common*** (and unclean). (The voice was not referring to the food because the verb used for *cleansed* means *to cleanse from SIN*; therefore the voice was referring to **people** whom God had cleansed.)

Peter knew that God's Law could not be set aside by a vision. Unclean food was still unclean, so he pondered over the vision. He began to see daylight when asked to go to Cornelius and he explains this in verses 28, and 29, but still somewhat keeping himself apart from them. Then to Peter's astonishment he saw holy spirit descending on Cornelius before he was even baptised.

By this act God was forcing the lesson of the Vision of the Unclean Food home to Peter. A lesson that most Christians today don't seem to appreciate. That is, when Jesus died on the stake, He died for the remission of **our sins**. Therefore, since God accepted that sacrifice then we, the redeemed, have been **cleansed**, as well as **redeemed**, and those acceptable to Jesus stand spotless in God's sight if we repent. Thus God was, in fact, saying to Peter, "Don't get the idea that YOU are doing anything for these people because I have already **DONE** it. Now you get busy and baptise them; **that's** your job!"

1.20.5. National Baptism

What many Christians do not understand is that baptism, in fact, simply replaced circumcision as a sign of acceptance by the assembled people that the person being baptised was legally and by birth an Israelite in every sense of the word and hence accepted as a member or citizen of the Israel nation. Paul refers to this in Galatians 3:27:

For as many as were accepted/naturalised by baptism into an Anointed (People) did put on the identity (nationality) of an Anointed People.

This is individual baptism, yes, but into a National Body – Israel, God's Anointed People. Unless you **are** a member of this People then you cannot be an heir to the promises (the covenant) made to Abraham **and HIS SEED**. Hence baptism is an act of cleansing, but it is also an act of naturalisation into the body of Israel.

Those who object to this idea should read Isaiah 44:7 where God said He appointed the Ancient People which in the Hebrew text reads, *the Everlasting People* and also take note of the nine everlasting things, in Isaiah, which apply to Israel and to Israel only:

1. The everlasting Covenant
2. The everlasting Salvation
3. The everlasting Excellency
4. The Kindness
5. The Joy
6. The Name
7. The Light
8. The Sign

And as the guarantee of it all:

9. The Everlasting God!

The whole Bible proclaims Israel from every page. I merely draw attention to those pages and what is WRITTEN on them!

1.20.6. The Samaritans, Acts 8:14

This verse is often quoted to “prove” that the Samaritans were heathen Gentiles, yet they received the word of God. The Romans also were heathen and Paul was a Roman (by citizenship) but that doesn’t “prove” anything. An example of proof is John 4, where Jesus stopped at a well and a “Samaritan” woman, from Samaria, came to the well and Jesus spoke to her. In verse 12 the woman said,

Art thou greater than our father Jacob who gave us this well?

Jacob could not be the father of the heathen race of Samaritans, but of Israelites who, like this woman, were born in Samaria and were called Samaritans because they lived there. They are the Samaritans being referred to in Acts 8:14. The heathen Samaritan would not be able to believe.

Therefore what I or anyone else believes does not matter. What I or anyone else says does not matter. All that matters is what God and Jesus said. I have done my best to bring out exactly what God and Jesus have said on a number of key points – The Facts. If these are true, even if one of them is true, then there can be no place for any other “interpretation” of chapter, verse or sentence which adds to or subtracts from that Fact.

1.21. Conclusion

From the foregoing analysis of all that the critics have raised to deny, amend or expand the *Incontrovertible Facts*, those FACTS remain as firm, as unshakeable and as exclusively for Israel as when I first presented them. The words of God behind those Facts, which I have brought out in this rebuttal of objections raised by students of Scripture simply confirm those Facts up to the hilt and add a lot more besides. The critics however, did a lot of research and put up some very good points. I regret that I cannot agree with them but I appreciate their efforts, for a lot more good information has come to light as a result of the research involved in answering their statements.



References:

- A.* Phillips, R.K., *Incontrovertible Facts of the Bible*, Canberra, 1973.
- B.* Phillips, R.K., *It is Written*, Canberra, Reprinted, 1989.
- C. Bullinger, E.W., *The Apocalypse of The Day of The Lord*, Third Edition, Eyrie and Spottiswoode, London. 1935.
- D. Dunbar, G., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 4th Edition, Maclachlan & Stewart, Edinburgh, 1844
- E. Bullinger, E.W., *The Companion Bible*, Samuel Bagster and Sons Limited, London, 1972.
- F. Panin, I., *Numeric English New Testament*, Book Society of Canada, Toronto, 1966.
- G. Bullinger, E.W., *Critical Lexicon and Concordance*, 10th edition, 1971.
- H. Wilson, C., *That Incredible Book, The Bible*, Hill of Content, Melbourne, 1973.
- I. *The Analytical Greek Lexicon*, Samuel Bagster and Sons Limited, London, 1971.
- J. Fenton, F., *The Holy Bible in Modern English*, Destiny Publishers, Massachusetts, 1966.
- K. Hertz, J.H., Editor, *Pentateuch & Haftorahs* Hebrew English Translation and Commentary, First Edition, The Soncino Press, London, 1960. [Second Edition, 1978]
- L. *Concordant Version, The Sacred Scriptures*, New Testament, Concordant Publishing Concern, Canyon Country, California, 1955.
- M. *Lexicon and Concordance*, Concordant Publishing Concern, Canyon County, circa 1955.
- N.* Phillips, R.K., *The Families of the Ground*, Sydney, 1976; Reprinted: April, 1992; Updated: May 1993.
- O.* Adams, J.O., *Is there a Need to be Born Again?* Melbourne.
- P. *The Amplified New Testament*, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1958.
- Q. Arndt, W.F. and Gingrich, F.W. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* Second Edition, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1979.
- R. Wilson, B., *The Emphatic Diaglott*, Recession of Dr. J.J. Griesbach, Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, Brooklyn, New York, 1942.
- S. Vine, W.E., *Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*, Oliphants, London, 1966.
- T. Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Sixth Edition, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1869.
- U. Cohen, A., Editor, *Soncino Books of the Bible*, Soncino Press Ltd, London, 4th Impression, 1968
- V. Ellicott, C.J., *Old Testament Commentary*. Details unknown. [see instead Ellicott, C.J., Editor, *A Bible Commentary for English Readers*, Cassell and Company, London, circa 1900.]

* Papers are available by request or via some British-Israel World Federation bookshops.

Index

I		
1Ch 16:22.....	20	
1Co 2:12-14.....	6, 9	
1Co 2:14.....	25	
1Co 3: 1,2.....	12	
1Co 4: 15.....	9	
1Co 4:15.....	8, 10	
1Co 11: 9.....	25	
1Co 15:28.....	10	
1Jo 3: 9.....	8, 9	
1Pe 1:22,23.....	9	
1Pe 1:23.....	8, 9, 10	
1Pe 2: 5.....	4, 5	
1Pe 2: 5,9.....	4	
1Pe 2: 9.....	4	
1Pe 3: 9.....	25	
1Pe 4:19.....	25	
1Sa 12:24.....	17	
1Th 4:14.....	23	
1Th 4:16.....	24	
2		
2Co 1:21.....	21	
2Co 4: 5.....	24	
2Co 5:17.....	27	
2Ki 15:29.....	5	
2Mac 9: 7.....	14	
A		
Acts 1: 6.....	11	
Acts 1:13.....	15	
Acts 8:14.....	29	
Acts 8:27.....	27	
Acts 9:13.....	3	
Acts 9:14.....	24	
Acts 9:15.....	15, 16, 18	
Acts 10: 1.....	27	
Acts 13:26.....	16, 17	
Acts 13:32,33.....	17	
Acts 17:11.....	1	
Acts 19:10.....	15	
Acts 22:26.....	27	
Acts 26:22.....	15	
C		
Col 1:15.....	3, 26	
Col 1:16.....	3	
Col 1:28.....	24	
Col 3:10.....	25	
D		
Dan 7:13,14,18.....	21	
Dan 7:18,22.....	3	
Dan 12: 1.....	19	
Deu 4:38.....	6	
Deu 7: 1,2.....	6	
Deu 14: 2.....	5	
Deu 25:19.....	6	
Deu 28:10.....	3	
Deu 32:43.....	17, 18	
E		
Enoch 29: 2.....	14	
Eph 2:10,15.....	25	
Eph 3: 9.....	25	
Eph 4:24.....	25	
Eph 6: 2.....	18	
Eph 17: 1.....	14	
Exo 6: 2.....	7	
Exo 6:2,3,6-8.....	7	
Exo 119: 6.....	20	
Exo 15:13.....	19	
Exo 17: 6.....	6	
Exo 19: 6.....	4	
Exo 34:24.....	6	
G		
Gal 3:14.....	23	
Gal 3:16.....	21, 22, 24	
Gal 3:26.....	22, 24	
Gal 3:27.....	28	
Gal 3:28.....	24, 25	
Gal 3:29.....	23	
Gal 6:15.....	25	
Gen 1:26.....	11, 25	
Gen 1:27.....	22	
Gen 12: 5.....	5	
Gen 2: 7.....	6, 11, 24	
Gen 4:16.....	5	
Gen 6: 2.....	11	
Gen 12: 1.....	5	
Gen 12: 3.....	5, 6	
Gen 12: 7.....	5	
Gen 13:10.....	5	
Gen 13:15.....	5	
Gen 13:17.....	5	
Gen 17: 7.....	21	
Gen 18:11-14.....	12	
Gen 18:18.....	6	
Gen 26: 4.....	5	
Gen 26: 5.....	24	
Gen 36:20.....	5	
Gen 48:19.....	13	
H		
Hab 3:1 3.....	20	
Hab 3:13.....	20	
Heb 3: 1.....	24	
Heb 7:11,12,24.....	4	
Heb 11:26.....	23	
I		
Isa 2: 9.....	6	
Isa 5:15.....	6	
Isa 11:11,16.....	19	
Isa 31: 8.....	6	
Isa 44: 7.....	17, 28	
Isa 51: 1,2.....	18	
Isa 51: 2.....	18	
J		
Jer 30:11.....	6	
Jer 31: 1.....	6	
Jer 33:21.....	10	
John 1: 3.....	3	
John 1:11.....	12	
John 1:11-13.....	11, 12	
John 1:13.....	12, 18	
John 3: 3.....	7, 8, 9, 11, 18	
John 3: 3,5.....	7, 9	
John 3: 3,5,8.....	12	
John 3: 5.....	18	
John 3: 8.....	14	
John 3:16.....	10, 11	
John 3:16,17.....	3	
John 3:36.....	18	
John 6:18.....	14	
John 8:47.....	12	
Jos 24:14.....	17	
L		
Lev 25:47.....	12	
Luke 2:10.....	3, 26	
Luke 17:21.....	17	
Luke 18:30.....	18	
M		
Mark 13:18.....	25	
Mark 16:15.....	25, 26	
Mat 7:25,27.....	14	
Mat 8:34.....	8, 26	
Mat 17:21.....	20	
Mat 19:29.....	18	
Mat 24: 2.....	19	
N		
Num 6:26.....	3	
P		
Phi 10.....	9	
Pro 8:22.....	26	
Psa 28: 8.....	20	
Psa 49: 2.....	6	
Psa 62: 9.....	6	
Psa 105: 15.....	20	
Psa 115: 9-11.....	17	
Psa 135: 19-21.....	17	
R		
Rev 5: 9.....	5, 19	
Rev 7: 4.....	19	
Rev 7: 9.....	19	
Rev 9: 9.....	14	
Rev 11:15.....	21	
Rev 11:16.....	21	
Rev 18:20.....	19	
Rev 22:16.....	12	
Rom 1:20.....	25	
Rom 1:25.....	25, 26	
Rom 5:11.....	27	
Rom 5:18.....	3	
Rom 8:16.....	10	
Rom 8:39.....	24	
Rom 9: 3.....	16	
Rom 9:11-13.....	12	
Rom 11:25-27.....	13	
Rom 15:10.....	17, 18	