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### The Source of the Question

More than one denomination has struggled with choosing an “approved” Bible translation: for pulpit reading, for a study Bible, for whatever reason.

This quest may be presented in some sort of position or study paper, all very necessary and well-intended. Such papers are frequently written for the novice so as not to exclude young people or others from the decision process with complicated theological language, equally necessary and well-intended. A paper might even be apropos for beginning seminary students, who may be approaching serious theological studies for the first time.

However, many Christians and theologians will find this kind of presentation tedious. They will know that we are just scratching the surface. A well informed decision requires much more information: more profound and more in quantity.

### Grammar. Coping with Political Correctness.

The present author has no patience with so called Political Correctness whatsoever. It is, of course, important that translations not become archaic and lose their ability to communicate in a given language. We concede that. On the other hand, the Bible and Christianity are given to change the culture and world view of worldly pagan societies. The Bible and Christianity do not exist to be conformed to the world. There is a subtle way in which language changes, especially so with Political Correctness, and the like, which begins to undermine and reconstruct history and truth, eventually destroying both. Such changes are not in the best interests of either the Bible or Christianity; these changes must therefore be resisted and overthrown.

Political Correctness is the language of social revolution. Its goal is to overthrow large segments of social morality and world view. The vast bulk of these historic social mores and world views are Biblical, Christian and true: they must not be overthrown. Their destruction will only result in the downfall of our nation and society. Granted, Christians sometimes do cling to false values that need to be hunted down and destroyed. Nevertheless, I do not intend to conform to the language of Political Correctness, or its mindset. I intend to make such things as these cope with me.

All language is a moving target. Language fads, slang, and spelling variation have all been with us, at least since the Tower of Babel.[[1]](#endnote-1) Political Correctness is a passing language fad, not a correction to that which has become archaic. That which is simply archaic needs to be modernized, so that the Bible can be understood clearly by modern people.

### Dual Roots. One Spelling, Two Meanings.

Homonyms or homographs, dual roots, two different words with the same spelling, as well as antonyms, heteronyms, synonyms, and a variety of other beasts exist, not only in English, but also in most any other language I know anything about. I do not know who to thank for the following:

“The bandage was wound around the wound. The farm was used to produce, produce. The dump was so full that it had to refuse more refuse. We must polish the Polish furniture. He could lead if he would get the lead out. The soldier decided to desert his dessert in the desert. Since there is no time like the present, he thought it was time to present the present. A bass was painted on the head of the bass drum. When shot at, the dove, dove into the bushes. I did not object to the object. The insurance was invalid for the invalid. There was a row among the oarsmen about how to row. They were too close to the door to close it. The buck does funny things when the does are present. A seamstress and a sewer fell down into a sewer line. To help with planting, the farmer taught his sow to sow. The wind was too strong to wind the sail. Upon seeing the tear in the painting I shed a tear. I had to subject the subject to a series of tests. How can I intimate this to my most intimate friend?

“Let’s face it - English is a crazy language. There is no egg in eggplant, nor ham in hamburger; neither apple nor pine in pineapple. English muffins weren’t invented in England or French fries in France. Sweetmeats are candies while sweetbreads, which aren’t sweet, are meat. We take English for granted. But if we explore its paradoxes, we find that quicksand can work slowly, boxing rings are square and a guinea pig is neither from Guinea nor is it a pig.

“If the plural of tooth is teeth, why isn’t the plural of booth, beeth? One goose, 2 geese. So one moose, 2 meese? One index, 2 indices? Doesn’t it seem crazy that you can make amends but not one amend?

“If teachers taught, why didn’t preachers praught? If a vegetarian eats vegetables, what does a humanitarian eat?

“Sometimes I think all the English speakers should be committed to an asylum for the verbally insane. In what language do people recite at a play and play at a recital? Ship by truck and send cargo by ship? Have noses that run and feet that smell?

“How can a slim chance and a fat chance be the same, while a wise man and a wise guy are opposites? You have to marvel at the unique lunacy of a language in which your house can burn up as it burns down, in which you fill in a form by filling it out and in which, an alarm goes off by going on.

“English was invented by people, not computers, and it reflects the creativity of the human race, which, of course, is not a race at all. That is why, when the stars are out, they are visible, but when the lights are out, they are invisible.

“PS. - Why doesn’t ‘Buick’ rhyme with ‘quick’?”

Both Greek and Hebrew have similar idiosyncrasies. Solving such problems in English is only a small part of the problem. These things are relatively simple to resolve in one’s native language. In a second tongue it is a whole new ballgame. These sorts of problems lurk in a strange language, like cats waiting to pounce on a fat mouse. The mouse does not suspect that danger is there. Even a Hebrew grammarian may not realize that he is coping with an homonym. Ancient words exist for which no one living has a correct definition.

Lexicons are not dictionaries. Both are based on usage, but dictionaries have a readily verifiable basis in contemporary conversation: it is unlikely that the context would be vague to very many people. Lexicons, may have to draw on a single use. This can be a hopeless task, no better than guessing wildly. If we are lucky, a similar word may be found in a cognate language: this can improve the guess. However, there remain words for which the real meaning is lost forever in antiquity. One can frequently see the problem when an abundance of different translations are offered for the same word. If the lexicographer has no identifiable etymology, he may fail to distinguish the denotative or explicit meaning of a word from its connotative or implicit meaning.

In the case of homonyms, the translator may attempt to extract manufacturing (produce) from a garden, rather than fruits and vegetables (produce). In a living, first language, this may produce a decent joke. In the case of ancient and frequently dead languages[[2]](#endnote-2) the results are disastrous. The translator may have no idea that there is a problem, or how to resolve it. Even in two living languages the translation of, “The Spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak,” can still make its way into Russian and back into English as, “The Vodka was terrific, but the steaks were quite disappointing,” Let’s consider a few examples from the Bible itself. These are the same examples found in Lesson #3, “The Problem with Language.”[[3]](#endnote-3)

### Example 1 (1 Timothy 2:3-4)

τοῦτο[[4]](#endnote-4) γὰρ[[5]](#endnote-5) καλὸν[[6]](#endnote-6) καὶ[[7]](#endnote-7) ἀπόδεκτον[[8]](#endnote-8) ἐνώπιον[[9]](#endnote-9) τοῦ[[10]](#endnote-10) σωτῆρος[[11]](#endnote-11) ἡμῶν[[12]](#endnote-12) θεοῦ[[13]](#endnote-13), ὃς[[14]](#endnote-14) πάντας[[15]](#endnote-15) ἀνθρώπους[[16]](#endnote-16) θέλει[[17]](#endnote-17) σωθῆναι[[18]](#endnote-18) καὶ7 εἰς[[19]](#endnote-19) ἐπίγνωσιν[[20]](#endnote-20) ἀληθείας[[21]](#endnote-21) ἐλθεῖν.[[22]](#endnote-22)

There is one textual variation supported by both the Majority Text and the Textus Receptus (1550 & 1894). Two texts omit the second word, γάρ, from the text. This word introduces verse 3 as an explanatory clause. The function of verse 3 is to give further explanation of verse 2.

We translate:

I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; [especially] for kings, and for all who are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty: — verses 1 and 2 for context.

for, this [*is*] good and acceptable in [*the*] presence of[[23]](#endnote-23) God our Savior, Who, desires all men to be saved and to come into commitment to truth:

for, there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; — verse 5, also for context

Commentary:

This verse explains that the supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgiving mentioned in verse 1 are accepted or received by God. It says nothing of God’s pleasure in such “calves of the lips”, in and of themselves, which is the impression given when “for” is removed. God is pleased when we pray for the President; He may not at all be pleased with our request for a new car. Such sacrifices are offered up in the sight, or better, in the presence of God.

God is our Savior. John 3:16 indicates that this is the Father. However, it is less definite here. Even so, we may be sure that salvation is a Trinitarian work. Nevertheless, we do prefer the idea that the Father is particularly referred to here. John 6 supports this idea as well.

Such salvation is specifically noted to hinge on God’s will, wish, or desire.[[24]](#endnote-24) This is the main verb of the sentence. It is indicative, meaning that it is a plain statement of fact. God does not force salvation on anyone. He does not coerce people into loving Him. Salvation is not fatalistic. Nor are people predetermined robots. Such ideas cannot be squeezed from the word θέλω. Neither is wants (NIV) an acceptable translation. The fundamental meaning of want is to lack, or be in need of something. God is not in need of anything, let alone our salvation. God loves us and desires our salvation. He has paid the full price for it. Nevertheless, this gift must be received freely and sincerely by faith.

This wish or desire of God applies to all men, not to angels or apes. The watering down of ἀνθρώπος to make it somehow sexist, misogynistic, and anti-women is a demonic lie. This term includes all human beings; it cannot be limited to homo sapiens[[25]](#endnote-25); it has no distinction of sexuality, race, ethnicity, age, rank, or social standing. What it does distinguish is men from spirit beings, men from animals. Salvation is specifically for man, and for no other. We must not suppose that the word ἀνθρώπος is unnecessary, being obviously understood. What should be obvious in our culture today, is that many people value angels and animals more highly than they value their fellow man. Many would go out of their way to show mercy on an animal, when their human neighbor suffers cruel indignity, starvation, oppression, and debt slavery. Removal or dilution of the word ἀνθρώπος in texts like these allows such corruption to slip by, unnoticed. Granted, the whole universe is impacted by this salvation: it is a work of astronomical, even beyond astronomical proportions. The plight of animals and nature is greatly improved by the death and resurrection of Christ. The groaning of creation is eased by His wounds. Nevertheless, this salvation is solely and exclusively stated to be for man. We must not cater to Political Correctness on such issues.

Two simple past tense (aorist) infinitives define the aim, goal, or objective of God’s wish or desire: to be saved and to come. To be saved is the passive voice; the cause of action is not named; God is naturally assumed to be the One who saves. To come is the active voice, and describes something that men are to do: all men are to come. It does not say that all men will come. It is impossible to say from this construction, if these infinitives are simultaneous or sequential, dependent or independent. We generally assume from other verses and contexts that the salvation is the logical cause of the coming. In reality men come because of the drawing of the Father and the prompting of the Holy Ghost, so that the coming and the saving are inseparable and integral to each other.[[26]](#endnote-26) It’s best to leave the mystery as a mystery and not try to explain what we cannot understand. God saves. Men come. We need a grammatically and lexically honest translation; not one with a built-in theological bias.

To what do men come? We cannot accept the any old willy-nilly, “a knowledge of the truth.” Admittedly, ἐπίγνωσις is a difficult word to cope with. It involves the inner workings of the νοῦς, the mind, and possibly the emotions and will as well. No mere human knows the exact meanings or workings of these things.

Still, we can say these three things with confidence: one, ἐπίγνωσις requires commitment; two, it never stops growing; three, it does not involve full knowledge, it does not resolve all mysteries.[[27]](#endnote-27) With the growth of knowledge, comes the attendant demand for increased commitment; and with fresh commitment comes new knowledge.

This is the way faith works: when we step out in faith, we experience and learn something, all by God’s grace. As we learn more we grow to trust more. The passage indicates that which is elsewhere called the obedience of the faith; the faith that does not exist apart from works. This is not to say that salvation can be earned, or that there is human merit to salvation. Nevertheless, if faith requires that we must take the cup of salvation: we cannot help ourselves, we cannot stop ourselves; we will take that cup and drink it down with fearful hearts and trembling hands.

If we don’t need a built-in theological bias; we certainly do not need one theologians biased opinion.

The contextual argument from verse 5 is more than a bit of red herring. If a clear distinction was in mind the word ἀνήρ would have been used, then ἀνήρ would have been translated by the word male, so that ἀνθρώπος is not corrupted in an ill-begotten attempt to cater to political correctness, or evilly directed women’s liberation rights.[[28]](#endnote-28) Women’s liberation rights are no rights and no equality at all; rather, they are the forfeiture of women’s Divinely granted place of honor. What we need to fix here is not our language, but how we treat women.[[29]](#endnote-29) Women’s liberation rights further reduce the status of all women. This error requires confrontation, not acquiescence or surrender.

While much of this discussion may be quite esoteric; it is this very esoteric nature of the subject that allows subtle change to slip in unawares: thus, reinventing and destroying the historic nature of faith, handed down from our Ancestors.

### Example 2 (Matthew 4:19)

καὶ7 λέγει[[30]](#endnote-30) αὐτοῖς[[31]](#endnote-31) Δεῦτε[[32]](#endnote-32) ὀπίσω[[33]](#endnote-33) μου,[[34]](#endnote-34) καὶ7 ποιήσω[[35]](#endnote-35) ὑμᾶς[[36]](#endnote-36) ἁλιεῖς[[37]](#endnote-37) ἀνθρώπων.[[38]](#endnote-38)

There are no identified textual variations in this verse.

We translate:

And He says to them, “Come. Be my followers,[[39]](#endnote-39) and I could make you … you will gather men.”[[40]](#endnote-40) Alternatively, “… you will be men gatherers.”

Commentary:

There are some very interesting concepts in this verse: Δεῦτε and ἁλιεῖς among them. These are worthy of sermonic development and specific application to life.

Christians are the soldiers of Christ; they take orders; failure to follow is to not be Christian. There is no easy path in the Bible, only a narrow one. A Christian is a highly committed disciple, there is no lax view of Christianity in the Bible. Sadly, some seem to make this into a formula for super-sainthood.[[41]](#endnote-41) This is not Pietism. This is a requirement for every Christian. Read your Bible, and by the grace of God, through faith, in the power and teaching of the Spirit, obey it. In other words, follow Jesus with all your mind, spirit, and strength, being earnestly led by the Spirit of God.

However, the presence of the subjunctive mood in ποιήσω, “I could, would, should make you”, shows that the human will is very much in play: among the twelve, one would not; among us, many could turn away, even at the last hour.

Christians are the gatherers of Christ. We are to be pulling people together wherever we are.

There is only one word worthy of defense and disputation: ἀνθρώπος. We intend to defend the translation, man, to our dying breath. We strongly protest the machinations and manipulations of translation that are attempting to expunge this word from the English language. We will not tolerate the erasure of anthropology, anthropological, or any other such term from the English language. This is simply catering to the worst, most rebellious behavior among some of the (not always) gentler sex, who are hatefully casting their crowns of glory to the ground, in one final act of hatred against God. If we cannot agree on the word man, perhaps we should consider the transliteration, anthropos, rather than giving up this word. The word means to gather men, both male and female, in preference to gathering angels and apes. Salvation is exclusively for humans; blessings flow from men to other creatures.

### Example 3 (Matthew 8:9)

καὶ7 γὰρ5 ἐγὼ[[42]](#endnote-42) ἄνθρωπός[[43]](#endnote-43) εἰμι[[44]](#endnote-44) ὑπὸ[[45]](#endnote-45) ἐξουσίαν,[[46]](#endnote-46) ἔχων[[47]](#endnote-47) ὑπ’39 ἐμαυτὸν[[48]](#endnote-48) στρατιώτας,[[49]](#endnote-49) καὶ7 λέγω[[50]](#endnote-50) τούτῳ[[51]](#endnote-51)·Πορεύθητι,[[52]](#endnote-52) καὶ7 πορεύεται,[[53]](#endnote-53) καὶ7 ἄλλῳ[[54]](#endnote-54)·Ἔρχου,[[55]](#endnote-55) καὶ7 ἔρχεται,[[56]](#endnote-56) καὶ7 τῷ[[57]](#endnote-57) δούλῳ[[58]](#endnote-58) μου28·Ποίησον[[59]](#endnote-59) τοῦτο,4 καὶ7 ποιεῖ[[60]](#endnote-60).

Westcott and Hort insert the word [τασσόμενος[[61]](#endnote-61)] after ἐξουσίαν, the brackets indicating that this is their editorial opinion, not a textual variant. There are no identified textual variations in this verse.

We translate:

For I also … I am [*a*] man under authority, having soldiers under me.[[62]](#endnote-62) I say to this one, “Go.” [~~And~~][[63]](#endnote-63) He goes. To another, “Come.” He comes. To my slave, “Do this.” He does.

Commentary:

There is no need to stray from the word, man, here either. The substitution of person just weakens the text, and blocks the English reader from getting a feel for the underlying Autographa. A good translation arrives at smooth English without destroying the feel of the original; especially the repeated use of words in various contexts. If we are fortunate enough to know the denotative or explicit meaning of a word, this should be used everywhere possible. Connotative or implicit meanings belong in footnotes or sermons, not in the translation.

Whenever, connotative or implicit meanings are used, the feel and look of the Autographa is lost to the English reader. When a variety of different words are used in translation, the feel and look of the original word is lost to the English reader. If we have a copy of the Autographa, we should defend it to the death. Subliminally, The English reader, reading straight through the Bible regularly, should be able to form an accurate understanding, both of the Autographa and of the original words used. This is extremely important in Example 1, where the bondage of the will is still a hot theological topic.

The distinctive value of this verse rests in the fact that this humble centurion immediately recognizes certain martial aspects about Jesus and about heavenly things. He understands that he needs to put himself under Jesus command: a new Commander in Chief has found him. His resultant expression of faith and understanding is extraordinary. Whatever Jesus commands, he is committed to obey. Whatever his shortcomings in ability, he will try his best unto death, understanding that his success depends on his Commander’s supply. He understands what it means to be a soldier of Christ. These ideas are conveyed through the simple introduction, “For I also …”

### Wrapping Up

These are important concerns that must be dealt with. Nevertheless, I am far more concerned that there exists in The Church, such appalling ignorance that some teachers of flocks:

* do not know that the word, go, in the Great Commission is a participle of attendant circumstance and not the main imperative verb.
* do not know that the High Priest of the Jews entered the Oracle once a year with sacrificial blood to cleanse it; so that he, other priests, and the Levites could enter the Oracle frequently in their attention to their regular daily tasks, throughout the rest of the year.
* do not believe that the object behind the communion rails is an altar, representative of the ark of the covenant and the mercy seat in heaven, or that they serve within this representation of the Oracle of God without fear, parading and strutting around without humility as though they owned the place, and even denying its very existence.

Our world has conformed many churches to its own standards. Brothers and Sisters, these things ought not to be. We are being overtaken by demons, and demonism; rather than conquering them. The job of The Church is to be that instrument in the hands of Christ, by the power of the Holy Ghost, and totally dependent on the grace of God the Father, that instrument, which conforms our world to Christ. We are failing in our assigned task. If we ever needed to be revived from our complacency, today is that day. Shame on us, we have denied our Savior. Shame on us, our hands are drenched in the blood of those who are perishing. Shame on us, we refuse to take this seriously.

### Conclusions

We cannot support any document, either Old or New Testament, as a legitimate contender for a first copy of the Autographa[[64]](#endnote-64) that is not Greek and is not handed down within The Church. Any other claimant is false.[[65]](#endnote-65) This is not a claim that we have such a perfect first copy of the Autographa in our hands, but it is certainly the goal which we must seek.

We highly value translations, because the Scriptures must be read in the language of the people; but all such translations must be based on a legitimate first copy of the Autographa, not on the opinions of various scholars.

Which American English translation should be selected as the standard for conservative, Bible believing churches: the ESV or the next generation NIV? Neither one. Both are based on the works of Hort, Westcott, Nestle, Aland, et al. Both are based on the MT. Both must be rejected as inferior. What about Holman (HCSB)? HCSB is based on a Nestle-Aland Text New Testament and a Masoretic Text Old Testament.

Isn’t it interesting that The Church survived for six hundred years without the help of the Masoretes in identifying a decent copy of the Old Testament Autographa? Then isn’t it amazing that The Church survived for another thirteen hundred years without a decent copy of the New Testament Autographa? Then Hort, Westcott, Nestle, Aland, et al came along to save us from our morass of ignorance and give us the first decent copy of the New Testament Autographa. Has it occurred to anyone that this is simply impossible: it contradicts everything about The Church, what The Church was designed by God to be, and what The Church is. Has it occurred to anyone that the Holy Ghost was not given with or to the Masoretes, and did not originate with Hort, Westcott, Nestle, Aland, et al. Where has The Church been from 33 to 2000 AD? Lost in darkness, without a Bible for over nineteen hundred years, until rescued by the Masoretes and Hort?

There has not been an English language standard translation since the King James version fell into disfavor and disuse. King James was also flawed, being based on the MT. However, it had the advantage of being in universal acceptance among English speaking people everywhere. With the fragmentation that exists in The Church today it is unlikely that an acceptable English standard translation is possible. This does not mean that we shouldn’t attempt such a version. Nevertheless, to do this honestly, we shall have to start from scratch, because all the current attempts are flawed at the basic presuppositional level.

The problem is complex and compound; multifaceted and murky. It dominates and ranges across the theological realms of revelation, inspiration, preservation, and canonicity long before it ever arrives at such juggernauts as textual criticism, transmission, and translation.

Let us hear the end of the whole matter. If we honestly and truly seek an “approved” Bible translation: for pulpit reading, for a study Bible, for whatever reason: then laypeople everywhere are going to necessarily involve themselves in the process of Greek translation. Our point is that such hard work of translating Greek into English is no simple or laughing matter; certainly not to be trusted to the hands of the so-called experts, who sell us copyrighted and expensive English language Bibles, upon which nobody can agree.

[[66]](#endnote-66)

1. Genesis 11:1-9 [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. Of course, one can always argue that King James’ English is not a dead language. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
3. This is the only identification we have. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
4. τοῦτο, neuter nominative or accusative singular of the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος, αὕτη, τοῦτο: this. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
5. γάρ, explanatory conjunction or particle: for, sometimes with ellipsis; less commonly causal: because; rarely epexegetical: now, then, to wit. [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
6. καλὸν, masculine accusative singular or neuter nominative or accusative singular of the adjective καλός, ή, όν: good. The Greek language does not distinguish between good and well. Connotative meanings are numerous and varied. Here, the neuter predicate nominative forming a verbless clause, requiring that the verb be supplied in English: “For this is good….” [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
7. καί, conjunction: and, [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
8. ἀπόδεκτον, neuter nominative singular of the adjective or noun ἀπόδεκτος, ου, ὁ, ἡ, τό, -ον, from ἀποδέχομαι, a contraction of ἀπό + δέχομαι: something that one is willing to receive or take, acceptable. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
9. ἐνώπιον, adverb: visually, in the presence or sight of; (metaphysical) in the judgment, perception or thought of. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
10. τοῦ, masculine or neuter genitive singular of the article ὁ, ἡ, τό: the. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
11. σωτῆρος, masculine genitive singular of the noun σωτήρ, ῆρος, ὁ, from σώζω: savior. [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
12. ἡμῶν, genitive plural of the first person, personal pronoun ἐγώ, ἐμοῦ, μου: our, ours. [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
13. θεοῦ, masculine genitive singular of the noun θεός, οῦ, ὁ: God. [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
14. ὃς, masculine nominative singular of the relative pronoun ὅς, ἥ, ὅ: who, which. [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
15. πάντας, masculine accusative plural of the adjective πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν, παντός, πάσης, παντός: all. [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
16. ἀνθρώπους, masculine accusative plural of the noun ἀνθρώπος, ου, ὁ, ἡ: the human class of creatures as distinct from angels or apes, mankind, man; an individual, either male or female. [↑](#endnote-ref-16)
17. θέλει, present active indicative, third person singular of the verb θέλω: to desire or wish. Will is too strong a word: its nuance presumes the conclusion of the controversy; as if I were able, by the mere exercise of my will, to cause substantial events to take place. [↑](#endnote-ref-17)
18. σωθῆναι, aorist passive infinitive of the verb σώζω: to be saved. Here, stating the aim, goal, or objective of the thing wished for. [↑](#endnote-ref-18)
19. εἰς, preposition: into. [↑](#endnote-ref-19)
20. ἐπίγνωσιν, feminine accusative singular of the noun ἐπίγνωσις, εως, ἡ, from ἐπιγινώσκω, a contraction of ἐπί + γινώσκω: a grasp of real objective information, knowledge, experience, not only outward, but also inward; awareness of the truth of a mystery without necessarily understanding it; an acknowledgement, particularly of what God has done; an awareness of sin and guilt leading to repentance; “the decisive knowledge of God … implied in conversion to the Christian faith.” However, this again presumes the conclusion. It appears that γνωσις simply emphasizes a grasp of objective evidence of any kind. Nevertheless, epistemologically, we must concede that all evidence ultimately comes from God. It also appears that ἐπίγνωσις emphasizes the arrival or coming to such a grasp, or perhaps committed agreement with that which is grasped. Moreover, neither γνωσις nor ἐπίγνωσις is ever complete, full, or perfect knowledge; knowledge which continues growing from one glory to another. See TDNT, γινώσκω. [↑](#endnote-ref-20)
21. ἀληθείας, feminine genitive singular of the noun ἀλήθεια, ας, ἡ, from ἀληθής, έος, ὁ, ἡ, τό, -ές: reality, truth, sincerity. [↑](#endnote-ref-21)
22. ἐλθεῖν, aorist active infinitive of the verb ἔρχομαι: to arrive or come, to go, pass. [↑](#endnote-ref-22)
23. The only article in these verses appears here. The text is more literally translated in presence of the, our Savior, God. The words our Savior are adjectival and describe the sort of God, which the God is. All the other words in these two verses are anarthrous. There is no, “the knowledge of the truth.” There is only, “knowledge of truth.” The nature of that knowledge and truth must come from their meanings, or be brought from context. [↑](#endnote-ref-23)
24. In some theological constructs, God’s wish is a predetermined certainty, a fatalism: that God always gets what He wishes. This ignores that fact that man is created in the image of God: thus, also having an independent will. Other theological constructs err in assigning power to the will; but, the will has no intrinsic power: we may not simply wish for things to happen (wishful thinking) and see them bloom into physical reality. We must also work for our wishes to happen; and even then, after all our blood, sweat, and tears, things won’t necessarily go our way: our wishes and plans may all fail. [↑](#endnote-ref-24)
25. Neanderthal, and other early humans must be included: at least, in our ignorance, we have no warrant for their exclusion. Apes, on the other hand are excluded. [↑](#endnote-ref-25)
26. We should say that God is the primary and greater first cause; man is the secondary and weak cause. God saves, men still choose: the salvation is still incomplete without the human decision. [↑](#endnote-ref-26)
27. At least one prominent theologian insists, repeatedly, that ἐπίγνωσις means full knowledge. Only God has full knowledge. [↑](#endnote-ref-27)
28. Verse 5 literally says, “there is one God, and one mediator between God and humans, the human Christ Jesus”; so, there is no emphasis on Christ’s maleness in this verse: for ἀνθρώπος means man, both men and women, without any gender or sexual preference whatsoever. [↑](#endnote-ref-28)
29. Which has, confessedly, been wrong. [↑](#endnote-ref-29)
30. λέγει, present active indicative, third person singular of the verb λέγω: to say. [↑](#endnote-ref-30)
31. αὐτοῖς, masculine dative plural of the reflexive pronoun αὐτός, ή, ό, which is commonly used as the third person, personal pronoun: literally -self or -selves. Here, the personal pronoun, to them, indicating His current body of listeners. [↑](#endnote-ref-31)
32. Δεῦτε, δεῦρο + ἴτε, present active imperative, second person plural of the verb εἰμί, with prefix δεῦρο: the copula; to be, be; “an exclamation in the plural … as a particle of exhortation, excitement … followed by an imperative: literally, here; come now, come right this minute; attention, as in the military use, tench-hut, which always precedes the following command(s), which can never be given from the at-ease position; listen up, fall-in, front-and-center all express the urgency of emotion. This urgency is generated by the brevity and sharpness of the contraction, and by the imperative ἴτε, rather than by the word definitions. The following command will have the force of a Divine act of creation, and leaves little room for the exercise of the human will: response is automatic, the hearers are not expected to be able to refuse; they may refuse, but we will be surprised if they do. It is rare to have a capital letter in printed Greek text, we have not removed it; neither do we have enough textual evidence to verify its presence: it needs a remark in the critical apparatus. [↑](#endnote-ref-32)
33. ὀπίσω, adverb: after, behind. Here, used as an imperative: follow. Since we expected an imperative, we suspect that this may be some sort of lost present active imperative, second person plural form. The problem is that this cannot be demonstrated: all omega ending imperatives appear to be third person singular. Nevertheless, all translators treat this as an imperative, a peculiar Greek idiom. More literally, “Be adherently (follower-ly) of me.” We treated it having substantive force, “Be my followers.” If the copula is more suppressed, it could equally have verbal force, “Come, follow me.” The point is to show the difficulty a translator often faces with Greek idiom. [↑](#endnote-ref-33)
34. μου, masculine genitive singular of the first person, personal pronoun ἐγώ, ἐμοῦ, μου: me. Or possibly, my follower-lies. [↑](#endnote-ref-34)
35. ποιήσω, future active indicative, or aorist active subjunctive, first person singular of the verb ποιέω: to create, make. The subjunctive force is informative, if not expected, behind a command. [↑](#endnote-ref-35)
36. ὑμᾶς, accusative plural of the second person, personal pronoun σύ, σοῦ: you. This is the direct object. [↑](#endnote-ref-36)
37. ἁλιεῖς, nominative or accusative plural of the noun ἁλιεύς, έος, έως, from ἅλς: fisherman. Alternatively, future active indicative, second person singular of the verb ἁλίζω: to assemble, gather together. We believe that the denoted or explicit meaning is to gather, substantively a gatherer; hence, the connoted or implicit meaning to gather fish in a net, to fish, substantively a gatherer of fish, fisher, or fisherman. [↑](#endnote-ref-37)
38. ἀνθρώπων, masculine genitive plural of the noun ἀνθρώπος, ου, ὁ, ἡ: the human class of creatures as distinct from angels or apes, mankind, man; an individual, either male or female. [↑](#endnote-ref-38)
39. Literally, “Here, be behind of Me.” Emphasis should be placed on the imperative, be, which is spoken in a command voice. [↑](#endnote-ref-39)
40. Literally, gather of men. We give particular attention to the use of the genitive to express the objects: both μου and ἀνθρώπων. [↑](#endnote-ref-40)
41. Bonhoeffer [↑](#endnote-ref-41)
42. ἐγὼ, nominative singular of the first person, personal pronoun ἐγώ, ἐμοῦ, μου: I. [↑](#endnote-ref-42)
43. ἄνθρωπός, masculine nominative singular of the noun ἀνθρώπος, ου, ὁ, ἡ: the human class of creatures as distinct from angels or apes, mankind, man; an individual, either male or female. [↑](#endnote-ref-43)
44. εἰμι, present active indicative, first person singular of the verb εἰμί: the copula; to be; I am. [↑](#endnote-ref-44)
45. ὑπὸ, ὑπ’, preposition ὑπό; with genitive: under with stative force, under the influence of; with accusative: under with dynamic force, under subjection to. [↑](#endnote-ref-45)
46. ἐξουσίαν, feminine accusative singular of the noun ἐξουσία, ας, ἡ, from ἔξεστι: to be lawful, permitted; authority, jurisdiction, right. [↑](#endnote-ref-46)
47. ἔχων, present active participle, masculine nominative singular of the verb ἔχω: to have, hold. [↑](#endnote-ref-47)
48. ἐμαυτὸν, masculine accusative singular of the reflexive pronoun ἐμαυτοῦ, ῆς, οῦ: myself. See αὐτός, ή, ό and αὐτοῦ. [↑](#endnote-ref-48)
49. στρατιώτας, masculine accusative plural of the noun στρατιώτης, ου, ὁ, from στρατιά: army; its soldier(s). [↑](#endnote-ref-49)
50. λέγω, present active indicative, first person singular of the verb λέγω: to say. [↑](#endnote-ref-50)
51. τούτῳ, masculine or neuter dative singular of the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος, αὕτη, τοῦτο: this, that; this one, that one. [↑](#endnote-ref-51)
52. Πορεύθητι, aorist passive imperative, second person singular of the verb πορεύομαι: to depart, go. [↑](#endnote-ref-52)
53. πορεύεται, present middle indicative, third person singular of the verb πορεύομαι: to depart, go. [↑](#endnote-ref-53)
54. ἄλλῳ, masculine dative singular of the adjective ἄλλος, η, ο: another of the same kind, from the same set; other, another. Here, another soldier. Distinct from ἕτερος, α, ον: another of a different kind, from a different set; other, another. [↑](#endnote-ref-54)
55. Ἔρχου, present middle imperative, second person singular of the verb ἔρχομαι: to come. [↑](#endnote-ref-55)
56. ἔρχεται, present middle indicative, third person singular of the verb ἔρχομαι: to come. [↑](#endnote-ref-56)
57. τῷ, masculine or neuter dative singular of the article ὁ, ἡ, τό: the. Here, left untranslated. [↑](#endnote-ref-57)
58. δούλῳ, masculine dative singular of the adjective δοῦλος, η, ον: slave. [↑](#endnote-ref-58)
59. Ποίησον, aorist active imperative, second person singular of the verb ποιπέω: to do, make. [↑](#endnote-ref-59)
60. ποιεῖ, present active indicative, third person singular of the verb ποιπέω: to do, make. [↑](#endnote-ref-60)
61. τασσόμενος, present passive participle, masculine nominative singular of the verb τάσσω: to appoint, arrange; having been appointed. [↑](#endnote-ref-61)
62. myself [↑](#endnote-ref-62)
63. The endless repetition of καὶ (and) in Greek, is tedious in English. This is probably a carryover from Hebrew idiom where “and” is used to simply indicate that the story continues, without carrying any other conjunctive force. In Hebrew, “and” is merely a single letter, doing less to disrupt the flow of thought. In Greek, as a three letter word, it is somewhat annoying. In English, it is positively offensive. We removed most of them. For the greater part καὶ is simply the Greek way of indicating that one clause or sentence has ended and a new sentence or clause has begun. This being said, καὶ has many other complex uses, other than the full stop. [↑](#endnote-ref-63)
64. Technically speaking, we strive to discover the ultimate archetype from as many manuscript streams as are known to exists, in the hope that such an archetype is a true representative of the autograph from which it was once penned. Of course, this task can never be inerrant, because we do not have exact knowledge of each step of provenance from autograph to archetype to extant manuscripts. If such an exact provenance existed, the construction of the archetype would be a simple task. Text criticism is an attempt to reconstruct a picture of the provenance. As it stands, the best available record of that provenance exists in the history and records of the ancient Church on earth (33-400 and onward). We ignore the provenance of the ancient Church to our own peril: the chain of custody means everything. [↑](#endnote-ref-64)
65. Which is why almost all modern English translations lack validity, even the basis of the King James is invalidated: because most are based on false theories of autography, the best archetypes available were not used. This is not to claim that such modern English translations are filled with error; nevertheless, the blunders are sufficient to require closer examination. We already have at least 30,000 different opinions about what the Bible teaches; we don’t need any more opinions: we need a method of more careful study, drawing us toward a single universal conclusion. [↑](#endnote-ref-65)
66. If you have been blessed or helped by any of these meditations, please repost, share, or use any of them as you wish. No rights are reserved. They are designed and intended for your free participation. They were freely received, and are freely given. No other permission is required for their use. [↑](#endnote-ref-66)