

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

**The Sacred Scripture  
or  
The Word of the Lord**

KEMPTON, PENNSYLVANIA  
June 2018  
In the 248<sup>th</sup> Year of the Lord's Second Advent

## **A New Church Revision of The Word**

*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. They are 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, but a translation faithful to the original text in the light of the Heavenly Doctrine can convey to the English reader what the Lord has revealed to man. It is with this hope that we offer this present revision of the Sacred Scripture.*

# Table of Contents

<b>A New Church Revision of The Word</b> .....	<b><u>3</u></b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b><u>7</u></b>
What is a New Church Translation?.....	<u>7</u>
<i>A translation of the Hebrew (Old Testament) and Greek (New Testament) in the light of the Heavenly Doctrine</i>	
Our Priorities.....	<u>8</u>
<i>Maintaining the purity and integrity, the urim and thummim, of the Word</i>	
<b>The Marriage of Good and Truth</b> .....	<b><u>10</u></b>
Dual Expressions.....	<u>10</u>
<i>Paired words indicate a conjunction of good and truth (“joy and gladness,” “poor and needy”)</i>	
Repetition.....	<u>11</u>
<i>Because of the marriage of good and truth there are many places in the Word where we see repetition, such as “dying thou shalt die.”</i>	
Consistency of Translation.....	<u>12</u>
<i>Translating a word in the original language consistently with the same English word whenever possible allows the marriage of good and truth to appear.</i>	
<b>Grammar</b> .....	<b><u>14</u></b>
Singular and Plural.....	<u>14</u>
<i>Singular relates to good and plural to truth.</i>	
The Second Person Pronoun.....	<u>15</u>
<i>“Thou” is used to preserve the singular as distinct from the plural, “you.”</i>	
Verbs of the Original Languages.....	<u>16</u>
<i>The timelessness of the Lord’s Advent is seen in aspects of the verbs in the original language, such as the use of participles and the present tense.</i>	
The Conjunction “And”.....	<u>18</u>
<i>“And” both distinguishes and conjoins ideas. It ties words together in the manner of the speech of celestial angels.</i>	
<b>Style of the Word</b> .....	<b><u>19</u></b>
The Divine Style.....	<u>19</u>
<i>The Divine style is such that there is a holiness in every sentence and word, and even the letters. Keeping close to the style of the Hebrew and Greek keeps the translation closer to this Divine style.</i>	
Concrete Imagery.....	<u>20</u>
<i>The Word, in order to be Divine, must be wholly natural in the letter, and keeping the concrete imagery preserves the correspondence.</i>	

The Human Form.....	<a href="#"><u>21</u></a>
<i>The correspondence with the human form is evident in the the original language, as in “the mouth of the sword” and “the ribs of the mountain.”</i>	
<b>Style of the Translation.....</b>	<a href="#"><b><u>23</u></b></a>
Modern English Style.....	<a href="#"><u>23</u></a>
<i>This revision is a blend of older and more modern English. The goal is to allow the internal sense to shine through.</i>	
Variety of Translation.....	<a href="#"><u>24</u></a>
<i>No one translation can convey the full meaning, and the New Church should not establish a single standard translation. But principles of translation are found in the Heavenly Doctrine that preclude too much variety.</i>	
<b>Punctuation, Markings and Notes.....</b>	<a href="#"><b><u>26</u></b></a>
Capitalization.....	<a href="#"><u>26</u></a>
<i>The personal pronouns referring to the Lord are capitalized, in accordance with the practice of the Heavenly Doctrine.</i>	
Direct Speech and Quotation Marks.....	<a href="#"><u>27</u></a>
<i>Because of the nature of direct speech in the Sacred Scripture, we do not use quotation marks.</i>	
Italics.....	<a href="#"><u>28</u></a>
<i>Italics indicate inserted words, small-font italics for words inserted by us, and large-font italics for those inserted by the Heavenly Doctrine.</i>	
Markings.....	<a href="#"><u>28</u></a>
<i>Special markings in the text show the reader important distinctions in the original language.</i>	
Footnotes.....	<a href="#"><u>29</u></a>
<i>Footnotes are limited to those that would be useful for devotional reading and family worship.</i>	
<b>Words from the Original Language.....</b>	<a href="#"><b><u>30</u></b></a>
Names of people and places.....	<a href="#"><u>30</u></a>
<i>We have followed the Heavenly Doctrine in how we render proper names.</i>	
Names of the Lord.....	<a href="#"><u>30</u></a>
<i>The Heavenly Doctrine uses the name Jehovah in the Old Testament, so that is what we do.</i>	
Hebrew words.....	<a href="#"><u>31</u></a>
<i>Some Hebrew words are left as transliterations, such as the “dudaim” that Reuben found.</i>	

Units and Measures.....[32](#)  
*Words for measures are not converted to modern measures because it is important to keep the original numbers, such as “two or three measures” instead of “twenty or thirty gallons.”*

Amen.....[33](#)  
*This word is left as “amen” instead of “verily,” “truly,” etc., following the clear teaching of the Writings.*

**Appendix I.....[34](#)**  
*Base texts for this revision and other resources*

# Introduction

## What is a New Church Translation?

“The style of the Word is such that there is holiness in every sentence, and in every word, and in some places in even the very letters. This is why the Word conjoins man with the Lord, and opens heaven. From the Lord proceed two things: Divine love, and Divine wisdom... and in its essence the Word is both of these; and as it conjoins man with the Lord, and opens heaven, it follows that the man who reads it from the Lord, and not from himself alone, is filled by it with the good of love and the truths of wisdom; his will with the good of love, and his understanding with the truths of wisdom. In this way man has life by means of the Word.” (SS 3)

In order to make a “New Church” translation of Scripture, it is first necessary to establish what the purposes of the sense of the letter are. For no translation is perfect; every translation will preserve some things from the original and lose others. In order to set priorities as to what to try to preserve, one must look to the Heavenly Doctrine. As we see in the passage above, the Word was given to conjoin man with the Lord, to open heaven, to fill man with the good of love and the truths of wisdom, and thereby to give him life.

The sense of the letter can serve these functions because the spiritual and celestial things of the Word are in it and founded upon it by means of correspondences. (SS 8) The conclusion from this, simple and obvious yet profound, is that a New Church translation of the Word must strive to preserve the correspondential basis of the sense of the letter. For example, it is key to preserve the numbers mentioned in Scripture (e.g., not changing “sixty stadia” to “seven miles”), because the numbers have correspondences. Or again, it is crucial to preserve imagery invoking parts of the human body (e.g., not changing “heart” to “middle”). More will be said about this below.

There are different standards whereby one might judge the “accuracy” of a translation. The standard to which we are trying to adhere is reflected in a statement that Swedenborg himself made, while working on the *Word Explained*, as to why he preferred Schmidius to other Latin translations of the Word:

“The translators themselves...have given little study to the translation of the exact words of the text from their fountain head as done by Schmidius, but, in the case of many of

them, have studied merely elegances of speech. Hence the words themselves have been changed [for words] which involve mere history. Thus they entirely take away the light which lies solely in the sense evolved from the exact words.” (WE 2073)

As Swedenborg here suggests, the only way to make a translation through which the light of the spiritual sense can shine is to translate, as much as possible, word for word. The images, the idioms, the turns of phrase of the Hebrew and Greek have to be preserved, for it is only through these things that the spiritual benefits of the Word can be conveyed by correspondence.

Also, to be clear, this revision is based on the original Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New Testament, not on the Latin translations of these found in the Heavenly Doctrine. One could argue, and some New Church translators have so argued, that the rendering in the Heavenly Doctrine should be taken as definitive. Our position, first defined by Louis Tafel more than a hundred years ago, is that when the Latin of the Heavenly Doctrine clearly diverges from the Hebrew or Greek original, it is no more “correcting” the original than is the Greek New Testament “correcting” the Hebrew when its quotations from the Old Testament do not agree with the Hebrew text. Rather it is giving a more interior perspective on the meaning of the text. That being said, the Heavenly Doctrine frequently gives guidance as to how the Hebrew or Greek should be read, as when it identifies ambiguous texts and tells us which alternative embodies the spiritual sense (e.g., AC 2559).

Our approach, therefore, is to translate the Hebrew and Greek in the light of the Heavenly Doctrine.

This revision is based, as much as possible, on existing New Church translations. The names of two of the translators are mentioned several times in this booklet. John Clowes and Louis Tafel provided a great deal of research into what the Writings say about translation, as well as applying those studies to their translations. The details of the translation sources are listed in the appendix.

## **Our Priorities**

“All answers from heaven have been made, and are made, through such things as are of the sense of the letter. For this reason the Urim and Thummim in the breastplate of Aaron, his outmost vesture, represented the sense of the letter. ... wherefore responses were given by this to Moses and Aaron. (De Verbo 20:3) And elsewhere we are taught that “by the Urim and Thummim [were represented] the brilliancy of Divine Truth from Divine Good in ultimates: for Urim is a shining fire, and Thummim brilliancy in the

angelic language, and integrity in the Hebrew.” (SS 44:3)

And concerning the need for the Word in the church we read: “It is well known that a church is like her doctrine, and the Word is the source of doctrine. Yet it is not doctrine which establishes a church, but the integrity and purity of its doctrine, and consequently its understanding of the Word.” (TCR 245)

When we put these two teachings together, we see that for the *urim* and *thummim*—the shining fire and the brilliancy of genuine good and truth—to shine through the letter, for answers to come to us from heaven in the Word, we must have purity and integrity in our doctrine and teaching from the Word, and in our translation of the Word. The English word purity comes from the Greek word for fire, and the Hebrew word *urim* means shining fire. Fire relates to purity, for fire purifies the gold and silver, removing the dross and leaving the pure precious metal. Integrity is the meaning of the Hebrew word *thummim*, which is wholeness and completeness. Integrity relates to brilliance, like all the facets of a precious stone, reflecting the light of truth.

Thus a translation which has integrity and purity, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, can transmit and reflect the heat and light of heaven to the reader in its fullness, holiness and power, like the *urim* and *thummim* of Aaron’s breastplate. To seek to accomplish this as best we can we have set the following priorities:

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 suitable style and grammar, so that it may serve as a basis, containant and support for the spiritual meaning within.

In presenting this New Church revision of the Word, we are well aware of its limitations, its imperfections, and the need for improvements. But we believe it is now a better translation for the New church than others that are available.

Two hundred years ago, the Rev. John Clowes started this translation effort, but was unable to complete it. We do not want another two hundred years to pass before a New Church translation is available.

It is our hope that those who read this revision will give us comments and suggestions so that, when we publish a more definitive translation in a few years, we will have the benefit of these ideas.

# 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 that 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)

## Dual Expressions

We find that most of the examples of the marriage of good and truth in the Word are where two different words or phrases are used to express the same basic meaning. This is especially true in the Psalms and the book of Isaiah. For example:

*They that wait upon Jehovah shall be renewed in strength, they shall mount up with strong wing as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint (Isa. 40:31);*

*‘to be renewed in strength’ is to grow as to the willing of good; and ‘to mount up with strong wing as eagles’ is to grow as to the understanding of truth, thus as to the rational. The subject is set forth here as elsewhere by two expressions, one of which involves the good which is of the will, and the other the truth which is of the understanding; and the case is the same with the expressions, ‘they shall run and not be weary, and shall walk and not faint.’ (AC 3901)*

There are many other teachings in the Heavenly Doctrine that speak of this 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. This 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 marriage and expressed in a natural form. 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, 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 by the bread and the wine. But this covenant is found throughout the whole of the Word in both Testaments. We hope that this translation will fully convey this covenant to the reader.

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.” Therefore 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) For 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)

## **Repetition**

Repetitions abound in the letter of the Word. These may sound redundant 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)

A word is repeated to show a relation both to the understanding and to the will. Because

of this we find not only the repetition of words, but even whole stories. For example the creation story is told in Genesis 1, and then again in a different way in Genesis 2. Also in the story of the flood we find two different accounts of the animals going into the ark (Genesis 6 and 7).

But this repetition is not just in stories, but in wording as well. It is especially common in Hebrew to find the same word repeated again right after the other: for example, what is often rendered as “to all generations” is actually in the Hebrew “to generations and generations.” And even more commonly we find the verb and the object to be almost the same word. Instead of “he offered a sacrifice,” it is usually said “he sacrificed a sacrifice.” We also find other expressions such as dreamed a dream, or he vowed a vow. And 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.” We have tried whenever possible to show this repetition, because it is also an expression of the marriage of good and truth. (See above, AC 6343:4)

But perhaps the most common example of repetition of words in the letter of the Word is exemplified in the phrase, “Dying thou shalt die”.

Here the Hebrew uses the same verb twice, adding an infinitive form to strengthen a verb. Most English translations translate such doubling of the verb as simply intensifying it, as “thou shalt surely die”. But this loses the Hebrew repetition, which is preserved in the Writings. This repetition in Hebrew is even kept when quoted in the Greek of the New Testament. And thus we read that “he who speaks evil of father or mother, let him *die the death*” (Mark 7:10 quoting Ex. 20:12). And, in Matthew the Lord quoted Isaiah, saying, “By hearing you shall hear and shall not understand, and seeing you shall see and shall not perceive.” (Matthew 13:14, Isaiah 6:9, 10) Since the Heavenly Doctrine consistently maintains this repetition in the Latin, we have chosen in the Kempton Revision to follow the Lord’s wording, both in His First Advent, and in His Second. We realize that this may at first be difficult for the English ear, but gradually, with use, the power and fullness of this form of expression will be both felt and appreciated.

## **Consistency of Translation**

We are taught in the work, the Divine Providence, “that the form makes a one the more perfectly as the things entering into the form are distinctly different and yet united.” This can be “illustrated by the marriage of good and truth, in that the more distinctly these are two, the more perfectly they can make a one; and the same is true of love and wisdom; while what is not distinct is mixed up, giving rise to every imperfection of form.” (DP 4)

It is common practice to translate meaning, rather than 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 translates these words using four distinct English words, “mourn,” “lament,” “grieve” and “wail.” Each of these words contains something different in the internal sense. In order to keep the distinction, and thus manifest the marriage of good and truth more clearly when they are used together in the letter of the Word, we have tried to translate each word in the original languages consistently. This principle of consistent translation is taught directly in the Writings in many places (AC 566, 1259:2, AE 468, etc.).

However there are times when the spread of meaning of an English word does not line up with the spread of meaning of a Hebrew or Greek word. For example, the Greek word for “let” or “leave” also means, “forgive” or “remit.” The meanings are clearly connected, in that forgiveness is to let something go by not imputing an evil to someone. However, it is clear that we need to use at least two different English words to render this Greek word accurately in English. We must heed the warning given to translators in the Spiritual Diary who stick to words instead of meaning. (SD 2040)

On the other hand, sometimes we find the reverse situation. For example, both of the Greek words, ναός (*naos*) and ἱερόν (*hieron*), denote a temple, and English does not have words to distinguish the two, so we use the word “temple” to translate both. The two Greek words do have a difference in meaning—*hieron* refers to the whole structure, courts included, whereas the *naos* refers to the sanctuary itself—so the internal sense is also different. To make the difference apparent to the reader, we add a little circle (temple<sup>o</sup>) when we translate *naos*. In this case, the Writings also consistently render both of these words as *templum*.

Again, the Greek word χρόνος (*chronos*), which means time itself, and καιρός (*kairos*), which means a duration of time, are both translated “time” (and *tempus* in the Writings). But we add the mark (time<sup>o</sup>) when translating *chronos*.

# Grammar

## Singular and Plural

In the Sacred Scripture, 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) “A thing in the singular involves good, in the plural truths,” “for truths are many but good is one.” (AE 761, AC 10154)

The use of singular and plural serves as a bridge from the previous section to this section on grammar, for the marriage of good and truth is wonderfully reflected when the Sacred Scripture uses the singular and plural together.

The two most common Divine names in the Old Testament provide the most striking example of this. The name Jehovah is in the singular, and signifies the Divine Love, while the name God (*Elohim*), although usually rendered in the singular, is actually a plural word in Hebrew. “The expression ‘*Elohim*’ is used in the plural, because by truth Divine are meant all truths which are from the Lord.” (AC 4402:5) Thus, “in the original language the plural word ‘*Elohim*’ is used to denote God; for truths are many but good is one.” (AC 10154) “Thus arises the name ‘*Elohim*’ or ‘God’ in the plural, as in the Word almost everywhere.” (AC 6003)

When the subject treated of is the will and good, and the celestial church, we find the name Jehovah used; when the subject is the understanding and truth, and the spiritual church, the name God is used. In fact, as was noted in the section on repetition, sometimes whole stories are repeated, one relating to the truth and the other to good. In such cases, we find the name God (or *Elohim*) in the story relating to the spiritual or truth, and Jehovah in the story relating to the celestial or good (see Genesis 1 and Genesis 2, as well as Genesis 6 and Genesis 7, and also AC 300).

It is interesting to note that, although “*Elohim*” is plural, and this is important to the internal sense, it takes a singular verb form because God is one.

There are other cases where the distinction between singular and plural can be seen.

In the story of the two angels bringing Lot and his family out from Sodom in Genesis 19:17, we see a shift from plural to singular:

“And it was, when they were leading them forth abroad, that He said, Escape for thy life.” Here we see a shift: first, two angels (“they”) bring the family of Lot (“them”) out of Sodom; then, the Lord in the singular (“He”) speaks to them (or just to Lot) in the

singular (“thy”). The Arcana Coelestia explains the shift as follows: “Here the ‘two’ [angels] signify the Lord’s Divine Human and Holy proceeding, as was said above. That these are one is known to everyone within the church; and because they are one, they are also named in the singular in what follows...” (AC 2329) This type of shift from singular to plural occurs throughout the Sacred Scripture. The present revision strives to reflect this whenever possible.

At times because of this correspondence we find places where the normal rules, such as the agreement in number between subject and verb, may bend to accommodate the spiritual meaning. For example in Genesis 35:26 we read, “These are the sons of Jacob, who was born to him in Paddan-aram”. The apparent disagreement between subject and verb is explained as follows in the Arcana Coelestia: “As all of these taken together are now ‘Jacob,’ it is therefore said in the original language, ‘who was born to him,’ in the singular.” (AC 4610) This is not normal Hebrew grammar (compare Genesis 5:20, 23, 27, 31). At other times the difference in number is clear in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and even in the Latin of the Writings, but cannot be shown in the English. For example we have the following explanation of Genesis 35:27: “Because the Divine Itself, the Divine rational, and the Divine natural are one in the Lord, it is therefore said, ‘where also Abraham and Isaac sojourned’ [*peregrinatus*] in the singular, and not [*peregrinati*] in the plural.” (AC 4615) Something similar occurs in Genesis 1:14 with a similar explanation in the Arcana Coelestia 30.

## The Second Person Pronoun

Because of the correspondence of the singular and plural, when the Lord speaks to a group of people He addresses them in the singular some of the time and in the plural at other times. In the sacred languages the distinction between singular and plural of the second person pronoun is expressed by the use of different words. In most modern English translations this distinction is lost, but older translations preserve this distinction by the use of the singular forms, thee, thou, and thy. But this is easier to see with examples. In the Sermon on the Mount when the Lord teaches us to pray, He first says, “When thou prayest” (in the singular), and directs us in what we should do when we pray, and why we should pray. These are things of the will. 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. These are things of the understanding.

In the Ten Commandments, the Lord says, “Thou shalt not...,” and in the first and great commandment, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.” Here He is speaking to our hearts and lives, so He speaks directly to us in the singular. On the other hand, when He is

speaking to our understanding, and our ideas and words, He speaks more generally, to all of us, in the plural. This follows the general rule given to us in the Arcana Coelestia, that when “things of the understanding are treated of,” the plural is used, and when “things of the will are treated of,” the singular is used. (AC 712)

We have generally used modern English in this revision, but we have retained the use of the singular forms, thou, thee, and thy, with their accompanying verb forms, in order to keep the distinction between the singular and the plural for the sake of the internal sense. Hopefully with use and a clearer understanding of what is meant by singular and plural, what may seem remote will give way to nearness, and what might appear formal to genuine affection. That nearness and affection are expressed by the singular pronoun can be seen in many other languages even today.

We hope that by using the singular pronoun forms the purpose will be accomplished, which is to reflect, not just the distinction between singular and plural but also the distinction between what is of love and what is of wisdom, which is found in every aspect of the Sacred Scripture, and from which the marriage of good and truth is effected and made manifest.

We should also point out the use of the archaic “ye” in one specific situation. This revision usually uses “you” as the second person plural pronoun, but in commands where it is necessary to show that the subject is plural, “ye” is used. For example, in Psalm 135:1 we say, “Praise ye the name of Jehovah,” “Ye” sounds better than “you” in this case. Modern English tends to leave the pronoun out altogether (“Praise the name of Jehovah”), but inserting “ye” shows that the command is to the group (understanding), not the individual (affection). Another example of “ye” with the imperative is seen in the Lord’s appeal at the beginning of each volume of the Arcana Coelestia, from Matthew 6:33, “Seek ye first the kingdom of God and its justice.”

## **Verbs of the Original Languages**

One of the most striking features of Clowes’ translation of the New Testament, which is one of the base texts we used for the four Gospels, is his close adherence to the verb forms in the original Greek. This is especially noticeable in the way he translates participles. For example in Matthew 9:12 we find the words, “But Jesus turning and seeing her, said, Have confidence, daughter, thy faith hath saved thee.” (See AE 815:4.) Other translations tend to say something like, “But Jesus turned around, and when He saw her He said....” Clowes was very well versed in Greek, and he made a conscious choice to keep the original participles (“turning and seeing”), and we follow this practice. When we compare the translation in the Heavenly Doctrine, we find a similar adherence

to this aspect of the original language (see Matt. 6:6 and AE 695:5 and AC 5694:4). In fact the Latin of the Heavenly Doctrine adheres more closely to the Greek verb forms than does Clowes himself. Another important reason for translating the Greek participles as participles, is that it carries across something of the timelessness of the Lord's Advent.

The eternal nature of the Lord's Advent in the New Testament is also reflected by the extensive use of the present tense, which is maintained by Clowes and by the Latin of the Writings. In many places, where we would expect to find a past tense to agree with the setting and other verbs, we find the use of the present tense instead, a feature that is preserved in the King James Version. We chose to keep the present tense to reflect the continued presence of the Lord in His Word.

There is yet another aspect of the verb tense in Greek which reflects even more directly the timelessness of the Word of the Lord, and that is the verb form called the aorist. The name "aorist", literally means "without boundary or limit," and although it is usually used for the past tense, it often simply takes on the time of the verbs around it. Unfortunately, neither the Latin of the Heavenly Doctrines nor the verbs of the English language can carry across the sense of timelessness of this Greek verb form. But knowing that much of the Greek New Testament is written in this tense "without limit" can help us appreciate the infinite and eternal nature of the Lord's Advent and Glorification.

When we consider the Hebrew we find that it also has timelessness in its verbs, which again cannot be expressed fully in the English language. Concerning this aspect of the Hebrew language we have the following teaching: "It should be known that the internal sense is such that it has no relation to times; and this the original language favors, where sometimes one and the same word is applicable to any time whatever, without using different words, for by this means interior things appear more evidently. The language derives this from the internal sense, which is more manifold than anyone could believe; and therefore it does not suffer itself to be limited by times and distinctions." (AC 618)

Something of this timeless nature of the Hebrew language can especially be seen in the name Jehovah. We read in the Apocalypse Revealed, "[The] name Jehovah signifies is; and He who is, or who is *Esse* itself, the same is also He who was, and is to come, for in Him the past and the future are present; hence He is without time eternal, and without place infinite." (AR 13; see also AE 23) So the Lord in the Gospel of John, to show He was Jehovah, said, "Before Abraham was, I am." (John 8:58)

An example of the fluidity of the Hebrew verb can be seen in Genesis 3:22, when the man and woman ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and the Lord said, "Man was like one of us knowing good and evil." The verb (*fui*) in the Latin of the

Heavenly Doctrine is in the perfect tense. This reflects the fact that man lost the likeness of God or the celestial quality he had at first, when he chose his own will over the Lord's. (AC 298) But elsewhere in the Writings, this verse is translated, "Man is like one of us knowing good and evil," using the present tense of the verb (*est*), and in this case, it is used to show that man retained the likeness of God. (CL 132:4) Thus the Hebrew verb form contains two ideas in one, while two different forms are needed in both English and Latin to express these two ideas. However it is important to note, that the meaning commonly given in most translations of this verse, "man has become like one of us knowing good and evil," is not supported in the Heavenly Doctrine, for it runs contrary to the explanation of this verse contained in the Arcana Coelestia 298—although it is in agreement with the serpent's lie. This shows how important it is to translate the Sacred Scripture in the light of the Heavenly Doctrine.

### **The Conjunction "And"**

A quick reading of the first chapter of Genesis from the Arcana Coelestia or the King James Version reveals something about the nature of the letter of the Word, and how it seems just about every verse, in fact every phrase is tied together to the next verse or phrase by the word "and". The Heavenly Doctrine gives us a couple of reasons for this, both of which come from the angelic or spiritual sense within. "In the original tongue the meaning was not at first distinguished by punctuation, but the text was continuous, in imitation of heavenly speech; and instead of punctuation marks, 'and' was used, and also 'it was,' or 'it came to pass.' This is the reason why these words occur so often, and why 'it was,' or 'it came to pass,' signifies something new." (AC 5578)

Yet while the word "and" helps distinguish one idea from another, it also helps conjoin them. "In the speech of celestial angels there are no hard consonants, and it rarely passes from one consonant to another without the interposition of a word beginning with a vowel. This is why in the Word the particle 'and' is so often interposed, as can be seen by those who read the Word in the Hebrew, in which this particle is soft, beginning and ending with a vowel sound." (HH 241) And indeed the word "and" in Hebrew is a single letter, the semi-vowel "wau" often sounded as u (oo), which is prefixed to the following word, which not only softens the following consonants but also ties the words together like "the speech of celestial angels [which] is like a gentle stream, soft, and as it were continuous". (HH 241)

Modern translations, like the New King James Version, tend away from repeated use of the word "and". They may translate the Hebrew and Greek words for "and" as "for," "then," "therefore," "now," or other words, or they may just leave it out. It is worth

noting that the Arcana Coelestia does not follow this practice, but instead uses the word *et* (“and”) over and over again, even though this may at first sound simplistic or tedious to the learned ear. Yet we notice that little children, perhaps due to the presence of celestial angels, will often use this style as they begin writing stories. We, too, follow this practice, which is the same as following the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Latin of Divine Revelation.

## Style of the Word

### The Divine Style

“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 proprium 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)

There are many other places in the Heavenly Doctrine which speak of the Divine style of the letter of the Word. In these we read that from a natural viewpoint, “the style [of the Word] 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, not well worked. To the worldly man it appears to be “written in 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 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.

Tafel and Clowes were quite aware of teachings like this, and therefore their translations kept very close to the original style of the Hebrew Old Testament and 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, and there is definitely room for improvement, but in many other cases the obscurity of style comes from the style of the Word itself. We are indeed fortunate that we have the Heavenly Doctrine to guide us as to which is which. We must recognize that Tafel and Clowes were translators of both the letter of the Word and the Heavenly Doctrine. So they were well aware of how the Writings themselves render the original Hebrew and Greek into Latin, and from this they drew their principles of translation into English. We hope we can be as faithful and diligent as they.

## **Concrete Imagery**

The Heavenly Doctrines teach us that the letter of the Word is written in a sense merely natural. For example, in Revelation 17 we find the word “kings” used instead of the word “truths.” (See AE 1061.) We are given a beautiful picture of the Lord in Psalm 23 : “Jehovah is my shepherd; I shall not want. He makes me to lie down in pastures of tender herb” (verses 1,2). And much of the Sacred Scripture is written in stories—stories of the patriarchs, the sons of Israel, and the Lord’s life in the world—to convey the Lord’s power and the need for man’s obedience. We have the language of the parables and the acts of miracles when the Lord described and showed what charity and forgiveness are. And we are given a view of the spiritual world in the visions of John on the Isle of Patmos, and the prophets Daniel, Zechariah and Ezekiel.

We find a similar use of imagery in the symbolism, metaphor, and allegory of great literature. But in the Word these are used for the sake of correspondence, and thus for the sake of conjunction, between the spiritual world and the natural, between heaven and the church, between the Lord Himself and man. As we are often taught in the Heavenly Doctrines, “He who knows not the internal sense of the Word may suppose that such things in the Word are only comparisons, like many expressions in common speech. ... But in the Word all things are representative of spiritual and celestial things, and are real correspondences; for the Word has come down from heaven, and because it has come down thence it is in its origin the Divine celestial and spiritual to which those things which belong to the sense of the letter correspond. Hence it is that the things of the heavenly marriage, which is the conjunction of good and truth, fall into such as correspond, thus into those which belong to marriages on earth.” (AC 4434:6)

We also read in the Apocalypse Explained: “I know that some will wonder why ‘waters’ are mentioned in the Word, and not the truths of faith, since the Word is to teach man about his spiritual life.... But it is to be known that the Word, in order to be Divine, and at the same time useful to heaven and the church, must be wholly natural in the letter, for if it were not natural in the letter there could be no conjunction of heaven with the church by means of it; for it would be like a house without a foundation, and like a soul without a body, for ultimates enclose all interiors, and are a foundation for them (see above, n. 41). Man also is in ultimates, and upon the church in him heaven has its foundations. For this reason the style of the Word is such as it is; and as a consequence, when man from the natural things that are in the sense of the letter of the Word thinks spiritually, he is conjoined with heaven, and in no other way could he be conjoined with it.” (AE 71:4; see also AE 1061, 1066.)

In order therefore to keep correspondence between what is in heaven with what is on earth, we have preserved as faithfully as possible the actual concrete imagery of the Word. For example, when Bathsheba asks a favor of Solomon, she says to him, “I ask one small asking of thee; do not turn back my face.” (1 Kings 2:20) We know from the Heavenly Doctrine that the face corresponds to a man’s interior affections. Most translations render this simply, “Do not refuse me.” But although this carries across the general sense of the literal meaning, the correspondence of “turn back” and of “her face” is lost. And even in the literal sense Bathsheba’s appeal to the affections is more powerfully felt when the concrete imagery is retained.

## **The Human Form**

As can be seen by the example at the end of the previous section, one of the most frequent examples of concrete imagery in the Word, especially in the Old Testament, is the reference to the human form. We find this both in the histories, and in the prophets and Psalms. For example, the edge of the sword is called the “mouth of the sword,” and the “head” and “ribs” of the mountains are spoken of, instead of the top and the sides. And in the building of the tabernacle we find words like “thighs,” “ribs,” “hands” and “shoulders” referring to different parts of the tent and the furnishings.

As we read in the Arcana Coelestia, “...all the forms by which heavenly things are represented, bear relation to the human form, and have their signification in accordance with their agreement with this form. From this it is now plain why it is that when ‘the ark’ signifies heaven where the Lord is,...the staves bear relation to the arms in man, and therefore they signify the same as the arms; the rings bear relation to the joints or sockets by which the arms are joined to the breast; the corners, to the projections themselves,

where this joining is effected; the sides [or ribs], to the chest or thorax...of the body, namely, good; for in this part are the heart and lungs, and by ‘the heart’ is signified celestial good, and by ‘the lungs’ spiritual good. From this it is plain that by ‘the rings’ is signified the same as by the joints or joinings of the chest to the shoulders, and of the shoulders to the arms, namely, the conjunction of good with truth.” (AC 9496)

An example of the need to retain the concrete imagery of the human form can be seen in Exodus 21:8, about a daughter who is sold as a maidservant. The King James Version gives the translation, “If she please not her master.” But in the Arcana Coelestia we find the following translation and explanation. “ ‘If she be evil in the eyes of her master.’ That this signifies if the affection of truth from natural delight does not agree with spiritual truth, is evident from the signification of ‘a maidservant’... as being affection from natural delight; ...from the signification of ‘in the eyes,’ as being in the perception; and from the signification of ‘master,’ as being spiritual truth”. (AC 8995)

There are many other passages of a similar nature which illustrate the need to keep the physical imagery of the human body in the translation, so that the correspondence with the heavens can be full, and thus the conjunction between heaven and earth can be strengthened by the reading of the Word. For each part of the human form corresponds to a society in heaven, and as the Word is read the various societies communicate with the mind of man, and thus with the human race. We read, for example, that “those who constitute the province of the kidneys and ureters are quick to explore or search out the quality of others—what they think and what they will.” (AC 5382) And to confirm the nature of these spirits from the letter of the Word, this section of the Arcana Coelestia continues as follows:

“From all this it is evident what is signified by its being said in the Word, that ‘Jehovah tests and searches the kidneys and the heart,’ and that the ‘kidneys chasten,’ as in Jeremiah:

*Jehovah tests the kidneys and the heart (Jer. 11:20)....*

In David:

*O Jehovah, examine my kidneys and my heart (Ps. 26:2).*

Again:

*Jehovah, Thou hast possessed my kidneys (Ps. 139:13).*

In Revelation:

*I am He who searches the kidneys and the heart (Rev. 2:23).*

In these passages spiritual things are signified by the ‘kidneys’ and celestial things by the ‘heart;’ that is, the things which are of truth are signified by the ‘kidneys’ and those which are of good by the ‘heart.’” (AC 5385)

In modern translations such as the New King James version, the word “kidneys” is not used, but instead we are given such words as “mind” or “inward parts.” But without the word “kidneys” in the text, we need to ask what happens to the communication through the Word between those in the province of the kidneys and the Lord’s church in the world. It is for this reason that our revision has sought to restore and bring out the human form within the Word, as it is spoken of in the original language and revealed in the Heavenly Doctrine.

## **Style of the Translation**

### **Modern English Style**

In many ways the most difficult decisions in making this revision of the Sacred Scripture concerned not the style of the Word, but the style of English. There is not space in this companion booklet to discuss fully the question of using modern English, 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 important, we do not consider it the reason why a New Church translation is needed. 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 Doctrine of the Sacred Scripture, throughout.)

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, and most of all, to keep the correspondences. For our real concern is not with the style of the English, but the “style” of the Word (AC 66).

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. This gives the text a blend between older and more modern English. It is our hope that this difference will not draw attention to the wording itself, but rather to the internal sense within. 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. Actually we are already to some degree accustomed to a blend of style, as in fairy tales, in Shakespeare, and also in many poems and even in our familiar hymns. For example, we sing the words, “O Thou whose power o’er moving worlds presides,” yet how many have noticed this mix of modern English (“presides” instead of “presideth”) with the older pronoun for the Lord (“Thou”)? It is similar in the familiar song, “Wake, awake.” In the same verse where 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 carry the same sense of affection and reverence that these familiar songs impart during worship.

## **Variety of Translation**

In working on this revision, we came to realize very early on that the Lord indicates a variety of ways to translate the Word. To give an illustration, let us consider how the Lord renders a passage from the Old Testament when it is quoted in the New Testament.

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 brings it across into the New Testament in three different ways. In Matthew He says, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind.” (Matt. 22:37) 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 see TCR 483:3 for yet another variation.) The letter of the Word contains within it so much that very often a single translation cannot convey the full meaning of the literal sense.

This can also be seen by the variety of ways in which the Heavenly Doctrine renders the Hebrew and Greek of the Sacred Scripture. To take just one example, we can look at

verse 7 of Psalm 29. This verse is quoted seven times in the Writings, but with five different ways of rendering it in the Latin of the Heavenly Doctrine. Although some of these renderings are similar, two of them are quite different, and yet the Hebrew allows for this ambiguity. This verse says both that “the voice of Jehovah cuts the flames of fire,” and that “the voice of Jehovah cuts as the flames of fire.” So which way do we translate this verse, when both are valid? We have to choose which way to put this. We see again that when a translation is made, even in the Heavenly Doctrine, the full meaning of the original language cannot be fully brought across into another language.

This kind of double meaning can be seen elsewhere in the Sacred Scripture, and is spoken of directly in the Arcana Coelestia when explaining Genesis 10 verse 11: “There is a twofold meaning in these words, namely, that Asshur went forth out of that land, and that Nimrod went forth from that land into Asshur, or Assyria. It is so expressed because both are signified, namely, that reasoning concerning spiritual and celestial things arises from such worship—which is that Asshur went forth out of the land of Shinar—and that such worship reasons about spiritual and celestial things—which is that Nimrod went forth from that land into Asshur, or Assyria.” (AC 1185)

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, as others have done. The Roman Catholic Church translated the Old and New Testaments into Latin, a version called the Vulgate. This translation became the fixed standard for centuries, and from Papal authority it became the one and only translation of the church. In England, shortly after the establishment of the Church of England, the King James Version was established as the Authorized Version in English. Although a reverent and fairly accurate translation, it became so fixed that even past New Church attempts to make changes for the better, such as those of Clowes, Tafel, and Price, were largely disregarded.

Yet we can also err in the other direction. While recognizing that no single translation can fully convey the power and holiness of the letter of the Word, and completely contain and support the internal sense, we must acknowledge that there are principles of translation that must be maintained and that preclude too much variety. Although there is variety in the way the various Gospels render the first and great commandment, still these translations are quite consistent with each other. This consistency is seen in how the Writings render both the Hebrew and the Greek words for heart and soul, not just in this commandment, but throughout the Word. This is in marked contrast to other translations, many of which render the word for heart as “mind,” “understanding” and “wisdom,” and the word for soul as “life” and even “self.” The distinction between heart and soul is the same as that between love and wisdom, for the word for soul in the

original language relates to breathing and the lungs, and thus the understanding, and the heart relates to the will. There will be, and should be, variety in translations of the Word, but we believe that in the New Church, this variety should be within the boundaries which the Lord Himself has now revealed in His Second Coming.

## Punctuation, Markings and Notes

### Capitalization

We have adopted the practice from the Writings of capitalizing not only the Lord's names, but also many of the nouns which stand for the Lord, such as Lamb of God, the good Shepherd, the little Child. But when these nouns simply describe the Lord, we again follow the usual practice of the Writings and do not capitalize them, as for example in Psalm 28, "Jehovah is my strength and my shield" (verse 7). Still, there is some variation, as it was not always a straightforward decision.

Another very important question of capitalization is that of the personal pronouns which refer to the Lord. Throughout this revision we have chosen to capitalize these pronouns, keeping to the practice firmly established in the Writings, and followed by Clowes and Tafel, and other English translations, such as the New King James version. In some cases, this can make a difference as to how the Word is understood. For example in Matthew 3:16 we read: "And Jesus being baptized, went up straightway out of the water; and lo, the heavens were opened to Him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove, and coming upon Him". 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, which also capitalizes pronouns referring to the Lord, has it being the Lord who sees this dove. Without any capitalization it would remain ambiguous.

It has been argued that the Heavenly Doctrine is not consistent in capitalizing pronouns that refer to the Lord. But on closer examination, we find that personal pronouns (He, Him) are nearly always capitalized, while the possessive adjective (thy) and the relative pronoun (who) rarely are, and that the Writings are consistent in this practice. They even use a special third person pronoun (*Ipse*) when referring to the Lord, one that is different from the one commonly used, which is virtually always capitalized to make sure it is known that this is the Lord.

Therefore, the consistency of the capitalization of personal pronouns in the Heavenly

Doctrines does indeed establish a principle, which we have held to in our revision. We have chosen to capitalize the personal pronouns (He, Him) referring to the Lord, but not the relative pronouns (who, etc.), partly because it follows the Latin more closely, but also because this is the tradition in earlier translations of the Writings, and it is the style often employed by Clowes and Tafel, as well as many more modern translations of the Sacred Scripture.

We have departed from the common practice of capitalizing the pronouns referring to the Holy Spirit. The Writings usually do not capitalize these pronouns, and at times even the words “holy spirit” are not capitalized, for the reason that the Holy Spirit is not a separate person, but the presence of the Lord Himself.

## **Direct Speech and Quotation Marks**

Many modern translations have included quotation marks as a way to set off direct speech. At first this seems to be a simple way of clarifying what is actually said by certain people. But the nature of direct speech in the Sacred Scripture is often different from the way it is used in modern language. We get some idea of this difference from the following teaching from the Spiritual Diary: “The mode of speaking in the Word is natural, not artificial, as may be plainly apparent from many things; to wit, that nearly everywhere they speak as if the person himself spoke: it is not said that he thus spoke, but [it is] as if he were speaking, and so forth.” (SD 2631)

We see this especially in the prophets, for example in Ezekiel: “And the word of Jehovah came unto me, saying: Son of man, set thy face toward the mountains of Israel, and prophesy against them, and say: Ye mountains of Israel, hear the word of the Lord Jehovih: Thus says the Lord Jehovih to the mountains, and to the hills, to the channels, and to the ravines: Behold, I, [even] I, will bring a sword upon you, and I will make your high places perish.” (Ezek. 6:1-3)

We can see how difficult it is here to use quotation marks to show direct speech, as there are at least four quotations nested within each other. It is especially difficult to show where the quotation marks should end. Yet because of the style or mode of speaking in the Word, it is relatively easy to see where the direct speech begins, and in fact often a quotation begins with a specific Hebrew word that means “saying.” So we have chosen to mark direct speech in the traditional way, like Clowes and Tafel, that is, to use a comma or a colon, followed by a capital letter.

## Italics

For centuries translators have used italics to indicate words added to help the meaning. Following the Heavenly Doctrine, we have tried to keep these added words to a minimum. For these inserted words do not actually contain an internal sense in themselves, but often aid the literal sense, and thus give a firmer foundation for the internal sense. In this edition, we have used a smaller font size for these italicized words, to indicate words added by the translators or revisers.

However, there are times when the Heavenly Doctrines themselves insert words, which shows that they really are needed for the meaning to be full. In this case we use italics that are full-sized. An example 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. In this situation, we have when possible included a reference to the Writings to show where this inserted word can be found.

## Markings

When comparing the Latin of the Writings to the original Greek or Hebrew, we see a very consistent one-to-one relation between the words in each. But there are times, even in the Heavenly Doctrine, when a combination of two or more words is needed to convey the meaning of a single Hebrew or Greek word. For example, we have the words “little·child,” and “take·hold,” and “deliver·him·up.” (In this last example, “deliver·up” is one word in the original language, and “him” is another.) To indicate that these words are actually one word in the original, we have inserted a special symbol. Because the internal sense is expressed by each word in the original language, we thought it best to convey to the reader cases when two words in English should be taken together as one distinct idea.

Another situation arises when the same English word has to be used to indicate two fairly different words in Hebrew or Greek. For example, in the story of the Lord feeding 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 *σπορις* (*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<sup>o</sup> you took?” (Matt. 16:9,10)

Another frequent example of this marking is seen in the two very common words in Greek for “and,” *kai* and *de*. They have somewhat different meanings, *de* having a sense of “but” to it. We do not have a word in English to show this distinction, so again here we have rendered the word *de* as “and<sup>o</sup>” (with a little circle), to distinguish it from the word *kai*, which is just “and” (no circle). In our on line notes, on the Kempton Project website, we are in the process of adding notes to explain these differences in the vocabulary in the original languages.

In some more rare cases there are three or even four words in the original language that need to be translated using the same English word. In these cases we use a triangle marking for the third<sup>^</sup> and a square for the fourth<sup>o</sup>.

It is our intent that these symbols, like the italics of this and previous editions, should 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 as 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)

## Footnotes

We purposely have kept footnotes to a minimum in the printed book. We set as our guide to note only things that might be useful to know in personal devotional reading or family worship.

The footnotes we have included are generally of four kinds: a reference for a quotation from the Old Testament found in the New Testament; a more literal translation of a specific Greek or Hebrew word, when we felt it necessary to be less literal in our translation; a brief explanation of a Hebrew, Greek or Roman measure or coin, or the meaning of a word we have left in the original language; 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 footnotes, relating both to vocabulary and to specific verses. There are some notes about the Greek found in the Apocalypse Revealed and the Apocalypse Explained, and there are also many passages in the Heavenly Doctrine that speak directly about the Hebrew names, roots, grammar and syntax of specific words and

verses. And there are many particular detailed teachings that we have come across as we prepared this revision, which serve to indicate how certain verses and words should be translated.

The more in-depth study notes, of which there are many, are found on the Kempton Project website, <http://KemptonProject.org>.

## Words from the Original Language

### Names of people and places

The most common example of words we have kept similar to the Hebrew and Greek is names of people and places. This is a common practice in all translations, but we have tried at times to render these names more closely to the original language, which is the practice of the Heavenly Doctrine. This is for the reason that the names in the Old Testament, specifically the place names in and around the Land of Canaan, were from Most Ancient times, and came from the Angelic language because of the correspondence of the various places with the things of heaven. For example, we use the Hebrew name Suph sea, as is done in the Arcana Coelestia and elsewhere in the Writings, although we include a footnote so that the reader is aware that this body of water is what is called the Red sea today. And instead of Mesopotomia we use the Hebrew name *Aram-naharaim*, which means Syria of the two rivers. But in following the Heavenly Doctrine, we find we also do keep familiar names, such as Egypt and Syria.

Often we find that the Heavenly Doctrine will indicate as a name a word that most translations will render as a common word. For example, in the song of Deborah, in Judges 5:10, the King James Version has, “ye that sit in judgment, and walk by the way,” while the Arcana Coelestia renders this, “sitting on Middin, and walking on the way.” (AC 2709:2, 2781:6)

### Names of the Lord

In both the Old and New Testaments, names of the Lord are very important. We are taught that the general subject of the internal sense is reflected in what name the Lord is called in that place. We see this in the New Testament in respect to the names Jesus and Christ. “By the name ‘Jesus,’ when named by a man who is reading the Word, the angels

perceive Divine good; and by ‘Christ,’ Divine truth; and by the two names, the Divine marriage of good and truth, and of truth and good; thus the whole Divine in the heavenly marriage, which is heaven.” (AC 3004) And also the Lord is called Master or Teacher while He is in the world as the Divine Truth. But after His glorification, when He becomes the Divine Love even as to His Human, He is then called “Lord.” (AC 14)

In the Old Testament we see a similar distinction between the names Jehovah and God. As mentioned in the section earlier on the singular and plural, the first chapter of Genesis treats of the regeneration of the spiritual man, and there the name God or *Elohim* is used. But in the second chapter with the seventh day, the regeneration of the celestial man is treated of, and here we find the Lord called Jehovah God, or Jehovah *Elohim*.

In this revision of the Sacred Scripture we have followed the Heavenly Doctrine in keeping the name Jehovah throughout the Old Testament. On account of its holiness, this name was rarely used by the Jewish Church by the time the Lord came into the world, and they used the name Lord (*Adonai*) instead. For this and other reasons, as explained in the Arcana Coelestia (see AC 2921), we do not find the name Jehovah used in the New Testament, and the Christian Church kept the tradition of the Jewish Church, using LORD for Jehovah in translating the Old Testament as well.

With the Lord’s Second Advent, and the revelation of the internal sense of the Word, the name Jehovah has been restored to the Lord’s Church on earth and also to the translation of the Old Testament. There is only one place that we know of where the Writings have Lord instead of Jehovah in quoting the Old Testament. It is a quotation which is also rendered in the New Testament with the name Lord. Yet even here, in his own copy of the True Christian Religion, Swedenborg crossed out the word “Dominus” (Lord) and corrected it to Jehovah.

“And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us; this is Jehovah, we have waited for Him; let us exult and be glad in his salvation (Isa. 25:8-9); [this treats] of the coming of the Lord.” (AC 1736, see also Doctrine of the Lord 6, 30, 38; AR 368, etc.)

## **Hebrew words**

Because of the power of the correspondences of the Hebrew, we often find Hebrew words in the New Testament, even though it is written in Greek. For example, we see Alleluia, Messiah, and Amen. When the Heavenly Doctrines translate the Old Testament, they leave many words in the Hebrew as well, simply transliterating them. In part this is because the very sound of Hebrew corresponds and communicates with the highest

heavens. But it is also because many words are like names, and either we do not know the English equivalents, or they simply do not exist.

We read for example concerning the “dudaim” which Reuben found in the field. “What the ‘dudaim’ were, the translators do not know. They suppose them to have been fruits or flowers, to which they give names according to their several opinions. But of what kind they were it does not concern us to know, but merely the fact that among the ancients who were of the church, all fruits and flowers were significative; for they knew that universal nature is a theater representative of the Lord’s kingdom; and that all the things in its three kingdoms are representative; and that each thing represents some specific thing in the spiritual world, and therefore also each fruit and flower. That by the ‘dudaim’ there is signified the conjugal of good and truth, may be seen from the series of things here in the internal sense; as well as from the derivation of that word in the original language; for it is derived from the word dudaim, which means loves and conjunction by means of them.” (AC 3942)

There are many other words for plants and animals which we cannot properly translate. Examples are the unclean birds called the *ochim*, *tziim* and *iim*, and the *kikajon* which grew up and gave shade to Jonah. In certain cases we followed the lead of the Heavenly Doctrine and used the original Hebrew words rather than trying to translate them, because there are not enough English words. For example, there are more than five words for thorns in Hebrew, and several for thistles and nettles. But usually when we leave a word in the original Hebrew, it is because that is what the Writings do, and in these cases we include a footnote to explain its meaning from the Heavenly Doctrine whenever possible.

## Units and Measures

Another group of words which we have left in the original language is units, measures, coins and other divisions which are unique to the Hebrew or Greek. This is generally the practice of the Heavenly Doctrine, but this is often done in many other translations as well. For example, the *homer* and the *ephah* are used for measures for grain and flour, and *hin* and *bath* for liquid measures. For money we have the shekel and the talent, as well as many coins, such as the *stater*, the *didrachma*, the *dinarius* and the *mina*. In some cases where the Heavenly Doctrines translate these coins, we do so also, using for example a farthing (meaning “a fourth”), and a mite. We have kept the Greek measure of distance as *stadia*, however, rather than using the British furlong.

One of the main reasons for not changing the units so that we can keep the original numbers, as the numbers themselves have a correspondence. An example will help illustrate: In John 2:6 the New King James has “six waterpots of stone ... containing

twenty or thirty gallons apiece.” We have rendered this as “two or three measures,” because the numbers in the Greek are “two” and “three,” not “twenty” and “thirty”. To give an idea of the size or value of the measure or unit, especially when these are unfamiliar, we have included footnotes to help the reader.

## **Amen**

The word “amen” was mentioned briefly at the beginning of the section on Hebrew words, but we thought it would be useful to explain more fully our decision to this word even in places where it sounds unfamiliar. The main reason, of course, is that it is the consistent practice of the Heavenly Doctrine to retain the Hebrew word “amen,” whenever it occurs in the Greek New Testament. 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 certain of the Psalms, at the end of each of the Gospels, and at the end of Revelation. Most readers, though, do not expect to find this word at the beginning of a sentence. But we can see from the following passage in the book of Revelation that “amen” can end or begin 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)

# Appendix I

This revision is based on the following texts:

**Genesis and Exodus:** Extracted from the English translation of the *Arcana Coelestia* by John F. Potts

**Leviticus through Deuteronomy and Jeremiah through Malachi:** Lacking New Church versions of these books, which were in a style similar to the other base texts, we have edited extensively the King James or “Authorized Version” of the Bible

**Joshua through Kings:** *The books of Joshua, Judges, I Samuel, II Samuel, I Kings, II Kings: a new translation* General Convention of the New Jerusalem, under the editorship of Louis H. Tafel. Published 1909

**Psalms:** *A new translation of the Psalms:* prepared by the committee on the translation of the Word, of the council of ministers of the General Convention, under the editorship of Louis H. Tafel. Published 1906

**Isaiah:** Extracted from a *New translation, from the Hebrew, of the prophet Isaiah: together with an exposition of the spiritual sense of the divine prophecies, from the theological works of Swedenborg*, prepared from a posthumous manuscript of John Clowes. Edited and published by the Rev. John H. Smithson in 1860.

**The Four Gospels:** Translations by the Rev. John Clowes, extracted from his commentaries of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, first published in 1805, 1826, 1823, and 1819, respectively.

**Revelation:** Extracted from the English translation of the *Apocalypse Revealed* by John Whitehead.

This revision also builds on other reference works, such as:

***Summarium vocabularii in loca Scripturae Sacrae citata in operibus Emanuelis Swedenborgii theologicis:*** Louis H. Tafel, 1906 and the exhaustive Hebrew-Latin and Greek-Latin vocabulary lists, upon which the summary is based, compiled in the late 1800’s by the Rev. Louis Tafel with the assistance of a committee of the General

Convention. These vocabularies show how the Latin of the Heavenly Doctrine renders the Hebrew and Greek words of the Old and New Testaments.

**The General Index of Swedenborg's Scripture Quotations:** edited by A. H. Searle and based on the Index General of Le Boys des Guys, published in 1859.

**Computer Programs:** Over the last 30 years, these original texts have been integrated, along with a compilation of the Latin renderings of Scripture in the Heavenly Doctrine, into a desktop research program designed specifically for this Kempton Project. And about 18 years ago Roy Odhner developed an online program and database which allowed us to keep the current translation up-to-date, and integrate the work of the various editors, and benefit from comments of readers as well.

Using these resources, we have been able to review and revise the various translations listed above, with the aim of making them consistent with each other. 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)

**The Revisers:** Rev. Stephen D. Cole and Rev. Andrew J. Heilman, with the help of many others (especially Hugh Brown, Roy Odhner, Kate Pitcairn and Rev. Lawson Smith).

**The Website:** Please visit <http://KemptonProject.org> to see notes on the translation of the individual verses and of the many different Hebrew and Greek words.

You may also use this website to send us your comments, corrections and suggestions, or you may send these to [feedback@kemptonproject.org](mailto:feedback@kemptonproject.org), or contact us at:

Kempton Project  
c/o KNCS  
PO Box 140  
Kempton, PA 19529