



SPOTIFY SHOW	Cepher Moments
EPISODE	Five Reasons to Own a Cepher
SPEAKER	Dr. Stephen Pidgeon
PUBLISHED	February 26, 2026

LISTEN TO THE ORIGINAL CPG EPISODE • [Open in Spotify](#) • [Open in YouTube](#)

Publisher's Note

This document was prepared from the original Cepher Publishing Group Spotify subtitle file, the previously cleaned transcript, and the February 26, 2026 episode audio. Subtitle numbering, timestamps, production interruptions, repeated false starts, and non-substantive filler were removed or condensed. Grammar, punctuation, paragraph structure, Sacred Names, book titles, proper names, and clearly identifiable quotations were standardized while preserving Dr. Stephen Pidgeon's sequence of thought, rhetorical emphasis, and intended meaning.

This is an edited transcript, not a verbatim court transcript. Spoken demonstrations—especially the vowel-centered pronunciation of Yahuah and Yahusha—cannot be represented perfectly in writing. Readers should use the linked original episode as the audio companion for those passages.

No content from unrelated shows, ministries, podcasts, or outside creators has been inserted into the teaching. External references appear only in the final verification notes to document corrections and source standards.

Five Reasons at a Glance

1

A Unique Scriptural Collection

The Cepher places commonly accepted writings alongside related works that the speaker believes illuminate the broader scriptural record.

2

The Security of a Printed Copy

A physical edition is owned—not streamed—and cannot be remotely revised, restricted, rented, or removed from a digital platform.

3

A Distinct Work—not Presented as a Bible

The title Cepher intentionally distinguishes the work from conventional canon labels and institutional definitions.

4

Transliteration, Harmonization & Inclusion

Hebrew names, consistent terminology, source relationships, and additional writings follow three stated editorial principles.

5

Corrections to Difficult Passages

The Cepher addresses passages the speaker considers mistranslated, internally contradictory, or obscured in common English editions.

READING NOTE

The first three reasons explain what the Cepher is and why the speaker values physical ownership. Reasons four and five move into editorial method and specific translation decisions.

FULL EDITED TRANSCRIPT

Introduction

Welcome and good evening. I'm Stephen Pidgeon, and thank you for joining us for Ceper Moments. Tonight we are going to discuss five reasons why you should own a Ceper and offer an overall view of what makes the Ceper distinct. The Ceper is not presented as a Bible; it has always been presented as the Ceper. We made that distinction from the outset because we did not want this work confused with a canon defined by the Roman Church, the Anglican Parliament, or another institution. We wanted to present, from an American point of view and under the freedom of speech protected by the First Amendment, the Scriptures we believed were important to read. Part of our reasoning involved discoveries in the Dead Sea Scrolls—materials unavailable to the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century councils and confessions that shaped later English canons and, in our view, worthy of renewed consideration.

The Name “Ceper” and Its Meaning

First of all, the Ceper. When we put together the Ceper, we had this discussion. Gee, how should we spell Ceper? That was a big issue because when you look at the Hebrew, you have this idea of samekh, peh/feh, and resh. These are the three letters involved in the word Ceper, and quite often this is transliterated into the English language as SEFER, which would be a correct pronunciation. But we decided early on in our transliteration work that we were going to use C as in cement for the letter samekh. So where the samekh would appear in terms of our transliteration of the Hebrew into the English language, wherever the samekh appeared, we would use C as in cement to express that S sound.

Now, in addition, we also wanted to use PH for the feh sound. Remember that the letter peh or feh has two sounds, either a P sound or an F sound. For the F sound, we used PH. So we ended up with the unique spelling Ceper. And we applied to the United States Patent and Trademark Office for a registered trademark, and we did in fact secure a registered trademark.

We had some discussion with the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The examiner initially objected that a foreign word meaning “book” could not be registered for a book. I responded that ceper, in its ancient setting, can carry the sense of a numbered writing or scroll rather than a modern bound book. The Hebrew root caphar concerns counting or numbering, and ceper can refer to the resulting writing or record.

A scroll is opened between two handles. A megillah, by comparison, is a roll opened from one handle. Esther can be called Megillah Hadassah; Judith, Shir HaShiriyim (Song of Songs), Qoheleth (Ecclesiastes), and Qiynah (Lamentations) are also treated as megilloth, or rolls. Other writings may be described as cepheriym—scrolls or numbered writings. We therefore chose the singular name Ceper, used that distinctive spelling, and obtained federal registration for the mark.

So the name Ceper is a registered mark. Now what does it mean that we have a registered mark? Well, when I told the USPTO it didn't really mean book, it meant numbered writing or a numbered scroll, they agreed with me, and they put us out on the register to see if anybody was going to challenge us and no one did. And so we were granted the mark.

Registration gives the mark protection under the Lanham Act. In general terms, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(a) addresses unauthorized use in commerce of a registered mark when the use is likely to cause confusion, mistake, or deception. The mark at issue here is CEPHER®. When someone uses the mark in a way that falsely suggests approval, sponsorship, or affiliation, that may create a claim under federal trademark law.

Potential remedies are addressed in related provisions of the Lanham Act. Subject to the facts, equitable principles, and a court's judgment, 15 U.S.C. § 1117 addresses profits, damages, costs, and—only in exceptional cases—reasonable attorney's fees; § 1118 addresses delivery and destruction of infringing articles. The point is simple: criticism is one thing, but using a registered mark in a misleading way is another. I recommend that people respect the mark and avoid implying authorization that has not been given.

1

A Unique Scriptural Collection

A broader scriptural collection that places related writings and cross-references within reach.

When we talk about the Cepher, we are describing a distinct collection of Scripture. It includes the writings commonly found in the (traditional 66-book) Bible and other works that we believe are inspired, referenced, or echoed within the broader scriptural record. One example is Baruch Sheny (Second Baruch), which discusses the consolation of Yashar'el. Luke 2:25 uses that same expression when Shimon is described as waiting for "the consolation of Yashar'el."

Luke 3 presents a genealogy that moves backward from Mashiach to Adam, unlike Matthew's genealogy, which moves forward from Avraham to Mashiach. Luke 3:36 includes Cainan between Arphaxad and Shelah—a name absent from the corresponding Masoretic genealogy in Genesis but present in the Septuagint tradition and in Yovheliym (Jubilees).

Yovheliym 8 describes Cainan as the son of Arphaxad and father of Shelah and says that he found and copied a writing connected with the Watchers. That provides important context for Luke's genealogy. Yovheliym 12 also contains a prayer asking for deliverance from evil spirits and protection from being led astray—language that invites comparison with the model prayer in Matthew 6 and Luke 11.

The Cepher Yashar gives another example. It says that the Ruach Ha'Qodesh enabled Yoceph to learn the languages of the kingdom and that his name was called Yahuceph. Tehilliym (Psalms) 81:5 likewise contains the distinctive Hebrew form b'Yahuceph. The Cepher preserves that form rather than flattening it to the ordinary spelling of Yoceph.

The Complete Jewish Bible also signals the extra hey in the form Y'hosef. The Cepher renders the name Yahuceph in agreement with its reading of the Hebrew. Yashar itself is named in Yahusha (Joshua) 10:13 and Shemu'el Sheny (Second Samuel) 1:18, which is one reason we believe it deserves serious consideration.

Now there are those who say, oh, Enoch is trash and should never be read by anybody, but guess what? It was read by all the New Testament writers. There are 56 references to the Book of Chanoch (Enoch) in the New Testament and there's direct citation through the Book of Chanoch (Enoch) in the Book of Jude and a very discrete reference to the book of Enoch in Second Peter talking about the fallen watchers and being in chains in darkness. In addition to that, our friend Luke, in chapter 3 of Luke in that same genealogy, going from Messiah all the way back to Adam, in the Book of Chanoch (Enoch), it says there are 70 generations of these demons being locked up and then the demons are unleashed.

Well, how long is a generation? I don't know, and it doesn't make any difference because we don't have to count. All we have to do is count the generations from Mashiach on the way back to Adam and count up to 70. And when you do, in the Gospel of Luke, the 70th generation is the generation of Chanoch (Enoch), and what's that tell you? Well, we know that the demons were unleashed for the first time during the time of Mashiach. Because when Mashiach, his first miracle as described in Mark, as described in Matthew, is to cast out demons. And when he casts out the demons, what's the reaction inside the synagogue? This has not been seen in Yashar'el before. Why hasn't it been seen before?

The Book of Chanoch presents a seventy-generation framework and, in chapter 93, a sequence of ten “weeks” that the speaker understands as a 7,000-year outline. In Chanoch 93:12, the righteous are promised knowledge of the “sevenfold doctrine” of creation. The speaker connects that theme with the repeated sevens in Chazon (Revelation): seven assemblies, seven messages, seven seals, seven trumpets, seven thunders, and seven bowls, among other sevenfold patterns.

You have the seven angels, you have the seven churches, you have the seven letters, you have the seven seals, you have the seven trumpets, you have the seven thunders, and you have the seven bowl judgments. There's seven sevens in the Book of Revelation. What does it say in Daniel 9:24? Seventy sevens, the sevenfold doctrine of His whole creation set forth in Genesis 1:1.

So one of the reasons that you should own the Cepher is because the Cepher is unique. It is like no other book on earth. It is called the Cepher because it is not a Bible. It is a unique writing that has been set up and established, we believe by the hand of Yah, to deliver the message that Yah wants to deliver at this time because the iniquity of Yashar'el came to an end.

Now let's talk about the iniquity of Yashar'el for a minute. If you go back to Ezekiel 4:5, you're going to see that Ezekiel is instructed to lie on his side for 390 days, each day equal to a year, for the iniquity of Yashar'el. And in Leviticus 26:27–28, we see that iniquity is multiplied sevenfold because Yashar'el had not repented. Well, that takes us to 2780 years. And when we take out the 722 years of 722 BC, when the northern Kingdom fell to the Assyrians, when the iniquity count began to accrue, it takes us to 2008. And shortly thereafter, our team was inspired to begin to move forward with the creation of the Cepher - and that we might do what? Deliver the name of Yahuah and Yahusha.

Some critics dismiss Chanoch, Yashar, Baruch Sheny, and Yovheliym outright. In my view, that overlooks both their messianic themes and their relationship to language found in the Apostolic Writings. It also differs from the judgment of early writers such as Tertullian and Origen, who treated Chanoch with considerable respect.

The quotations and thematic parallels are important. One example is the “Elect One,” a title found repeatedly in Chanoch. At the transfiguration, a textual form of Luke 9:35 uses the Greek expression *ho eklelegmenos*—“the Chosen” or “Elect One.” I see that as a direct connection with the figure prophesied in Chanoch.

Taken together, Chanoch, Yashar, Baruch Sheny, and Yovheliym are cited, echoed, or considered throughout the Apostolic Writings. Yovheliym also helps frame the Jubilee sequence. Leviticus establishes the fiftieth-year Jubilee, and I understand Genesis 6:3—“his days shall be an hundred and twenty years”—as pointing beyond an ordinary lifespan to 120 Jubilee cycles. That is an interpretive conclusion, but it illustrates the broader chronology made visible by the Cepher's collection.

What kind of year? Why didn't he say man's years shall be 120 years? Because he's referring to something else, that's a different kind of count. What count is he talking about? He's talking about the 120 Jubilee years, which by the way, we are just but days away from wrapping up the 120th Jubilee and entering into the second year of the 121st Jubilee. And now I can tell you might say: Doctor P, your calculations are ludicrous. You're just absolutely out of your mind. But, who agrees with me that this is a Jubilee year? The Vatican agrees with me that this is a Jubilee year. This is why they opened up that one door that is only opened every 25 years.

They opened it up this year because they believe it's a Jubilee year, which Jubilee? The 120th Jubilee; man's days shall be 120 Jubilee years. Is that important? Maybe it's not. Maybe you don't care about the End Times analysis at all. Maybe that's irrelevant to you. Maybe you don't care about the sevenfold doctrine of His whole creation. Or maybe you think that just because Jude quoted the Book of Chanoch (Enoch) shouldn't stop you from throwing the Book of Chanoch (Enoch) in the trash. Just because the Cepher cites all (155) Psalms doesn't mean you should call the book trash and direct people to throw it in the garbage can. Does it?

2

Why a Printed Copy Matters

A physical copy cannot be remotely revised, restricted, rented, or removed from a platform.

Let's turn to the second reason. On Radio Free Alaska, I comment on political events and their application to Scripture. I believe we are entering a period of unprecedented technological control. The concern is not merely that information will be digitized, but that access to information can be monitored, changed, restricted, or removed by institutions that control the platform.

In a fully networked society, buying, selling, communication, and even private records may depend on systems of surveillance, monitoring, analysis, reporting, and tracking. I connect that concern with the prophetic language of the mark, name, or number of the beast. Whether one agrees with every detail of that analysis or not, the practical point remains: digital access is conditional access.

When the digital world becomes the gatekeeper, a text can be revised or denied remotely. What do you do for the Word of Elohiym if the platform changes it or removes it? There is a simple safeguard: have it in writing. Own a physical copy that does not depend on a subscription, an account, or a server.

I remember growing up in Anchorage and visiting Betty's Record Den on Fifth Avenue, across from Penney's and next to Club Paris. You could hear a song on KYBR or KENI, walk into the store, and ask to listen to the new 45. The records were spread across a huge rack, with rows of vinyl albums nearby.

You could take the record into a listening booth, put on the headphones, lower the needle, and listen to your heart's content. Maybe it was Diana Ross singing "Love Child," "The Jolly Green Giant," or the Beatles' "Can't Buy Me Love." If you bought the 45 or the album, you owned it. As long as you cared for the record and had the equipment to play it, no company could remotely take it away.

The same was true of a carefully kept vinyl collection. You could clean the disc, place it on a Denon direct-drive turntable, lower the stylus, and hear the recording. Digital formats may offer convenience and lower noise, but ownership changed as music moved from records to compact discs, then files, and finally subscription access.

A compact disc may have offered a cleaner signal than a worn record, but the deeper transition was from owning a copy to licensing access. Once the physical medium disappears, the provider can change the catalog, the terms, or the price.

Today much of our music is rented per listen. Yuval Noah Harari has publicly discussed the possibility of artificial intelligence producing new religious texts; I view that prospect with deep concern. If the only available text is a digital revision controlled by someone else, you may no longer possess the text itself. That is why a printed Cepher belongs in your home.

You're going to get the revision and then you're going to have to rent it at that. You're not even going to own it. You're going to have to rent it. So the point I'm making is this is another reason why you should own it in a paper form so that you can put it on the shelf.

3

The Cepher Is Not Presented as a Bible

The title Cepher intentionally distinguishes the work from institutional canon labels.

A third reason to own the Cepher is that it is not presented as a Bible. So when they criminalize the Bible, the Cepher isn't a Bible. I'm sorry, I don't own a Bible. Oh, well, the Bible's been criminalized. Are you aware of that? We've made it a felony to own any book called the Bible. Well, that's fine, but I don't own a Bible. So out, get out of my get out of my house, shoo, fly, shoo. So, you can see that's another reason.

4

Transliteration, Harmonization, and Inclusion

Names, terminology, cross-book consistency, and inclusion follow a visible editorial method.

The fourth reason concerns three guiding principles behind the Cepher: transliteration, harmonization, and inclusion. These principles emerged as the work developed. Transliteration preserves Hebrew names and terms; harmonization carries those forms consistently throughout the collection; inclusion keeps significant related writings available to the reader rather than excluding them by default.

The English Bible tradition includes the Great Bible of 1539, the Geneva Bible of 1560, the Bishops' Bible of 1568, the King James Version of 1611, and Benjamin Blayney's influential 1769 Oxford edition. The New Testament of that stream depended heavily on the Byzantine textual tradition and, later, the Textus Receptus. In my view, that tradition is preferable to editions built primarily on Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus.

Codex Sinaiticus has long been controversial. Constantine Tischendorf recovered leaves at Saint Catherine's Monastery and presented the manuscript as extraordinarily ancient. Constantine Simonides later claimed that he had produced it in the nineteenth century. Mainstream manuscript scholarship rejects Simonides's claim, but the controversy remains part of the history surrounding the Codex and should be described accurately as a disputed claim—not as an established modern forgery.

Westcott and Hort gave Vaticanus and Sinaiticus substantial weight in their nineteenth-century Greek text. Critics of that approach point to omissions and shorter readings in many modern translations, including the shorter ending of Mark in the earliest major codices. Supporters understand those readings as earlier textual forms. My own editorial judgment favors the Byzantine and Textus Receptus tradition.

That preference does not mean the English tradition is beyond criticism. The Cepher's work begins with those source traditions but addresses names, vocabulary, cross-book consistency, and the scope of the collection in a different way.

The Westminster Confession was completed by the Westminster Assembly in 1646 and approved by the Church of Scotland in 1647. Chapter 1 treats the Apocrypha as outside the canon. Earlier English editions, including the 1611 King James Bible, commonly printed the Apocrypha between the Testaments. The Cepher rejects a strict sixty-six-book limitation and returns those writings to the reader.

The older English translators also aimed at language ordinary people could understand. That was a worthy goal, but common English substitutions sometimes obscured Hebrew names and terms. The Cepher's transliteration principle addresses that loss.

Miles Coverdale's Great Bible and the later English tradition inherited substitutions for Elohiym and Yahuah. The Cepher instead restores the sacred names according to its transliteration system. We do not condemn the earlier translators; we recognize the historical and theological setting in which they worked.

Scripture repeatedly speaks of declaring, remembering, calling upon, and publishing the Name. The Cepher therefore presents Yahuah and Yahuah Tseva'oth rather than suppressing the Name behind a generic title. It also presents the Son's name as Yahusha.

I understand the recovery of the Name as connected with the end of Yashar'el's period of iniquity. That is a theological interpretation specific to this teaching. The editorial result, however, is concrete: the Cepher transliterates thousands of names so readers can see the Hebrew forms reflected in English.

A Hebrew reader recognizes the four letters yod-hey-vav-hey and the name Yahusha when they appear. Transliteration allows an English reader to recognize those names too. The purpose is not novelty; it is visibility and consistency.

That brings us to the evidence considered in choosing the form Yahuah and in understanding the Son's name as Yahusha.

One comparison is Yahudah, commonly rendered Judah. The letters are yod-hey-vav-dalet-hey. Removing the dalet leaves yod-hey-vav-hey. The Cepher team treats that relationship as one witness for the form Yahuah.

Another witness cited in this teaching is Josephus, who described the four letters on the high priest's headpiece as four vowels. The speaker uses that description, together with the vocal behavior of yod, hey, and vav in other Hebrew words, to explain a flowing four-vowel pronunciation of the Name.

The letter hey at the end of words such as Torah and Sarah carries an "ah" sound. Vav can function with an "o" or "u" sound, as seen in Torah and shalom. These comparisons are offered as part of the Cepher's transliteration rationale.

The written edition uses Yahuah. In speech, I emphasize the vowels with no hard fricative inserted between them. The purpose of the spelling is to lead the reader toward that vowel sequence while retaining a practical English form.

The same harmonizing principle is applied to Yahusha. The Septuagint uses Iesous for Yahusha son of Nun, whom English readers call Joshua, and the Greek Apostolic Writings use Iesous for the Messiah. The shared Greek form points back to the same underlying Hebrew name.

The official Cepher reference materials note 175 instances of the form Yahusha in the Tanakh, compared with two instances of Yahushua. The Cepher connects Yahusha with the root yasha—to save, deliver, rescue, preserve, or bring victory—and understands the name to mean that Yahuah saves.

For that reason, the Cepher publishes Yahusha rather than later English or Greek-derived forms. This is the transliteration argument: compare the witnesses, identify the Hebrew letters, and render the name consistently across the full collection.

Harmonization Across the Text

Harmonization addresses inconsistent English forms across the collection. Older editions may use "Holy Spirit" in one place and "Holy Ghost" in another, or Isaiah and Esaias, Elijah and Elias. Acts 12:4 in the King James Version even uses "Easter" where the Greek word is pascha. The Cepher carries the restored Hebrew names and consistent terminology from the Tanakh through the Apocrypha and into the Brit Chadashah.

So all the transliteration work that was done in the Old Testament, when those names are identified in the Old Testament, they are harmonized into the New Testament. And so this was the doctrine of harmonization across both the Old Testament, the apocryphal works, and the New Testament or the Brit Hadashah.

The Doctrine of Inclusion

Inclusion explains why Yashar, Chanoch, Yovheliym, Baruch Sheniy, and the Apocrypha appear in the Cepher. Earlier English Bibles regularly printed the Apocrypha, though Protestant confessions later treated those books differently from the canon. The Cepher's editorial posture is that significant writings should remain available for reading and comparison.

The history is more complicated than a single parliamentary decree. The Ten Articles of 1536, the Thirty-Nine Articles finalized in 1571, the printing practice of English Bibles, and the Westminster Confession of 1646–1647 belong to different moments. The Westminster Confession's first chapter expressly excludes the Apocrypha from the canon, while the 1611 King James Bible printed those books in a separate section.

The Cepher does not follow the Westminster limitation. Works such as Ezra Reviv'iy (4 Ezra, also known in many traditions as 2 Esdras) contain prophecy and theological reflection, not merely neutral history. The speaker also sees language echoed in the teachings of Mashiach, including the image of gathering children under protective wings.

The doctrine of inclusion therefore asks the reader to examine the writings rather than dismiss them by label. The fact that a work contains history does not make it spiritually insignificant; much of the accepted canon is historical in form.

The Cepher includes the Apocrypha and also Psalms 151–155, Chanoch, Yovheliym, Yashar, Baruch Sheniy, and other related texts. Their presence does not prevent readers from testing each work; it makes that testing possible.

The Dead Sea Scrolls demonstrate that Chanoch and Yovheliym circulated among the Qumran community in multiple manuscript copies. Chanoch also survived in several ancient languages and is fully preserved in Ge'ez within the Ethiopian tradition. Those discoveries materially changed the evidence available to modern readers.

The first Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered in 1947. That was long after the Council of Trent (1545–1563) and the Westminster Confession (1646–1647). The Cepher's inclusion principle takes that later manuscript evidence into account.

Yashar required extended consideration. The team compared its narratives, names, and chronology with Genesis, Yovheliym, the Psalms, and other writings. The distinctive form Yahuceph is one example. Its calendar details and expanded narratives are other reasons the team concluded that Yashar deserved inclusion.

Yashar also names Jannes and Jambres, the Egyptian magicians whom Pa'al mentions in Second Timothy 3:8. That correspondence is part of the cumulative case for an older tradition behind the surviving Yashar text.

We further compared Yashar with Genesis 49 and with readings in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and argue the details about Yahudah and archery reflect an early interpretive tradition. These are arguments for consideration, not a claim that every question about Yashar's textual history has been settled.

The surviving Hebrew Yashar was printed in the early modern period and has a disputed transmission history. The teaching presents traditions linking the work with Spain and Italy and argues that its agreements with other ancient sources deserve more weight than a simple "late forgery" label.

Place names also require care. A translator may use a later geographic name—such as Africa—to help a modern reader identify the location under discussion. That choice does not by itself establish the date of the underlying narrative.

Yashar's descriptions of the families of Yepheth and their movement into Europe are also presented as potentially consistent with geography and migration patterns. The speaker offers these as corroborating observations, not as a substitute for archaeological or genetic study.

The same inclusion rationale applies to Baruch Sheniy (Second Baruch) and to the work commonly called the Sonnini Manuscript or "Acts 29." Baruch Sheniy is connected in this teaching with the consolation of Yashar'el. The Sonnini text is included because we believe its account of Pa'al's western travels coheres with a broader body of tradition.

The Sonnini text's authenticity is disputed, and its account is not part of the standard textual tradition of Acts, but points to the traditions of Pa'al traveling to Spain and Britain, meeting Druids, and continuing through western Europe. Those claims are preserved as historical argument, not presented as universally accepted fact.

Pa'al's stated intention to travel to Spain appears in Romans 15:24 and 15:28. The Muratorian Fragment also refers to his departure for Spain. Traditions connecting Yoceph of Arimathea and early messengers with Britain are later and more contested, but they form part of the historical framework. In that framework, the Druids are not reduced to a modern stereotype, but rather connect British and Irish traditions, the memory of Boudicca and Bangor, and stories of early acceptance of the testimony of Yahusha.

The Sonnini narrative continues through Britain and into the Alps, where later tradition associates a mountain with Pilate's death. Again, the point of inclusion is to let readers examine the claim within the larger collection.

For the Cepher team, the cumulative result supported including the additional (29th) chapter. This illustrates the three-part editorial method: transliteration, harmonization, and inclusion.

5

Correcting Difficult and Contradictory Passages

Difficult passages are rendered according to the Cepher team's textual and interpretive conclusions.

The fifth reason is that the Cepher directly addresses passages the team considers difficult, contradictory, or mistranslated. One example is Matthew 1. The Cepher follows a textual interpretation in which the Yoceph named in Matthew 1:16 is the father of Miryam rather than her husband, preserving the genealogy as the direct line from Avraham and David to Miryam and then to Mashiach.

That reading differs from the dominant Greek manuscript tradition and from nearly all standard English translations, which identify Yoceph as Miryam's husband. The Cepher's position is that distinguishing the two men named Yoceph resolves the difference between Matthew's genealogy and Luke 3, where Yoceph is described as the supposed father of Mashiach.

Matthew 23:2–3 is another example. Common translations can appear to command obedience to everything taught by the scribes and Pharisees. The Cepher adopts a reading intended to keep Moshe's Torah—not later rabbinic tradition—as the standard. First Corinthians 11 is also rendered so that a woman whose head is already shaven (such as at the conclusion of a Nazarite vow) should cover it when praying or prophesying, rather than being commanded to shave her head.

The Cepher also renders Pa'al's statement in Romans 11:13 as honoring his office rather than magnifying himself. These choices reflect the editorial goal of removing contradictions created, in the team's judgment, by inherited wording.

The name Pa'al is itself an example. The Cepher connects it with the Hebrew root pa'al, "to work," and presents Sha'ul as Pa'al—the worker and sent one—rather than treating "Paulos" as a new identity adopted from Greek culture. These are distinctive translation decisions, and the Cepher makes them visible for readers to evaluate.

Closing Reflections

These five reasons explain why we believe readers benefit from owning and reading the Cepher. Many subscribers already own a copy and have found writings such as Baruch Sheny especially meaningful. Others have questioned the inclusion of the Johannine Comma in First John 5:7 because of its association with Trinitarian debate. The Cepher includes the passage as part of its stated doctrine of inclusion, without requiring every reader to draw the same doctrinal conclusion from it.

The textual history should be stated carefully. The Johannine Comma was absent from Erasmus's first two printed Greek New Testaments and appeared in his third edition of 1522; it was then carried in later editions associated with the Textus Receptus, including editions by Robert Estienne, known as Stephanus. The Greek manuscript evidence for the longer reading is late and limited, while the passage has a longer history in the Latin tradition. The Cepher nevertheless retains it as a textual and editorial choice.

Our responsibility is to examine the textual tradition and make the editorial decision visible. Applying the Cepher's doctrine of inclusion, we retained the Johannine Comma. That is one example of how this edition differs from many modern Bibles while still allowing readers to compare the witnesses and evaluate the passage for themselves.

Readability is another practical difference. Some compact Bibles place small type in multiple columns, combine heavy bold and all-capital material, and justify every line so tightly that sustained reading becomes difficult. We tried to replace that hostile reading environment with a clear layout, comfortable type, useful spacing, and page proportions that invite the reader to remain in the text.

That design work matters. Readers have told us that they opened sections whose gold-edged pages were still stuck together and, for the first time, read an entire book such as Yashar with sustained attention. They encountered the collection as a full meal rather than a brief weekly excerpt. The aim is an edition that makes extended study approachable and rewarding.

The Cepher invites a fuller encounter with the narrative: Tamar and her pregnancy, Rivqah and her pregnancy, and the confrontation between Esau and Ya'aqov; restored forms such as Arpakshad; and books identified by names such as Qiynah, Qoheleth, Tehilliyim, Yechezq'el, and Yeshayahu. The goal is not a weekly spoonful but a complete meal for sustained study.

Those are the five reasons we believe you should own a Cepher. Keep a physical copy in your library—something you can read, compare, annotate, and preserve even if you choose to step away from the digital world.

EDITORIAL TRANSPARENCY

Verification Notes & Source Standards

CHECK	EDITORIAL STANDARD
Episode identity	Cepher Moments; “Five Reasons to Own a Cepher”; Cepher Publishing Group; published February 26, 2026; runtime 1:43:39. Confirmed through the CPG podcast feed and major podcast listings.
Cepher terminology	Sacred Names and distinctive forms—including Yahuah, Yahusha, Yashar’el, Chanoch, Yahuceph, cepheriym, and Pa’al—were standardized against Cepher Publishing Group’s official FAQ and reference materials.
Trademark law	The discussion was corrected to distinguish 15 U.S.C. § 1114 (registered-mark infringement), § 1117 (profits, damages, costs, and exceptional-case attorney’s fees), and § 1118 (destruction of infringing articles). This transcript is not legal advice.
Historical dates	The Council of Trent is dated 1545–1563; the Westminster Confession was completed in 1646 and approved by the Church of Scotland in 1647; the first Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered in 1947; Marcion belongs to the second century A.D., not B.C.
Attributed claims	Disputed manuscript histories, canon arguments, prophetic chronology, linguistic interpretations, and theological conclusions are identified as the speaker’s analysis. Where the audio compressed or conflated names—most notably Eusebius and Jerome—the edition clarifies the distinction.

Primary Links

- [Original Spotify episode](#)
- [Apple Podcasts episode listing](#)
- [Cepher Publishing Group](#)
- [Cepher Frequently Asked Questions](#)
- [Cepher Academy](#)
- [15 U.S.C. § 1114](#)
- [15 U.S.C. § 1117](#)
- [15 U.S.C. § 1118](#)