

**A Companion Booklet
for a New Church Revision of**

The New Testament

**Kempton, Pennsylvania
November, 2002**

A New Church Revision of the New Testament

The base texts for this revision are the translation of the four Gospels by the Rev. John Clowes, published in his commentary in the year 1805, and the book of Revelation found in the English translation by John Whitehead of the *Apocalypse Revealed*. This revision also builds on the work of the Rev. Louis Tafel in the late 1800's, who compiled an exhaustive Greek-Latin vocabulary list showing how the Writings render the Greek words of the New Testament. Combining these with other resources (such as *Searle's Index* and the *Latin of the Writings for Scripture*) into an integrated research application on the computer, we have been able to review and revise Clowes' and Whitehead's translations in detail. There is of course always more to be done, for each word of the original language in each verse of the Sacred Scripture contains Divine truths beyond measure. Indeed we are taught that in the contents of just five verses of the sixth chapter of Matthew, the Lord's Prayer, "there are more things than the universal heaven is capable of comprehending." (AC 6619)

Realizing our limitations, we present here a New Church translation of the New Testament that has been almost 200 years in the making. Our priorities, which are similar to those of Clowes and Tafel, are the following:

First: Faithfulness to the original language of the Letter of the Word, keeping the translation as consistent as possible, in the light of the internal sense and the Latin rendering found in the Heavenly Doctrine.

Second: Maintaining English usage in a reverent style which reflects the fullness, holiness and power of the Letter of the Word; while at the same time striving for clarity of meaning and good style and grammar, so that it may serve as a basis, containant and support for the spiritual meaning within.

Almost always the second priority follows as a consequence of the first, for the Letter of the Word was written in accommodation to the natural mind of the man of this world, and throughout this

work of revision we have sought to find this accommodation in the Word itself. Each word is like a precious stone given to us by the Lord, each phrase and verse is like a jewel, beautifully arranged to reflect and transmit the light of heaven from within, and the more a translation reflects this arrangement and beauty the more the glory of the Lord can be seen. There are aspects of the Sacred Scripture that cannot truly be brought into what we call *standard* English. Nevertheless, a translation faithful to the original text in the light of the Heavenly Doctrine can translate to the average English reader what the Lord has revealed to man. It is with this hope that we offer this present revision of the Sacred Scripture.

In presenting this New Church revision of the New Testament we are well aware of its limitations, its imperfections, and the need for improvements. But rather than wait another one hundred or two hundred years in an effort to make a translation which is both faithful to every word of the original, and acceptable to everyone in the church, we have printed this revision of the New Testament, with the hope of publishing the whole of the Word within a few years. It is our hope that those who read this revision will give us comments and suggestions so that, when we publish the Sacred Scripture in its entirety, we will have the benefit of these ideas.

Revisers: Stephen D. Cole and Andrew J. Heilman, with the help of Roy Odhner, Kate Pitcairn, Charles Cole, and many others.

General Notes by the Revisers

Overall Style: There are many places in the Heavenly Doctrine which speak of the Divine style of the Letter of the Word. In these we read that from the natural viewpoint, “the style is in appearance more humble than is the style which is adapted to the disposition of the world.” We read that it appears commonplace (*vulgaris*), simple and absurd (*simplex et absonus*), not well

worked (*rudis*). To the worldly man it appears to be “written a style so simple and at the same time obscure in so many places that no one could learn anything from it,” and in the style of a sojourner or like a foreigner (*peregrinus*) speaking. (AC 855, 9086:3, 9280:3, HH 310, HD 261, WH 12, SS 1, 3, 8, TCR 189, SD 4757, AE 1065:3, De Verbo 6) And the same passages say that from this natural perspective, the Word does not appear elegant, sublime, brilliant, nor excellent like the style of the learned. To quote more fully from one of these: “In its letter the Word appears like ordinary writing, foreign in style, neither sublime nor brilliant as the writings of the present time are in appearance. For this reason the man who worships nature instead of God or more than God, and whose thought therefore is from himself and his selfhood and not from the Lord out of heaven, may easily fall into error respecting the Word, and into contempt for it, and when reading it may say to himself, What does this and that mean? Is this Divine? Can God, whose wisdom is infinite speak thus? Wherein and wherefrom is its holiness, except from some religious notion and consequent persuasion?” (TCR 189)

“Yet the style of the Word is the Divine style itself, with which no other style can be compared, however sublime and excellent it may seem. The style of the Word is such that there is a holiness in every sentence and in every word, and even in some places in the very letters, and thereby the Word conjoins man with the Lord and opens heaven.” (TCR 191) Clowes was quite aware of teachings like this, and therefore his translation kept very close to the original style of the Greek New Testament. In our revision we have kept this principle. For the most part the words are very simple and commonplace, but there are a few places which appear obscure and foreign and not well worked. In many cases this is simply a question of English style, but in many other cases the obscurity of style comes from the style of the Word itself. We are indeed fortunate that we have Heavenly Doctrine so that we may compare and see what can be changed to some degree, and what should be left as it is. We must recognize that Clowes

translated not only the four Gospels into English, but also much of the Writings themselves. He was well aware of how the Writings themselves render the original Greek into Latin, and from this he drew his principles of translation into English.

Repetition: Repetition abounds in the Old Testament, yet even in the New Testament we find phrases such as “Treasure not up for yourselves treasures on earth,” or concerning the shepherds, that “they feared a great fear.” These may sound redundant or repetitious to the English ear. But we are taught, “He who does not know that the expressions in the Word are significative of spiritual and celestial things, and that some are said of good, and some of truth, cannot but believe that such expressions are mere repetitions, said merely to fill in, and therefore in themselves useless; and from this it is that they who think wrongly about the Word, regard such expressions as ground for contempt; when yet the veriest Divine things are stored therein, namely, the heavenly marriage, which is heaven itself; and the Divine marriage, which is the Lord Himself.” (AC 6343:4) And similarly when two different words are used which have similar meaning we are taught, “This is not merely a repetition for the sake of emphasizing the matter,” but is representative of the heavenly marriage within the Word. (AC 9314, see also AC 683, AC 9661)

Clowes often remarked on this heavenly marriage in his notes on translation. For example in his note about “mourning, and weeping, and much lamentation,” in Matthew 2:18 he writes: “This is one of those passages, amongst many others of a similar kind, which demonstrate the Divinity and spirituality of the Word, by proving it to contain a spiritual sense and meaning distinct from that of the letter, and also to be written with a view to the heavenly marriage of goodness and truth. For if this was not the case, the three terms, mourning, weeping, and lamentation, must be regarded merely as repetitions, and as having no use but to heighten the sense of the letter, which is a mode of expression utterly unworthy of the Divine Author.” It is also true that when these words are used separately the subject may be that of good

and the will, or that of truth and the understanding, depending on the specific word used. Therefore, even more than Clowes himself, we have paid close attention to consistency of the translation of each word in this revision, so that the distinction and the marriage of good and truth might be brought over into this translation as much as possible. (SS 81)

The Marriage of Good and Truth: “That the Word is holy, and in its interiors most holy, is very evident from the fact that in every detail of the Word there is the heavenly marriage, that is, the marriage of good and truth, thus heaven; and that in every detail of the inmost sense there is the marriage of the Lord’s Divine Human with His kingdom and church; nay, in the supreme sense there is the union of the Divine Itself and the Divine Human in the Lord. These most holy things are in every detail of the Word—a manifest proof that the Word has descended from the Divine. That this is so may be seen from the fact that where mention is made of good, mention is made of truth also; and where the internal is spoken of, the external also is spoken of. There are also words which constantly signify good, and words which constantly signify truth, and words which signify both good and truth; and if they do not signify them, still they are predicated of them, or involve them. From the predication and signification of these words it is plain that, as before said, in every detail there is the marriage of good and truth, that is, the heavenly marriage, and in the inmost and supreme sense the Divine marriage which is in the Lord, thus the Lord Himself.” (AC 6343:2)

There are many other teachings in the Writings which speak of the marriage of good and truth in the Letter of the Word, and how certain words refer to good and others to truth, and some to both together. Clowes notes this many times throughout his translator’s notes, and it is perhaps one of the most important aspects of the style of the Sacred Scripture, for holiness comes when good and truth are conjoined in a spiritual marriage. Expressions such as “nation and people,” “joy and gladness,” “mourning and

weeping,” and “justice and judgment” are examples of words used together to represent this marriage. (SS 84) Although this is far more apparent in the Old Testament, especially in the Psalms and Isaiah, we find it throughout the New Testament as well. For a testament is a covenant, and a covenant is a conjunction and a marriage of what is good with what is true. This testament or covenant is especially evident in the Holy Supper, in respect to the Lord’s Divine Good and Truth, represented by His body and blood and the bread and wine. But we find this covenant throughout the whole of the Word in both Testaments. We hope that this translation will fully convey this covenant to the reader.

Plural and Singular: Related to the distinction and marriage of good and truth is the use of the singular and the plural in the letter of the Word. The singular and plural are not used simply to relate how many people are involved in a conversation or action, they also reflect the internal sense within. Because of this, at times, the normal grammatical structure may bend to accommodate the spiritual meaning within. For example we may occasionally find a plural subject taking a singular verb (AC 30). “A thing in the singular involves good, in the plural truths,” “for truths are many but good is one.” (AE 761, AC 10154) The plural is used when things of the understanding are treated of, and the singular when things of the will are treated of. (AC 712) We see this reflected when the Lord teaches us to pray. First He says, “When thou prayest” (in the singular), and directs us in what we should do when we pray and why we should pray. Two verses later He says, “When you pray” (in the plural) and directs us in the words we should say and the ideas of our prayer. Although we have modernized the English in Clowes’ translation in many ways, we have retained his use of “thou” and “thee” in order to keep the distinction between the singular and the plural for the sake of the internal sense, which is found in every aspect of the Sacred Scripture.

Consistency of Translation: In order to manifest the distinction and marriage of good and truth, we have tried to make this translation as consistent as possible when bringing each Greek word into English. The common practice of translation is to carry across (translate) the meaning from one language to another, and often this is done with little consistency as to the actual words. For example, there are four distinct Greek words in Matthew which are rendered “mourn” or “mourning” in the King James Version. The Heavenly Doctrine renders these words by four distinct Latin words, and following this principle, Clowes uses four distinct English words, “mourn,” “lament,” “grieve,” and “wail.” Each of these words contains something different in the internal sense, which especially manifests itself when they are used together. This principle of consistent translation is taught directly in the Writings in many places (AC 566, 1259:2, AE 468, etc.)

There are times, however, when the spread of meaning of an English word does not line up with the spread of meaning of a Greek Word. In these cases, again following the usual practice of the Writings, we have used a different English word. One example is the Greek word for “let” or “leave” which also means “forgive” or “remit.” The meanings are clearly connected, in that forgiveness is to let something go, not to impute something to the person, although it has come to mean “pardon” and “excuse,” which are quite different words in Greek and Latin. However it is clear that we need to use two or three different words in different places to render this Greek word clearly into English. We must heed the warning given to translators in the Spiritual Diary who stick to words instead of meaning. (SD 2040).

Sometimes we find ourselves in the reverse situation, where the English language does not have enough words to express the differences in meaning between two Greek words. One example of this is the word “temple,” which is used for both “*ναος*” (naos) and “*ιερον*” (hieron). The Writings consistently render both of

these words only as *templum*, but the two words do have a distinction. The *ἱερον* refers to the whole structure, courts included, whereas the *ναος* refers to the sanctuary itself. Another example is the word “time”; time itself is expressed by the Greek word *χρονος* (*chronos*), but a duration of time is expressed by *καιρος* (*kairos*). Again the Heavenly Doctrine uses only one word, *tempus*, to render both Greek words. In both of these cases we have followed the example of the Writings and used one English word, “temple” for *ναος* (*naos*) and *ἱερον*, and “time” for *χρονος* and *καιρος*. However, to show the reader there is a distinction, we have put a little circle (°) after the less common word, which is explained in the following section.

Markings and Font Types:

Italics: For centuries translators have used italics to indicate words added to help the meaning. Like Clowes, and especially the Heavenly Doctrine, we have tried to keep these added words to a minimum, as these inserted words do not actually contain an internal sense. In this present edition, following the practice of the first King James Version edition, we have used a smaller font size in italics to indicate words added by the translators or revisers. However, we use full sized italics to show words which have been added by the Heavenly Doctrines themselves. An example of this can be seen in Revelation, Chapter 8, where the word “part” (*pars*) is found in the Latin of the *Apocalypse Revealed* but not in the original Greek, although it is clearly understood. Where we have done this in the Gospels we have tried to include a footnote to the Writings to show where to find this inserted word.

Connected Words: It is remarkable, when comparing the Latin of the Writings to the original Greek or Hebrew, to see a very consistent one-to-one relationship between the words in each, and in the original order as well. But there are times, even in the Heavenly Doctrine, when two or more words are needed to convey the meaning of a single Greek word. As the internal

sense is expressed by each word in the original language, we thought it best to convey to the reader when two words should be taken together as one distinct idea. To indicate this we have used a special symbol to show that these words are actually one word in the original. Some examples of this are the words “little^child,” and “take^hold,” and “deliver^him^up.” In this last example “deliver^up” is one word and “him” another.

Circles: As mentioned in the previous section, there are cases when the same English word had to be used to indicate two fairly different words in Greek. For example when the Lord fed the five thousand the Greek word for the baskets used to gather what remained is *κοφινος* (*cophinus* in the Latin of the Heavenly Doctrine), but when He fed the four thousand the word for baskets is *σπυρις* (*sporta* in Latin). Rather than lose this distinction in the original, especially when these two words are used in close proximity, we have marked the less common word with a little circle following the word. For example: “Do you not yet consider, neither remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets you took? Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets° you took?” Very rarely, an English word is used for three Greek words. In this case another mark is used to indicate the third word, for example, “I suppose⁴ that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.” In the *Translation Notes*, spoken of in the last section of this booklet, there is a section which explains the words followed by these marks (° and ⁴).

It is hoped that these symbols, like the italics of previous editions, will not draw undue attention to themselves, that they will enhance rather than detract. We hope that these things will be seen as a reflection of the internal sense of the Word, although we realize that we cannot present the Word in the same way that it is presented in Heaven. “It is a wonderful thing that the Word in the heavens is so written that the simple understand it in simplicity, and the wise in wisdom, for there are many points and marks over the letters, which as has been said exalt the meaning, and to

these the simple do not attend, nor are they even aware of them; whereas the wise pay attention to them, each one according to his wisdom, even to the highest wisdom. . . . Our Word is indeed like that in heaven, but this is effected in a different way.” (SS 72)

Participles and Verb Tense: One of the most noticeable aspects of Clowes’ translation is his close adherence to the verb forms in the original language whenever possible, especially in the use of participles. Clowes knew his Greek very well and we might wonder why he did not follow the common practice of other English translations, and translate these participles into the simple past tense. For example in Matthew 9:22 we find the words, “But Jesus turning and seeing her, said, Be of good courage, daughter, thy faith hath saved thee.” (see AE 815:4) Most English translations have something like, “But Jesus turned around, and when He saw her He said. . .” But when we compare Clowes’ translation to that in the Writings we find a similar and even more consistent adherence to this aspect of the original language in the Writings themselves. (See Matt 6:6 and AE 695:5, AC 5694:4.) Translating the Greek participles as participles carries across something of the timelessness of the Lord’s Advent.

Another aspect of the Greek New Testament which reflects the eternal nature of the Lord’s Advent is the use of the present tense. In many places where we would expect to find a past tense to agree with the tense of the other verbs, we find the use of the present tense instead. The King James Version was very faithful in keeping this present tense. We chose to preserve the present tense, not just to be faithful to the original, but also to reflect the continued presence of the Lord in His Word. The timelessness is even further reflected in the original Greek in the aorist tense, which in itself is neither past, present nor future. This is often rendered in by a simple past in most translations, as English, like Latin, lacks such a verb tense.

Modern English: In many ways the most difficult decisions in the revision of Clowes’ translation have been, not with the style

of the Word, but with the style of English. We do not have the space in this companion booklet to fully discuss this question, but we are well aware that this question is very important to many people, in the New Church and in the Christian world as a whole. However, although this is an important question, we do not consider it the reason why we need a New Church Translation. If it was simply a question of modernizing the English, many current translations would suffice. The reason for a New Church translation is to bring across, as much as possible, the fullness, holiness and power of the Letter of the Word as the basis, containant and support of the internal sense within, through which man is conjoined with the Lord and heaven is opened. (See the note on overall style above.)

For some the older English style, although reverent, seems too removed and sublime and difficult to understand. For others this older English style is closely associated with the holiness of the Word. In working on this revision we have found among our readers a great variety of thought and affection in regard to the style of the English. Some would like it fully modernized; others would prefer it left in the style of Clowes and Tafel, which is similar to that of the King James Version. We have chosen to modernize to some extent, but in such a way as to keep the style both reverent and familiar. But our real concern is not with the style of the English, but the “style” of the Word. (AC 66) In doing this modernization there are aspects which we did not change, as they convey to the reader not simply reverence of style but also meaning, both in the literal sense and in the spiritual. An example of this is discussed in the section on the plural and singular.

In modernizing some things and not others, we realize that the English style will appear different from what you may have encountered before, either in the King James Version or in more modern translations. It is our hope that this difference will not draw attention to the wording itself, but rather to the internal sense within. For example, we have modernized the word “ye” to “you” in most cases, but have retained “ye” when it is used

with an imperative. Modern English makes no distinction between the plural and the singular in the imperative, yet in Clowes' translation, like the King James Version, "ye" is used with the imperative to indicate the plural. For example, when the Lord says, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God" (Matt. 6:33), He is using the plural, whereas at other times in the Sermon on the Mount, He addresses the disciples in the singular. This distinction would be lost if we followed the modern English usage of using the imperative without a pronoun. But if we changed "ye" to "you" in this case, it would sound too forceful in modern English usage. Also this use of "ye" with an imperative is still quite common and familiar, even today, as in the phrases "hear ye" and "praise ye the Lord."

Perhaps if the translation of the Word had been modernized gradually, keeping the distinctions of the original language, this style would sound more familiar to us today. This style was used by Rev. O. Prescott Hiller in his *Notes on the Psalms* in the late 1800's, and this blend of style is also found in several of the hymns in use in the New Church. For example, we find the words, "O Thou whose power o'er moving worlds presides (not presideth)," yet few have noticed this mix of modern English with the singular pronoun for the Lord. The same occurs in the familiar song "Wake, awake"; in the same verse that we sing, "She wakes, she rises from her gloom" (not waketh and riseth), we also sing "Where Thou hast bid us sup with Thee." As we sing in celebration of the wedding of the New Church with her Bridegroom, these words lose neither reverence nor closeness with the Lord. It is our hope that a similar blend of English in this revision will not detract from the meaning or holiness of the Lord's words, but rather increase the reader's awareness of the power and truth within. At the same time we realize that the style of English is not the essential of the Word, but only a means by which the Lord can speak with us.

Variety of Translation: Directly related to the question of modernization comes the question of variety in translation. But

variety of translation is not limited to the style of English, for it is something given to us by the Lord Himself. The first and great commandment is a wonderful example of the Lord's variety in reaching out to man. In Deuteronomy where this commandment is first given, we find the words, "Thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy forces." (Deut 6:5; see AE 427:8) Yet when the Lord refers to this commandment in Matthew He translates it or brings it across into the New Testament with something of a variation: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind." (Matt 22:37) And in Mark He says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God from thy whole heart, and from thy whole soul, and from thy whole mind, and from thy whole strength." (Mark 12:30) In Luke we are given yet another variation: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God from thy whole heart and from thy whole soul, and from thy whole strength, and from thy whole thought." (Luke 10:27) And even in the Writings we find some variety in translation. (TCR 483:3) The Letter of the Word contains within it so much that quite often one translation cannot convey the full meaning of the literal sense.

With so much variety of translation in the New Testament, and especially in the Writings, we can see that the New Church must be careful not to establish just one translation as a standard. The Roman Catholic Church translated the Vulgate so that the common people (*vulgares*) could read the Word. Yet this translation became the fixed standard for centuries, and from Papal authority it became the one and only translation of the church. Shortly after the establishment of the Church of England, the King James Version was established as the Authorized Version, and although a reverent and fairly accurate translation, it was by no means perfect, for no translation can contain and express fully the Divine truth revealed by the Lord.

Yet we can also err in the other direction. Although the Lord has given us much variety in how the Word can be translated, we

must be careful that we do not fall into the error of thinking that any translation will convey the power and holiness of the Letter of the Word or contain and support the internal sense. Even the examples of the first and great commandment in the preceding paragraph are quite consistent. The Writings are very precise in how they render the Hebrew and Greek for heart and soul, in marked contrast with many translations that render these words in both the Old and New Testament with remarkable diversity. In the King James Version “heart” is often translated as mind, understanding and wisdom, and “soul” is translated as life, heart and even self. Yet the distinction between heart and soul is the same as that between the will and the understanding, between love and wisdom. There will be, and should be, variety in translations of the Word, but we believe it should be within limits, which limits are demonstrated clearly by the Lord Himself, and now revealed in His Second Coming.

Capitalization: Throughout this revision of the New Testament we have kept to the practice of Clowes and also Tafel, which is firmly established in the Writings, of capitalizing the personal pronouns referring to the Lord. In some cases, such as in Matthew 3:16, this can make a difference how the Word is understood. We know from the Heavenly Doctrine that it was John who saw the Holy Spirit descending as a dove upon the Lord, (TCR 144), yet the New King James Version, by its capitalization makes it the Lord who sees this dove. Yet, for now, we have followed Clowes and Tafel in leaving the relative pronoun (who, whom, whose), when referring to the Lord in lower case, but we acknowledge that this also is often capitalized in the Latin of the Writings.

One specific case which is worthy of note is the pronoun referring to the Holy Spirit. We have departed from the common English practice of capitalizing the pronouns referring to the Holy Spirit as this is not a person, but the Divine proceeding, much like the Lord’s Divine Providence. It is also the common practice of the Writings not to capitalize this pronoun, quite probably for this

reason.

We have also adopted the practice from the Writings of capitalizing nouns which refer directly to the Lord, such as Lamb of God, the good Shepherd, the little Child. But when these refer only indirectly to the Lord in a parable, again following the usual practice of the Writings, we do not capitalize these nouns. In some cases it was difficult to decide, as certain nouns would be capitalized in some places in the Writings and not in others.

“And” and “But”: Throughout the New Testament we find the continuous use of the word “and” in the Clowes’ translation. Like the King James Version, Clowes is careful to translate this word consistently, even though it seems repetitious. Modern translations, like the New King James Version, tend away from this word, either using a variety of words, or simply omitting it altogether. Yet this word “and” serves to both connect and distinguish one idea from another, and in this respect is like the speech of angels. We have followed Clowes in retaining this word in translation, although at times it may appear repetitious and even monotonous if we are not aware of the spiritual origin of this style of speech, and of why it is also found so much in the New Testament as well as the Old. (AC 5578, HH 241)

In Hebrew there is one word for both “and” and “but.” However in Greek we find three commonly used words, “*και*,” “*δε*,” and “*αλλα*.” The first word, “*και*,” is clearly like our word “and,” perhaps a little stronger, like “also.” The last word, “*αλλα*,” is like our “but,” perhaps a little stronger, approaching “however” in English. But the middle word, “*δε*,” is in between our words “and” and “but” and can be translated either way. Clowes chose to translate “*δε*” almost always as “but” to make a distinction from “*και*.” In many cases we have changed this to “and” as it may sound strange in English and there is no real change taking place in the direction of the narrative. We regret that we do not have another word in English to show this distinction. We have put a little circle following “and” or “but” when this is the

Greek word “*δε*” and not “*και*” or “*αλλα*.” (See above, in the section *Markings and Font Types*.)

Amen: Following the consistent practice of the Heavenly Doctrine we have retained the Hebrew word *Amen*, whenever it occurs in the Greek. Leaving this word as *Amen* is further supported by several teachings in the Writings, as in the *Apocalypse Explained*: “The Lord calls Himself the ‘Amen,’ because ‘amen’ signifies verity, thus the Lord Himself, because when He was in the world He was Divine verity itself, or Divine truth itself. It was for this reason that He so often said ‘Amen,’ and ‘Amen, amen’ as in Matt. 5:18, 26; 6:16; 10:23, 42; 17:20; 18:3, 13, 18; 24:2; 28:20, and in John 1:51, . . .” (AE 228:3) The English reader is accustomed to using *Amen* when it follows a statement, as at the end of the Lord’s Prayer and at the end of each Gospel and Revelation. Yet as we can see from the book of Revelation, *Amen* can begin or end a statement: “And all the angels stood around the throne, and the elders, and the four animals, and fell before the throne on their faces, and adored God, saying, Amen; blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might, be unto our God, for ages of ages, Amen.” (Rev 7:11.12) The Writings explain this as follows: “In this verse ‘Amen’ is said at the beginning, and again at the end; when it is said at the beginning it signifies truth, and thence confirmation; but when at the end, it signifies the confirmation and consent of all, that it is the truth.” (AR 375)

Footnotes and the Translation Notes: We purposely have kept footnotes to a minimum. We set as our guide for footnotes things that might be useful to know in personal devotional reading or family worship. The footnotes we have included are generally of four kinds: references to quotations from the Old Testament; a more literal translation of a specific Greek word; brief explanations of Greek or Roman coins or measures; and notes that will help with the understanding of the literal sense, usually with a reference to the Writings.

There could have been many more notes, both as to vocabulary and specific verses. Clowes made many notes on his translation of the Four Gospels, and there are also some notes about the Greek found in the *Apocalypse Revealed* and the *Apocalypse Explained*. There are also many things we have come across as we prepared this revision, which explain some of the reasoning behind certain decisions. However, instead of weighing down a translation of the Sacred Scripture with all of these notes, we decided to put them into a detailed volume of *Translation Notes*, which includes three sections:

- 1) General principles and comments about this translation of the New Testament. (This section is similar to what is presented in this booklet.)
- 2) Comments about specific vocabulary words arranged in alphabetical order of the English “equivalent.” (All of the words with little circles after them are included in this section, as well as others which warranted a specific note.)
- 3) Notes about the translation or meaning of a specific verse. (This kind of note contains an explanation of an unexpected wording or a difficult reading, or some other interesting point in connection with the original language.)

To obtain the more detailed *Translation Notes*, please contact Andrew Heilman at 1050 Mountain Road, Kempton PA, 19529 or andrewj@entermail.net or 610-756-4415. It will be available for the cost of copying and postage, or for free in electronic form over the internet. This present revision of the New Testament, together with this *Companion Booklet* and the *Translation Notes*, will also be available on CD. For more information, and free downloads, please visit our web site at www.kemptonproject.org.