

Name Above All Names — Letter to Mr. Brooks

Dear Mr. Brooks,

Most names that come to us from other languages we transliterate; that is, we write or spell the names in the alphabetical characters of the English language that most accurately express the same sounds as the original. We don't translate names according to what they mean, since this would usually be awkward and odd. Take, for instance, the name "Adam." The meaning is "ruddy," yet when speaking of Adam in the Bible, we do not call him "Ruddy," do we? No, but we call him Adam, a fairly close transliteration of the Hebrew "אָדָם" (aw dawm). And so it is with "Abram," "Abraham," "Isaac," "Jacob," "Reuben," "Esther," "Ruth," "Rebekah," "Rachel," and so on. These names are transliterations and closely resemble the original Hebrew, although they have lost some of their purity of pronunciation over the centuries. A quick study of Biblical names will reveal that most, if not all, Hebrew names, when brought into English, are at least attempted transliterations.

Why do men call the Savior of the world by the name "Jesus," and not the closer transliteration "Joshua"? Isn't "Joshua," or, better yet, "Yahshua," His real name? It is evident that the Savior Himself cannot be "Jesus," because this word is not the transliteration of the Hebrew name "Yahshua," YHWH is Salvation. Neither is it closely related to, nor does it resemble the word "Joshua," the closer transliteration. The truth is, that the word "Jesus" is of doubtful and suspect origin, having been handed down to us from the early English, "Iesus," which is from the Latin, "Iesus," which came from the Greek, "Iesous." What name is the name above all names; what name would the Savior want to be called by? "Jesus" or "Yahshua"? Would He want to have a name distinctively different from His heroic predecessor and personal type, Joshua? Does it even matter?

We think it matters. In fact, if anyone is of the commonwealth of Israel (Eph 2:11-13), he will naturally have insight into the significance of names; but if he is still of the nations, walking just as the Gentiles also walk, he will be darkened in his understanding, just as the Gentiles are (Eph 4:17-18). Then, to him, such Gentile names are appropriate, such as "Bob," "Bill," "Peggy," etc. In the same way, Gentile translators of the Hebrew written gospels and epistles felt it was appropriate to give Greek names to the personalities in the Scriptures of the New Testament according to their darkened understanding, and not according to good practices of transliteration, as they should have.

If we believe that the entire New Testament, especially the parts that reveal His true name, was originally written in Greek, "inspired" by the Holy Spirit through mostly illiterate apostles, or at least "monolingual" apostles and writers, then we had better call upon Him as "Jesus," for this is the name above all names. But common sense and scholarship does not support such an idea and neither does the Holy Spirit who has been given to those who obey Him (Acts 5:32).

Mt 1:21 is an interpretation of the Savior's name, a name which has a specific meaning. Our Father wished to express to "His people" our Savior's name. He explained that He (YHWH) shall save (*shua*) His people, Israel, from their sins (their abominations) and transgressions of His laws. So the name of the Savior combines the name of the Heavenly Father (Yah) with the word for salvation (*shua*), and the Messiah's name became "Yahshua." In the Old Testament Scriptures this name appears as the name of the type of Messiah, "Joshua," or "Yahshua" in Num 13:16. There you will find that Joshua's name was originally "Hoshua." Moses changed it to "Yahshua," which means YHWH is Salvation." But instead of calling Him that, we find ourselves calling him "Jesus," a name which does not resemble "Yahshua," leaving us with an historical discontinuity that robs us of the true meaning and heritage of our Savior's name.

If "Jesus" means "YHWH is Salvation," then you would force a meaning on it that is not true and can make no cognitive Jew jealous (Rom 10:19-21; 11:11,13-14) or envious in the least, much less save him for the Holy City, Jerusalem, the wife of the Lamb (Rev 21). The word "Jesus" does not mean YHWH is Salvation," as it has meant to many, and us as well, for as long as we were in the Protestant and Catholic "churches." Consequently, there is no salvation in the name of "Jesus," since this name does not mean "YHWH's Salvation," the name which bears the name and message of salvation intrinsically within itself.

Scholarship, if you will, has proven that there was no “j” sound in the English language before 1565, when it was created by a printer named Gille Beys. How was the Savior’s name pronounced before then? So, if the dictionaries are correct, the word “Jesus,” as it is, is no older than the 16th or 17th century. (See if early printed versions of the New Testament don’t bear this out.) Should we allow for this development in the English language and continue to pronounce the “j” in “Jesus”? Or is there a name that the God of Israel desires to communicate to His people at this present time, a name that communicates who He is? Those who have the mind of the Messiah of YHWH and love Him, those who have become “Hebrew,” will not fail to call Him by His true name, not only because they desire to be pure, but because they know there is something better than being called by a name that you are not. (Or, if you will, there is nothing worse than being called by a name that is not yours, that offends your dignity, and does not represent your character.)

So what is His name and His Son’s name, if you can tell (Pr 30:4)? *Encyclopedia Judaica*, article “God, Names of” reads as follows: “The true pronunciation of the name YHWH was never lost. Several early Greek writers of the Christian church testify that the name was pronounced “Yahweh.” Isa 52:6 — “Therefore my people shall know my name! Therefore they shall know in that day that I AM he that does speak: it is I.” It is written in Hos 12:5 that “YHWH is His name.” Why does the Father’s name continue to be obscured by scholarly advice and tradition? Does not common sense dictate that if a person says, “My name is ‘such and such,’” we should call him by that name, lest he become irate? There is only one God and we know His name is not “Theos” (nor does “Theos” define divinity as we know Him) but “YHWH,” the God that was revealed first to the Hebrews in Abraham, then in Moses at the birth of the nation Israel (Ex 3:15). (Those who study the Bible under the word “theology” could very well also be influenced by another god (2 Cor 11:4, 13 15)).

Do you know His name? And what about His Son’s name? Who is going to be reigning with Messiah in the coming kingdom except those who have not denied His name? How can one continue to deny His name after it has been revealed to one’s inner consciousness?

Paul (as he was called by the Greeks, perhaps, although his name was actually Shaul, the name Yahshua called him and commissioned him by, to “bear His name” before the nations, Gentiles, and kings and the children of Israel (Acts 9:15 16), and even to suffer for that *name*), in order to be saved, had to have his sins washed away in the Blood by being baptized, calling on His name. What name was revealed to him, the name the Savior called himself by, when Saul asked, “What is your name, Lord?” Did Paul call upon the name “Jesus,” or the Greek, “Iesous,” or did he call upon the name revealed to him by Messiah’s very utterance, the very words of His mouth (Acts 22:14; 26:14-15)? In Acts 9:4 5; 22:8 9; 26:15, the Messiah spoke His name in Hebrew! He could have spoken in Greek, for Saul would have understood, but He didn’t. Why did He speak in Hebrew? Saul was “appointed ... to know His will, and to see the Righteous One, and to hear an *utterance* from His mouth” (Acts 22:14). And he became a witness for Him to all men of what he had *seen* and *heard* (Acts 22:15). After His name is revealed to us, which name will save, which name is the name above all names, which name is the only name “under heaven that has been *given* among men, by which we must be saved” (Acts 4:12)? This is the message we wanted to awaken in you! He has only one name! It is not different in every language under the sun. “YAHSHUA”! That is His name. Yahshua the Nazarene — a Hebrew, a Jew with a Hebrew name spoken in the Hebrew language by the Hebrew Savior, whose name was revealed to the Hebrew nation (Luke 1:31) and the Hebrew husband to Mary (Mt 1:21) by a sent one from the God of the Hebrews.

It never occurred to us, either, that His name had taken on the flavor of a strange deity, until we entered Messiah and the Commonwealth of Israel. It was then that we began to notice the strange and foreign behavior of those who professed to follow the same deity we followed. We saw that those who follow the Greek version of our Savior also practice the customs of the Gentiles, customs that have become foreign to us, customs we read in Rev 21:27 that will keep those who practice them out of the eternal city, New Jerusalem. Perhaps you will benefit by seeing the true and deepest meaning of the article “Name Above All Names” in the *Freepaper* and

not stumbling over what seems to be a detail, or a mistake. For by taking offense over our “unscholarliness” you may lose the “little detail” that carries the utmost importance. You may not see any evil in our returning to the name “Yahshua” in place of “Jesus,” but do you see the evil in remaining attached to a deity that does not save?

You do not see any evil in our returning to “Yahshua” in place of “Jesus,” but do you not see the GOOD in restoring what has become apostate? Or do you not know that before the return of the Messiah there must be a restoration of all things (Acts 3:21)? What has been lost through the ages of transcribing and translating has not been just a name, but the Man Himself, His thoughts, His deeds and His life. Does Christianity with all its splits and divisions pretend to represent the Hebrew Savior we read about in the Scriptures? “Come out of her,” is all we can say, “and be part of the restoration of all things prophesied by the mouth of Yahweh’s holy prophets from ancient time (Rev 18:4; Acts 3:21). We detest the unclean thing, and we desire to be free of everything that would keep us from entering the Holy City (2 Cor 6:17; Rev 21:27). Do you think that, perhaps, “Jesus,” the name, might be “unclean”?

We think so. Whether it has become so through a slow eroding process as YHWH’s people took on the ways of the Gentiles, or whether it was deliberately tampered with, we believe it has changed and must be restored. One day, all those who call upon the name of the true Savior will name only one name and will enter into one body through one baptism (Eph 4:46). These are the times of restoration.

We do not want to seem arrogant, nor do we wish to start an argument, insisting that “Zeus” and “Jesus” are etymologically linked together. We only mentioned this as a “maybe” in the Freepaper article in order that we would not seem to be too strong about other people’s scholarship. But we would want you, as a reader, to consider the possibility, and we offer the research contained in the rest of this letter as some sort of proof. Keep in mind as you read the following text that many facets must be taken into consideration in order to arrive at the conclusion we have concerning our Savior’s name. We have come to this conclusion naturally, and it has become quite clear to us; but to many it is like searching for the direct command in the scriptures to “live in community.” We have observed over the years that only the obstinate of heart cannot find it, because they are not drawn by our Father (John 6:44). So, as the Savior said, “Take care how you listen” (Luke 8:18), for some listen with the intent to criticize. But “if any man is willing to do His will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself” (John 7:17).

If we think that the Greek “IESOUS” is an attempted transliteration of the Aramaic name Yeshua or Yehoshua then we are guilty of perpetuating the corruption of *the one name* by which we must be saved, when we use it in our own English variation “Jesus.” {Acts 4:12 refers to His revealed name. Acts 22:15 16; 26:14 15; Rom 10:13 15.) All must call upon the name that was revealed. It was revealed to Paul. He knew His name and it was this name that he preached. Should we not exert every effort to know *this* Savior, the Savior of the whole world, the one who is bringing those who are drawn to Him by the Father into Isra el, those who are “commanded by E1,” the Holy City of Rev 21? Then God is One, and so is His name One! But not as each language sees fit to corrupt it. Notice Jdg 21:25. In our day since there is no apostolic authority in the land, anything goes and is accepted, and few notice or even care that our Savior’s name has been corrupted during the last 2000 years. After all, is it important?

Scholars have shown that there is no “sh” sound in the Greek, Justifying “Iesous” as the closest transliteration of the name Joshua or Yahshua. But there is an “sh” sound in the Hebrew and all men must acknowledge the Hebrew Savior and the nation He first became the God of, considering that He will be the God of only Israel, for He is Israel’s God throughout eternity. All must come into Israel to be saved (Eph 2:11 12), where there is no distinction of race or nation. All Israel today must return to His name, which was revealed to Mary and Joseph in Mt 1:21 and Lk 1:31, and to Paul in Acts 26:14 15. The One Paul called upon to be saved (Acts 22:16) and the One Paul preached (Rom 10:13 16) is the One we must return to. This is the same name revealed to Messiah’s apostles, Jn 17:6; not only revealed but also manifested as the Salvation of YHWH, the very meaning, significance and essence of His name. (And He made His Father’s name known also to them (Jn 17:26). In verse 3 of Jn 17, you may notice that eternal life is based upon knowing the Father and the One He

sent. Whoever knows them knows also their names (Pr 30:4; Psalm 83:18).)

The name “Jesus” is a corrupted form of our Savior’s name because it was derived from a foreign, second generation attempt to transliterate the Hebrew name Yahshua into Greek. The lack of the “sh” sound in Greek does not excuse this corruption if indeed Rom 1:5 is true; that is, if there was true apostolic authority at that time, the Greeks could have been commanded and the name maintained for generations to come, so that all nations may call upon the name above all names (Mt 28:18-20).

Now consider this. In the Greek religion, a deity was worshipped who was called Dionysus. He was parallel in mythology to Bacchus, the deity of wine. In the *Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology* (Paul Hamlyn, London), you can find this statement: “Dionysus is etymologically the ‘Zeus of Nysa’ and seems, by several similarities of legend and function, to be the Greek form of the Vedic god ‘Soma’” (page 178). *The Two Babylons* by Alexander Hislop, page 71, reads, “From this point let the well known name of Bacchus in Greece be looked at. The name was Dionysus or Dionusus. What is the meaning of that name? Hitherto, it has defied all interpretation. But deal with it as belonging to the language of that land from which the god himself originally came, and the meaning of it is plain. Dionusus signifies ‘The Sinbearer,’ a name entirely appropriate to the character of him whose sufferings were represented as so mysterious, and who was looked up to as the great purifier of souls.” Then a note at the bottom of the page shows how this name was originally derived from the Hebrew words for “bearing iniquity” as in Ex 28:38.

The final syllable of the name “Dionysus” is the identical ending of the word “Jesus,” as you can see in the book named *The Two Babylons*, page 72. That Zeus was known as the “Savior” and that he was worshipped through Dionysus as “the great sinbearer” in ancient Greece is an indication that *maybe* the reason for the suffix “sus” in Jesus is simply that it came from “Dionysus” or “Zeus”, who was known as the Greek savior at the time the New Testament was translated into that language.

Without exception, all knowledgeable sources of information declare that the Savior’s name which was given by Heaven through the messenger Gabriel in Mt 1:21 was Yahshua. Yet many Bible translations give the variation “Jehoshua” instead (Num 13:16), as the attempted transliteration. But there is a problem with this variation. It is inaccurate. It is a hybrid word at best, since it is made up of misinformation handed down to us from the Masorites. As you may be able to tell, “Jehoshua” is the natural outcome of combining the Masoretic “Jehovah” with the Hebrew “Hoshua,” that is, salvation. “Jeh” + “Hoshua” = “Jehoshua.” Cross out the first two vowels from the word “Jehoshua” and you have “Y’Hshua” or, if you add the “a,” “Yahshua.”

Read Josephus, *War of the Jews*, book 5, chapter 5, section 7.

Remember that some of the reference books print “Joshua,” but we know that the “j” was a “y” originally so that the word should be pronounced “Yahshua.” Num 13:16 contains the Savior’s name.

Joshua is a perfect type of the Messiah, since he took Israel into the land of promise as the Messiah will be doing for the Israel of YHWH in the Kingdom and the Holy City, Israel, the wife of the Lamb. We therefore maintain that our Savior’s name must not be different from Joshua’s, since His name was the same by divine appointment.

We used to call Messiah by the name “Yeshua” because in an article called “Judaism and Professors of Religion,” *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Jan 1970, a certain Dr. Solomon Zeitlen wrote, “This is how ‘Jesus’ wrote His name in Hebrew ...,” and he proceeded to explain that the Hebrew letters of His name in combination were pronounced “Yeshua.” We took his scholarship as authentic, he being a Jew cognitive of the Hebrew language and a scholar on top of that. So we began to call Him by His supposed Hebrew name and our Father honored our hearts. But “Yeshua” is modern Hebrew, or late Aramaic. It is from the time the Jews began to suppress the use of the Tetragrammaton in mundane speech. To accomplish their goal, they began to distort the pronunciation of the name “Yah” by pronouncing it “Ye.” They are doing this even until this very day.

As we see the results of the evolutionary corruption of the word “Yahshua,” so also the word “Christ” has taken the place of the word “Messiah,” “Christ” being derived from “Chrishna.” Look at page 60 in the book *The Two Babylons*. Here you see Chrishna crushing the head of the serpent with his foot (Gen 3:15).

The Serpent is crushed by the Indian god and savior, Chrishna. See Dr. Ignaz Goldzhier's *Mythology Among the Hebrews*. It ties together the deities of Greece and India. Also Robert Taylor in his *Diegesis*, in his chapter on *Chrishna*, also Larousse's encyclopedia of mythology. It should be our desire to return as closely as possible to the original words of deity and our Savior.

In the *Hasting's Bible Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, in the article "Bible", the Gospel soon left the soil of Palestine and the Aramaic speech. This article recognizes that the Aramaic language was spoken almost exclusively in Palestine during the time of Messiah. He also says that the New Testament was compiled in Greek; but Rom 1:16 says that the gospel was to the Jew first. The gospel was proclaimed and written down for the Jew first. The concept that the Jews in the dispersion of the first church in Judea all knew Greek is the only possible reason why they would have written the New Testament in Greek. Common sense tells us that books such as Matthew, Hebrews, Revelation, James, and Peter were not first written in Greek. Do you suppose that the Greeks could have adequately passed on the Hebraisms contained in the scriptures when they could not understand them?

Notice Rom 8:16. Take the word "Abba," for instance. This word is a Hebraism. "Messiah," a Hebraism meaning "anointed," was translated "Christ" by the Greeks and the meaning was obscured. Eventually "Christ" or "Christos" ceased to be a title and became only a part of the proper name "Jesus Christ." The Greeks have not only corrupted the pronunciation of the names of the Bible, but also have corrupted the meanings. Ps 147:19-20 declares that we must enter the original faith of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in purity and without corruption from the Greeks. Alfred Loisy, in his book called *The Birth of the Christian Religion and The Origins of the New Testament*, says that Mark and Matthew were first written in the Aramaic or Aramean language, the text of which we have only in the untrustworthy translations of the Greek language; see page 66. He says, "Peter could probably express himself only in Aramean or Hebrew, as those in dispersion could very well understand."

Even if one or two books were written in Greek, there is no reason why the Greek names should have been substituted for the Hebrew names. We find many Hebrew names in the English Bibles. Why then has the true name of our God and Savior been substituted by Greek names or deities? Yahweh would hardly call Himself "Theos", which Dr. Ignaz Goldzhier, in his book *The Mythology of the Hebrews*, states is the same as "Zeus," the idol of the Greeks. The Messiah came in His Father's name (Jn 5:43).

The bust of Zeus is seen today in Greece, bearing a resemblance to the Messiah of Christianity, hair hanging loose and all—not tied back as He is pictured on the shroud of Turin. (Lev 13:45 — Messiah did not have leprosy, as Christians portray Him.) He has crept in unawares into the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament in the form of "Theos." Ponder this quote from *Greek and Roman Mythology*, appendix 1, "Survivals of Ancient Greek Divinities and Myths in Modern Greece", page 312: "Only in a few localities, notably in Crete, does any form of the name of Zeus survive, but the god still lives on under the title 'θεου' (theos), a title so conveniently equivocal that the Christian can use it without heresy and at the same time square perfectly with the ancient pagan belief." See the introduction to the Lomsa's Bible.

All Bible scholars know that the Savior was not known by the name "Jesus." Many who have come to accept the name of "Jesus" as the Savior and trust in Him to save them could have trusted in vain if, when they discover His true name, they fail to appropriate it as their Sovereign's name. As 1 Cor 12:3 says, these do not have the Holy Spirit's power to invoke Him as their Sovereign. Just because many have trusted in this name to be His real name does not make it His name. He was born a Hebrew as was prophesied in Isaiah 9:7, Micah 5:2, and elsewhere. Yet the Christian "Jesus" is not Hebrew, but derived from the Greek name "Iesous," and is Greek in character as we have labored to tell you already. This name, of course, is found in all the Greek translations and copies of the original New Testament which are remaining today.

According to the famous Liddel and Scott *Greek Lexicon*, "Iesous" is the Ionic form of the name "Iaso," the Greek goddess of healing. See under the word "Iaso," ninth edition, 1958, page 816.

But be that as it may, the important thing is not what His name is not, but what His name is. As all Bible scholars know (and everybody ought to know who He is), He is not the Greek goddess or the Greek idol Zeus;

but He is Shoshan Ha Emeq (Lily of the Valley), Ayalet Ha Shakhar (Morning Star). Yahshua is Hebrew. All Bible scholars also know that His name is in fact the same as Joshua's, the successor of Moses, as pointed out already. See Acts 7:45 and Heb 4:8 KJV. This shows that "Jesus" (which comes from Iesous) is being substituted for the Hebrew name "Joshua." If the "j" sound in Joshua is pronounced as in the original English (before 1565), in agreement with the Hebrew, which has no "j" sound, we have the correct pronunciation of the Savior's true name. But to write it as "Yoshua" does not show the connection it has with His Father's name, "Yah". Therefore, the best way to write His name in present day English is "Yahshua." Look at Jn 5:43 and Ps 72:17. He bears the family name. He is the Salvation of Yah (Acts 4:12). In Acts 3:21, the restoration of all things mentioned *surely* must also include the restoration of His true name.

There is one verse in the King James Version of the Bible, which brings this name into the English language as "Jah." Before the "j" was invented in English it was pronounced "Yah," the true name of our Father. This form of His name is used in Ps 68:4 and Rev 19:1 as part of Hallelu Yah!; that is, "Praise you, Yah!" or "Sing unto God sing praises to His name, extol Him by His name, 'Yah,' and rejoice before Him!" So it is clear that the name of Yahweh is meant to be known and used by His people. The connection between His name and His Son's name (Pr 30:4) is in Psalm 72:17 in the KJV published by the World Publishing Co. The center reference gives the original Hebrew to read as follows: "His name shall be as a Son to continue His Father's name forever ..." The Son came as Jn 5:43 says and also Jn 17:26: to declare the name of His Father to His disciples. The Father's name is upon every family that is His, the whole family in heaven and on earth bears His name. All who are His are a family. They have one Father, "one God and Father" (Eph 4:5 6). There is one Body, one baptism into this one Body (Mk 16:16; 1 Cor 12:13).

Joshua in the Old Testament was called "Hoshua" or "Oshea," which means "salvation" or "deliverance." But Moses added the Divine name and called him "Yahoshua," meaning, Salvation of Yah, Numbers 13:16. Later the "o" sound dropped away in usage and the name became shortened to "Yahshua." The exact letter for letter transliteration of this later form would be Y'shua, the "Y" representing "Yah." Evidence of later ancient pronunciation indicates the "ah" sound for the unwritten vowel between "Y" and "shua." Thus it would be sounded as "Yahshua" with the accent on the "shu." But we like to equalize every syllable: Yah'shu'a', emphasizing not only His divinity, but equally His humanity, as His power to save was manifested equally in both.

The word "HalleluJah," pronounced "HalleluYah" is the most ancient of all words of praise. It is used both on earth and in heaven to worship the true God (Rev 19:1 6). It is a pure Hebrew word found in almost every language. The first part, "hallelu ", means "praise," and the last part, "Jah," pronounced "Yah," is the name of the one being praised. "Yah" is the personal name of the Creator. It is found in the Bible over 6,800 times. "Yah" is the basic or short form of the Divine name. The full form is "Yahweh." This name may be found in the Hebrew Scriptures, large Bible concordances, and encyclopedias. It may be found in dictionaries and in many current writings of history and archeology. Until recently, as *Encyclopedia Britannica* explains, "'Jehovah' is an erroneous thought that this name was pronounced as 'Jehovah.'" But the form of the divine name, of which the true form is 'Yahweh' ..." All up to date dictionaries show the same. So we should not further corrupt the divine name by using erroneous or corrupted forms of this name. This wrong form came about when Bible scribes deliberately and erroneously used the vowel sounds of the Hebrew word for divinity (eloha) in the tetragrammaton, YHWH. The result, "Yehowah", or "Jehovah," as it has come to be pronounced. Some translations still have "Jehovah" throughout the Old Testament. The Goodspeed version says in its preface: "In this translation we have followed the orthodox Jewish tradition and substituted 'The LORD' for the name YAHWEH. Anyone who therefore desires to retain the flavor of the original text has but to read 'Yahweh' whenever he sees 'the LORD' . . ."

Jah: Exodus 15:2, translated "The LORD." Ex 15:1 2 — "I will sing unto Yahweh ...". Exodus 15:2 — The LORD = Hebrew "Jah," the Eternal, inhabiting eternity—see Appendix XIII in *The Companion Bible*. "He who is and was and is to come ...".

The New American Standard Version of the Bible brings cowardly deceit into its translation of Hos 12:5 and Ps

68:4. Fearful that their translation will not sell to the traditional public and Christianity (by confession in the preface of the earliest versions), the translators write, “The LORD is His name,” when they know that this is not true, but a lie. They should consider 2 Cor 4:2 and be true and accurate in their translations.

Traditions of men are most prevalent in our day and time. Many of these traditions have even squeezed into the Bible in subtle ways. Look at 1 Cor 10:11 and Rom 15:4. Everything and all things are in need of restoration (Notice Acts 3:21), even the King James version of the Bible, and for that matter, all versions which hold to traditions rather than revealed truth (Jn 3:27).

In the restoration of all things referred to in Acts 3:21, if we are in that restoration and are part of it, the “all things” must include all vestiges of paganism and anything that will keep us from pure and simple devotion to Him in word and truth and deed (Rev 21:27).

Here are a few references to look into concerning the subject matter of this letter:

The *McKenzie Bible Dictionary*, Bruce Publishing Co.

Hastings Bible Dictionary, Charles Scribner's Sons.

McClintock and Strong's Bible Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature, Baker Book House.

Jewish Encyclopedia, KTAV Publishing.

Encyclopedia Britanica, Oxford.

Encyclopedia Judaica, MacMillan Co.

Companion Bible, Bagsten Publishing.

Douay Catholic translation of the Bible, Catholic Book Publishing Co.

Encyclopedia Dictionary of the Bible, McGraw Hill.

Smith's Bible Dictionary, Zondervan.

and you might check with your own dictionary.

Sincerely,