

To : Mr G D Buss  
Chairman of the Trinitarian Bible Society  
William Tyndale House, 29 Deer Park Road  
London SW19 3NN

**Copied to Mr John Metcalfe, Minister of the Gospel**

The Everlasting Begetting Mistranslated

I trust that my private communication (answering your own private response) is satisfactory to you and, on that basis, I continue with the next matter of mistranslation by the Authorised (King James) Version, an even more serious example than the one previously dealt with.

Great is the onslaught against the word of God in these times. I am discovering a more massive opposition to truth than is, I fear, realised by the majority of even the more serious and solemn readers of scripture. There is a veritable army of scholars, academics, professionals of all kinds, linguists, etymologists, scribes - gathered, organised, logistically arranged and supported financially that they might overwhelm the poor and needy who seek water from the wells of salvation.

Every subtlety is employed, every argument is arrayed in well-ordered layers, every nuance is examined - but with one purpose in mind : to overturn truth, yet in a specious way that appears to be valid, such that those who seek the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent shall be caused to be troubled about every text of scripture, every utterance of prophet and apostle, every word of the God-breathed volumes that, together, compose the only source of real divinity on earth.

And in the midst of this never ceasing war, we have a Version that has received far too great a veneration than was due to it and that has undergone no revision whatsoever since - arguably - 1611 or at least, with the most charitable of allowances, 1769.

The Authorised Version deserves a great deal of respect but most of that respect sees through the version itself to William Tyndale's work which preceded it, and to The Wycliffe which went before which, excellent in spirituality though it is, could only ever be, of historical necessity, a translation of Jerome's translation.

But is it right to give absolute veneration to any translation when the translators are not (as they cannot be) those whom Jesus Christ personally chose in a demonstrable way without any possible argument to the contrary, and, therefore cannot be regarded as - inherently - apostles ?

Any translation into English must - it absolutely must - be accepted only under some system of what might be termed 'peer review'. Anyone can undertake the task, no doubt. And that one may be a spiritual man, a maturely spiritual man, a grave and sober man, an elder, a true bishop, a real minister of Jesus Christ. But if every word of his translation is examined - and examined in minute detail it will and it must be - who would dare to assert that every single word is 'inspired' in the same way as Paul uses the word, or that it is - in an absolute sense - 'scripture', in the way that Peter uses the word of Paul's writings ?

Any individual, or any group of individuals, who lay claim to such 'inspiration' of 'scripture' must of necessity regard themselves as apostles. But apostles they are not. For they cannot be. There are twelve only, till the end of time.

Peter, the chief apostle, has been gathered out of the little ship, girded in his cloak - for so it was prophesied he would be girded and taken elsewhere - and there are left six others. There remains a doubter who would not be convinced by his brethren, a cynic who would accept nothing out of Galilee, two who are named 'that of Zebedee' and no more, and two who are of such significance that they are left unnamed.

Peter has gone 'ashore' and is with the Lord. Six - men - remain.

And there is a precise number of fish to be got through the water of the seas, with nothing more than a 'little' ship to convey them. Netted they are, for sure, but the net is near to breaking and spilling them back into the waves. Only by the united actions of the six shall the catch reach the shore - the whole complement of three times three, times the ten plus seven.

These are the conditions that are faced.

It is not a time for any to assert himself above all others and claim a new kind of 'apostleship' that departs from the only possible true apostleship.

Peer review, I say, and not to be neglected.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

The text of Luke 1:35 according to Erasmus (1519) Stephens (1550) Elzevir (1624) Byzantine Majority (2000) and Byzantine Majority (Family 35) is as follows :

και το γεννωμενον αγιον κληθησεται υιος θεου

" [...] therefore also the holy-begotten thing shall be called Son of God." [Young's Literal 1864].

The AV translates a γενναο inflection as 'born' (rather than as an inflection of 'beget').  
The AV translates a present participle as 'shall be' (thus a future, rather than a present).  
The AV translates the neuter article as though it denoted the presence of a 'thing'.  
The AV adds 'of thee', without adding italics, thus showing preference for a variant Greek text.

" [...] therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. "

Beza (1598) adds the words εκ σου after γεννωμενον and thus the KJV (1611) and the Geneva (1650) add the words 'of thee' after 'born or begotten'.

Tyndale (1534) the Great Bible (1539) Matthew's Bible (1549) the Bishop's Bible (1568) Young's Literal (1864) J N Darby (1871) and the Englishman's Greek New Testament (1877) all reject the Beza inclusion and miss out 'of thee'.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

"Shall be born of thee" speaks of a delivery in the future. It speaks of a woman delivering a child at the end of her term of pregnancy. Jesus makes it clear that a natural pregnancy, involving a human father and a human mother, results in the delivery (*tikto*) of a child which results in a begetting (*gennaο*). John 16:21.

η γυνη οταν τικτη λυπην εχει [...] οταν δε γεννηση το παιδιον [Stephens 1550]

The child is delivered from the mother and this involves grief in the process. Afterwards, once there is a begetting, the mother is joyful that a man is born into the world. The separation from the mother, the cutting of the cord, the situation of a new, independent entity in the world - is a 'begetting'. For there to be a 'begetting' there must first be the delivery.

Luke records the same process of Elizabeth bringing forth her son, John :

ο χρονος του τεκειν αυτην και εγεννησεν υιον Luke 1:57 [Stephens 1550]

The time came to deliver and she beget a son. Delivery, then begetting.

But this is not the case spoken of by the angel Gabriel regarding Mary and Jesus.

και το γεννωμενον αγιον κληθησεται υιος θεου (Luke 1:35) does *not* speak of a future event. It speaks of something present, within Mary, at the time of conception. Gabriel makes it clear that with the presence of the Holy Spirit and with the overshadowing of the power of the Highest (a power unutterably far above all that is of the creature) *therefore* the begetting holy shall be called 'Son of God'.

Gabriel had before promised that Mary would conceive. *Sullambano*, 'that which holds together' (Liddell & Scott, Thayer, BDB) conveys a conjoining and what is conjoined is evident from Gabriel's further words - γεννωμενον and αγιον.

'The' begetting (the use of an article at all) denotes the present participle acting (to some degree) as a noun. The fact that το is neuter indicates that what is in view does not involve masculinity or femininity. It is neither. The act of begetting - here - does not involve gender.

It is present. One of those two things mentioned as being conjoined is a begetting, present tense, which is not a matter of human gender. The other thing conjoined is holy.

The everlasting begetting - that which, in one Spirit, involves the Father and the Son - is not of time, is not bound by time, and is everlasting. This is the everlasting Life which John testifies was with the Father. This everlasting Life was manifested and was seen and was handled. I John 1:2.

It was seen and it was handled because it had been conjoined, within Mary, with that which is holy. Separated from Mary, separated from her humanity, was that which was holy. And that holy item was conjoined to the everlasting begetting.

And the AV calls this conjoined glory - a 'thing'.

And the AV favours a variant Greek text paving the way for the Westcott and Hort text - and the subsequent Nestle/Aland text - to thrust in 'of her' and lose - altogether - the awesome, the wondrous, the glorious, the unspeakable conjoining of the everlasting begetting with the holy item from Mary.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

*The AV states that there will be a birth in the future. And a 'thing' will be born.*

*Gabriel states that, immediately upon conception, there was, within the virgin, a 'begetting holy'.*

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Without doubt, it is long overdue for the Authorised Version to be properly revised by competent authority, in conjunction with competent peer-review.

Nigel Johnstone  
Belmont Publications