

# APPENDIX

[This translation is primarily the third edition of *McCord's New Testament Translation of the Everlasting Gospel* (1989), or, the Freed-Hardeman Version as Hugo McCord affectionately called it. However, minor changes have been made based on changes that were made in the fourth (2000) and fifth (2007) editions. Those changes not made (with the exception of retaining the third edition's elimination of the word "church") are listed in the appendix with the fifth edition appendix notes and texts and a brief statement in brackets to annotate the reason for rejecting them. Whether the reasons for the rejections are satisfactory is left up to the reader to decide.

This appendix is a hybrid of the appendices of the third and fifth editions ensuring the maximum retention of invaluable, but uninspired, notes made by each edition since there are notes absent from the third edition that are included in the fifth and vice versa. Minor changes to the appendix that simply involve merging the appendices are not annotated while deliberate insertions of additional information are bracketed.]

## I. EXPLANATION

### Is There a Perfect Translation?

"Every scripture is God-breathed" (2 Timothy 3:16). Nothing in the autographs was "by human will, but men spoke from God being moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Peter 1:21). Theirs were not "words of human wisdom" but "of the Spirit" (1 Corinthians 2:13). The original writings then were perfect.

But translation of the Greek New Testament into English "is a human – not a divinely inspired – process," writes Professor Jack P. Lewis (*The English Bible from KJV to NIV*, Baker Book House: Grand Rapids, 1981, p. 10), and is "subject to all the faults man is heir to. The perfect translation does not exist." Consequently, "the careful student of the Bible will not rely completely upon one version, but will seek to recognize the strengths and weaknesses of the versions he uses." Though the Father did not choose to leave us a perfect copy of the autographs, his providence guarantees that we can learn from all the versions how to be saved (1 Peter 1:25).

### Is a Literal Translation Possible?

The thought of a word-for-word translation initially appears attractive, but right away the idea has to be discarded. Immediately, as one begins such, he retreats. For example, Matthew 1:18 would look like this:

of her having been betrothed to the mother of him of  
Mary to Joseph before to come together them she was  
found in womb having the Spirit Holy.

Not only awkward but confusing is a word-for-word rendering of Luke 3:14:

They were asking and him and soldiering saying, what shall we do and we? And he said to them, none shake through nor fig-shine, and be satisfied with boiled food bought of you.

A word-for-word translation of 2 Corinthians 9:10 is unintelligible:

The one and chorus-leading seed to the sowing and bread into food a chorus he will lead.

Literally one would have to know where a word starts or ends, for the Greek uncials had no spacing and no punctuation, and were written all in capital letters. With the expertise of many scholars through nearly two thousand years, no one knows for sure where to put a space in *maranatha* (1 Corinthians 16:22). Consequently, no one knows for sure what those letters mean. To space after the "n" gives one meaning, but to put it after the third "a" gives another.

This problem is not major, affecting no one's salvation, but it is enough of a problem that would-be literalists are embarrassed. A literal translation, no matter how much admired and desired, would be unintelligible. A word-for-word rendition with Greek grammatical constructions "would be more awkward than an interlinear and convey as little sense" (Dr. Eugene, American Bible Society).

The literal translation of the name of a Jerusalem pool "Siloam," according to the inspired apostle John, is *apestalmenos* ("having been sent from," John 9:7), but no version in my acquaintance follows John's example by using the literal translation.

## Is a Paraphrase Wrong?

Just as a literal translation can be awkward and confusing, so is the idealistic notion of "no paraphrase." Notice how meaningless it would be to translate such examples as Matthew 1:18; Luke 3:14; 2 Corinthians 9:10 (quoted above) without changing phrases.

All translations paraphrase. The literal translation of Matthew 26:15, "they paid him," the KJV has paraphrased to "they covenanted with him." The KJV has paraphrased "the thieves...reviled him" in Matthew 27:44 to "the thieves...cast the same into his teeth." The KJV has "God forbid" in Romans 6:2 as a paraphrase of the literal "may it not be," and in fourteen other citations.

Paraphrases conveying the thought of the Greek are not wrong, but sometimes the thought is changed: "Easter" (Acts 12:4, KJV); "Drink ye all of it" (Matthew 26:27, KJV); "horses' bridles in their mouths" (James 3:3, ASV); "women" instead of "wives" (1 Timothy 3:11, ASV); "deaconess" (Romans 16:1, RSV); "layman" (Numbers 16:40, NASB); "you are Peter the Rock" (Matthew 16:18, NEB); "the word was a god" (John 1:1, NWT); and "sinful nature" (Romans 8:3,4,5,8,9,12,13, NIV).

The literal translation of *hrabbi* (John 1:38) is "My Great One." However, the inspired John paraphrased it as *Didaskale*, "Master" (KJV), "Teacher" (ASV).

## **What Kind of Translation is Best?**

Since a literal translation can be confusing, and a paraphrase is sometimes misleading, how should a translator proceed? Dr. Nida writes that (1) a literal translation is formal equivalence; (2) a paraphrase is the author's thought in the translator's words; and (3) dynamic equivalence leaves the same impression on a modern reader that a first century reader received. Surely the third is what the Lord wants. He wants "the word of the truth of the gospel" (Colossians 1:4) to go into all languages with "understanding" (Psalm 119:130), not misunderstanding.

This translation (in places, literal; in places, paraphrastic) is an attempt to reproduce in twentieth century English the exact meaning of the inspired first century Greek words. In this approach, I follow the plan of the Latin scholar Jerome (340-440 A.D.). It took him fifteen years (390-405 A.D.) to prepare the Vulgate Version. He stated that his translation principle was *non verba sed sententias*, "not the word, but the sense."

Young people and older have critically read parts or all of this translation. A master reader in Greek and a scholar in English composition have each read the entire book. But I am responsible for all errors. Since translation is a human enterprise, this translation has weaknesses, as do all translations. Pray with me that the book will mislead nobody and will encourage many to live in "the beauty of holiness."

In this appendix, New Testament books are abbreviated as follows: Mt, Mk, Lk, Jn, Ac, Ro, 1 Co, 2 Co, Ga, Ep, Ph, Co, 1 Th, 2 Th, 1 Ti, 2 Ti, Ti, Pl, He, Ja, 1 Pt, 2 Pt, 1 Jn, 2 Jn, 3 Jn, Jd, Re.

## Corrections

In previous editions of the FHV I gave the Greek word *hina* in its usual telic (*telikos*) meaning, "in order that," but I overlooked its ecbatic (*ekbatikos*) meaning, "with the result" (Thayer 304). This oversight has been corrected in Mt 13:34-35; 21:4; 26:56; Jn 12:37-38; 13:18; 17:12; 18:8-9, 31-32; 19:24, 36; Ro 5:20.

I also erred in using only the first meaning of *biazetai* ("inflict violence on," Bauer-Gingrich-Danker, 140), as in Mt 11:12, but in Lk 16:16 a second meaning of *biazetai* ("invite urgently," B-G-D, 140) is demanded by the context, and is used in this edition.

## The Word "Church" Eliminated

To make this translation as accurate as possible, the word "church" is eliminated. The word "church" is firstly defined by Webster as "an edifice consecrated for public worship," and "church" historically refers to a physical building, a meetinghouse, which the Lord's people in the first century did not build, and for which there is no New Testament word. The English word "church" comes from the Middle English "cherche" or "chirche," which is from the Anglo-Saxon "circe" or "cyrce," which is from the German "Kirche," which is from the Greek *kuriakos*, meaning "belonging to the Lord." Webster says that the Greek word *doma*, "house," has to be added to *kuriakos* to make the word "church," that is a "church" is "the Lord's house." In the New Testament are found two things that are *kuriakos*, "belonging to the Lord," namely the Lord's Supper

(1 Co 11:20) and the Lord's Day (Re 1:10), but never "the Lord's house."

William Tyndale knew that the word "church" is an inaccurate translation of the New Testament word *ekklesia*, which simply means, "called out." So Tyndale, in the first English translation of the New Testament from Greek in 1525, eliminated "church" in favor of "congregation." King James I, having a vested interest in the word "church," since he was the head of the Church of England, did not like the change, and so he ordered the fifty-four translators of the King James version to use the word "church." Alexander Campbell knew what Tyndale knew about the inaccuracy of that word, and in *The Living Oracles* (1826) he, like Tyndale, used the word "congregation."

The Greek text of the United Bible Societies has one hundred and fourteen citations of *ekklesia*. In the two instances (Ac 19:32, 41 [E, 41]) where the reference is to an illegal group, this translation has "gathering." In the one instance (Ac 19:39) where *ekklesia* refers to a lawful group of citizens, this translation uses "assembly." In the one instance where the word refers to the Hebrew nation (Ac 7:38), this translation uses "called-out people," and uses the same phrase thirty-five times in reference to the Lord's New Testament people. Seventy-five times in reference to the same New Testament people, this translation uses "congregation."

## **The Word "Baptism" Eliminated**

Likewise, the word "baptism" is eliminated, because it is not a translation: "baptism" only anglicizes the Greek word *baptisma*, using English letters to replace Greek letters, and does not tell what it means. Since the root meaning of *bapto* is "dip,"

as seen in Lk 16:24: "Send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water to cool my tongue," this translation uses the word "immersion" (or, "immerse," "overwhelm," "submerge," Mk 10:38- 39) except in four instances where the author's thought is not the action (an immersion), but the result of the action (a washing) (Mk 7:4; Lk 11:38; He 9:10; 1 Pe 3:21). The metonymy is more realistic by the use of *loutron* (Ep 5:26; Ti 3:5) and *louo* (He 10:22). Those words show that *baptisma* sometimes points not to a dipping as such, but to the result of a dipping, namely, a washing, as seen in the statements: "having cleansed them in the washing of the water by the word" (Ep 5:26), and "the bath of the new birth" (Ti 3:5), and "having ... our body washed in pure water" (He 10:22).

William Tyndale in 1525 translated *baptisma* as "immersion," but King James I (in deference to the Church of England that practices sprinkling) forbade his translators in 1611 from using "immersion," and ordered them to use the noncommittal cover-up word "baptism."

Alexander Campbell's translation (*The Living Oracles*, 1826) used "immersion." The restoration preacher, "Raccoon" John Smith, in turning away from the King James version, said publicly, "'Baptize' is a foreign word," and that "as not many of you have the gift of tongues, ... I am resolved to speak to you in Greek no more." Another restoration preacher wrote in 1831: "It is an insult to the Holy Spirit to require his truth to be concealed from men to accommodate sectarian views."

Quite different was the approach of Noah Webster, the father of our dictionary, who wrote in 1833 that he was careful "to avoid giving offense to any denomination of Christians." In 1838 the Baptists asked the American Bible Society to publish a Bible translating *baptisma*. When the Society refused, the

Baptists asked Alexander Campbell to assist in a translation for them that used the word "immersion." He did so, but when they read in their new version (*The Bible Union*) of "John the immerser," they would not use it.

In the twentieth century the American Bible Society is still adamant in refusing to translate *baptisma*, defending themselves this way: "No translation should employ a word which would rule out one or the other of the interpretations as to the mode of baptism."

### **The Word "Repent" Eliminated**

Likewise the word "repent" is eliminated because it does not accurately translate the Spirit's word *metanoeo*. The word "repent" simply means "be sorry again" (*repoenitere*). *Repoenitere* (Latin), *metamelomai* (Greek), and "repent" (English) are synonyms of *metanoeo*, because regret and sorrow are prerequisites of *metanoeo* (2 Co 7:10). Regret and sorrow may lead to *metanoeo* (Mt 21:29, Mk 14:72), but they may stop short (Mt 27:3). *Metanoeo* has both a prerequisite and a consequent (Mt 3:8, Lk 19:8). The literal meaning of *metanoeo* is to think afterwards, to have an afterthought, to change the mind. [Alexander Campbell translated it as "reform".] In He 12:17 this translation uses the literal phrase "change of mind;" in other places, since biblically man's mind is his heart (Genesis 6:5; Ac 8:22), and since deeper feeling is usually associated with the word "heart" than with the word "mind," this translation uses the phrase "change of heart."

## The Phrase "Only Begotten" Eliminated

Likewise the phrase "only begotten" (Jn 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; He 11:17; 1 Jn 4:9, KJV, ASV, NASB) is eliminated (1) for the sake of accuracy and (2) for the sake of the honor that belongs to Isaac and to Jesus. Many Christians (of whom I was one) were brought up to believe that Jesus is dishonored if one does not call him "only begotten" (though somehow we did not take up for Isaac).

As for accuracy, in none of the six citations mentioned above did the infallible Holy Spirit cause *monos gennethis* or *monogennetos*, "only begotten," to be written, but in every instance the word written is *monogenes*, "the only one of a kind, the unique one."

It would have been inaccurate for the Holy Spirit to describe Isaac as *moledeth badad* (in the Hebrew), *monos gennethis* or *monogennetos* (in the Greek), "only begotten" (in the English), for Abraham his father begat seven sons (Genesis 16:15; 25:2) besides Isaac. Accordingly, Isaac was not an only begotten (as the KJV, ASV, NASB, and NKJV call him in He 11:17), nor was he an "only son" (as in the NRSV), nor was he a "one and only son" (as in the NIV), but God called him a *yachid* (Genesis 22:2), a "unique being, one of which no duplicate existed, a solitary person" (cf. Psalm 68:6 [H, 7]). The inspired writer of the book of Hebrews explained in what way Isaac was a *yachid*, a *monogenes*: he was the only son of promise, not the only begotten of Abraham (He 11:17).

Similarly, it would have been inaccurate for the Holy Spirit to speak of Jesus as a *monos gennethis* or *monogennetos*, an only begotten, for he was not the only begotten either of God (1 Jn 5:1; 2 Co 6:18) or of Mary (Mk 6:3). Actually, to call the

*Logos*, the Word, who "was God" (Jn 1:1), a begotten being, is to deny his eternity (Micah 5:2), is to demote him to creature-status (as some have done: the Arians, the Unitarians, the Jehovah Witnesses, etc.), whereas he is the Creator (Jn 1:3; Co 1:16). This is true because no begotten being can be as old as his father. The "Son" designation then, though important and precious, cannot be literal.

Physically he was begotten of Mary (Lk 1:35), but actually as the Word, he was always existing, he was never begotten. Ignatius wrote to the Ephesians in A.D. 110 that Jesus was *gennetos kai agennetos*, begotten and unbegotten (B-G-D, 156). Figuratively he was begotten (Psalm 2:7) in his being raised from the dead and in his being made king and priest (Ac 13:32-33; He 1:5; 5:5), but in no sense does the Bible call him an "only begotten."

B-G-D, p. 527, simply define *monogenes* as "only, unique." In the first three occurrences of *monogenes* in the New Testament (Lk 7:12; 8:42; 9:38) there is an "only" person described (son, daughter, son) who is compared with no other, and therefore any other word of definition would be "redundant" (Jack Lewis). But in the last six occurrences of *monogenes* in the New Testament (Jn 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; He 11:17; 1 Jn 4:9) neither Isaac (with seven brothers, Genesis 16:15; 25:2) nor Jesus (with many brothers, Mk 6:3; He 2:11) was an "only" son. Therefore, the word "only," as a translation of *monogenes* in regard to both Isaac and Jesus would be inaccurate. However, the word "unique" is both accurate and precise, and is followed in this translation.

## **Substitutions for God's Personal Name Eliminated**

An improvement needs to be made by the KJV, the NASB, the NIV, and the NRSV in their use of "LORD" with capital letters as a substitute for God's personal name: *YHWH* (Exodus 3:15; Psalm 83:18; Isaiah 42:8, etc.). The four letters (called the "Tetragrammaton") erroneously came to be regarded as too sacred for human lips, and consequently the correct pronunciation (which God used in speaking to Moses, Exodus 3:15) died out of human memory.

Orally the rabbis substituted *adonay*, "Lord," wherever *YHWH* appeared in the sacred text, which substitute in Greek became *kurios* in the LXX. The Vulgate followed suit, using the Latin *dominus*. In English the KJV generally did likewise, using four capital letters, "LORD," which pattern has been followed by the NASB, the NIV, and the NRSV.

But the substitute "LORD," for *YHWH* introduced a double problem: (1) the word "lord" is not a proper name, only a title; and (2) the use of one translation, though one is entirely capitalized, for two different words (*YHWH* and *adonay*) is confusing.

Before the Hebrew scholars transliterated the four letters of God's name as *YHWH* they used *JHVH*, "the sound of Y being represented by J and the sound of W by V, as in Latin" (Bruce M. Metzger, "To the Reader," preface of NRSV). Petrus Galatinus (confessor of Leo X), using *JHVH*, in 1518 injected the vowel points of the Hebrew word for "Lord" (e, o, a) into *JHVH*, and so constructed the word "Jehovah" (A. B. Davidson, *The Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 47). (Grammatically, hateph pathah under a yodth becomes a shewa.) The word "Jehovah" is therefore a hybrid, which "in linguistics" is "a word

made up of elements from different languages" (*Webster's Unabridged Dictionary*).

About a century after Galatinus, the KJV in 1611 "generally, though improperly, translated" the Tetragrammaton "by 'the LORD'" (Robert Young, *Analytical Concordance*, p. 536), but in four places (Exodus 6:3; Psalm 83:18; Isaiah 12:2; 26:4) the KJV used Galatinus' word "Jehovah." The English Revised Version of 1881 "departed" from the pattern set by the KJV "only in a few passages in which the introduction of a proper name seemed to be required" (Preface, English Revised Version). The impersonal word "LORD" in those "few passages," the English revisers thought, was inadequate to portray what they called the "ineffable" name. *Webster's Unabridged Dictionary* defines an "ineffable" word as "too awesome or sacred to be spoken, as God's *ineffable* name."

Then the American revisers of 1901 thought that the "ineffable" name should appear not "only in a few passages," but everywhere that the Tetragrammaton is in the sacred text. So the ASV has the word "Jehovah" some 6,823 times.

However, scholars in Hebrew have all along "contested" the use of the word "Jehovah" as being "against grammatical and historical propriety" (Brown-Driver-Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, p. 218). "The word 'Jehovah' does not accurately represent any form of the Name ever used in Hebrew" (Bruce M. Metzger, "To the Reader," preface in NRSV).

There is then no way to justify textually the use of the word "Jehovah," nor the word "LORD." Historically, however, the use of "LORD" is justified as a substitute because Jesus used the word "LORD" when apparently he was quoting from the LXX's rendition of the Tetragrammaton (Mt 22:44; Psalm 109:1 in the

Hebrew; 110:1 in the English). Similarly the Tetragrammaton in Isaiah 8:13 becomes "LORD" in 1 Pe 3:14-15, and in Isaiah 40:3 it becomes "LORD" in Luke 3:4. But textually there is no way to justify the use of the word "LORD" as a translation of the four letters *YHWH*.

Textually, what vowels are necessary to make the four letters *YHWH* pronounceable? If the pronunciation is "Yehweh" ("qal" in grammar), the meaning is: "he keeps on being," a certification of his endlessness and of his self-sufficiency and of his independence. "Besides me, there is no God" (Isaiah 44:6), "From everlasting to everlasting, you are God" (Psalm 90:2). Our hope for non-extinction depends on such a being.

If the pronunciation is "Yahweh," ("hiphil" in the grammar), the meaning is: "he causes to be," a certification of his creative power, without which we could not be in existence. "For in him we live and move and have our being" (Ac 17:28). "You are worthy, our Lord and God, to receive the glory and the honor and the power, for you created all things, and they came to be, yes, they were created, because of your desire" (Re 4:11).

B-D-B (*ibid.*) exhibit grammatical constructions in the Hebrew text that point only to "Yahweh" as the proper pronunciation. Today Bible scholars agree that "it is almost if not quite certain that the name was originally pronounced 'Yahweh'" (Professor Bruce M. Metzger, "To the Reader," preface to NRSV).

This translation has "Yahweh" for *YHWH*, as in Genesis 2:4; Psalm 1:2; Proverbs 1:7, and "Yah" for *YH*, as in Psalm 68:4, 118:5, and "lord" for *adon* when the word refers to a human, as in Genesis 18:12; Psalm 105:21.

The use of "Yahweh" in this translation is an attempt to get back as close as possible to God's personal name, of which he said to Moses:

This you will say to the children of Israel: "Yahweh, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you. This is my name forever, and this is my memorial to all generations" (Exodus 3:15).

Our grandmother Eve did not think that God's name is too sacred for human lips, saying, as Cain was born: "With the help of Yahweh, I have a male child!" (Genesis 4:1). It was during the lifetime of her grandson Enosh that "men began to call on the name of Yahweh" (Genesis 4:26). Similarly, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and many others used the memorial name in conversation (Genesis 14:22; 15:2; 24:27; 26:28; 27:27; 28:16; 30:24; 31:49). Reverence for the sacred name was one of the ten commandments: "You shall not make wrongful use of the name of Yahweh your God, for Yahweh will not pardon anyone who misuses his name" (Exodus 20:7). "Holy and awesome is his name" (Psalm 111:9, NRSV). But, for some reason, known only to God, not the pronunciation, but apparently the meaning of his name was first revealed to Moses (Exodus 3:13-15; 6:2-3).

## **Misleading Translations of OLAM Eliminated**

An improvement needs to be made by the KJV, ASV, NASB, NIV, and NRSV in their use of "forever" or "everlasting" or "perpetual" in regard to the covenant and the land promise to Abraham and to his seed (Genesis 13:15; 17:7-

8; 48:4). The use of those words leaves the impression that the covenant and the land promise were unconditional, that no obligations for Israel were attached.

However, God required that the seed of Abraham obey his commandments (Deuteronomy 28:1-2, 9, 13, etc.), which they failed to do. The Lord said that "they broke" his covenant (Jeremiah 31:32). Consequently, he allowed them to be driven from the promised land in 721 and 586 B.C. (2 Kings 17:18-23; 25:11-12). After a temporary restoration in 536 B.C., their final expulsion from the land was in 70 A.D., when, after they had "rejected" Jesus, their "house" was left "desolate" (Mt 21:42-43; 23:38).

Though the word *olam* at times is properly translated "forever" or "everlasting," as in Psalm 89:34-37; 90:2; 102:12; 2 Samuel 23:5, such a translation in regard to the land promise to Abraham and his seed contradicts Jesus' words (Mt 21:42-43; 23:38). Since 70 A.D., historical accuracy requires that other definitions of *olam* be employed, as "hidden time" or "long duration" or "time indefinite" or "unlimited" or "unending but not endless" or "on and on."

Jesus' statement "until the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Lk 21:24) could mean that someday the time of the Jews will return, and that "all Israel shall be saved" (Ro 11:26). But the statement, like the original promise to Abraham and to his seed, is conditional: "if they continue not in unbelief" (Ro 11:23). In the days of John the immerser and of Jesus, as well as now, for Jews to say, "Abraham is our father," means nothing (Mt 3:9). Only spiritual "Israel," from the first century to the end of the world, has meaning (Ga 6:16). Now "there is no distinction between Jew and Greek, for the same Lord is over all" (Ro 10:12). Now "the circumcision" are they who "boast in Christ

Jesus and have no confidence in the flesh" (Ph 3:3). "Real circumcision" is "spiritual, and not literal" (Ro 2:29, NRSV).

## **The Word "Perfection" Eliminated**

Because the word "perfection" in popular language most often signifies "sinlessness," a meaning valid only in certain contexts, the word is eliminated in favor of other correct meanings: "completion" and "wholeness." Likewise, the word "perfect" in Genesis 6:9; 17:1 is replaced with "blameless"; with "upright" in Psalms 18:30; and with "complete" in Psalm 19:7.

## **Be Not Many of You Translators**

Most people do not know Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic and they have to trust the translators. "Woe to the world because of the stumbling blocks! For the stumbling blocks must come, but woe to the man through whom the stumbling block comes" (Mt 18:7). Translators have within their power to destroy a "brother for whom Christ died" (1 Co 8:11). So, if translators are not dedicated to accuracy, they had better quit. One is not perverting Ja 3:1 to make it read: "Be not many of you translators, my brothers, knowing we shall receive greater condemnation."

## **II. PRINCIPAL EXCEPTIONS TO THE UBS TEXT AND ENGLISH VERSIONS**

The basic text (with some exceptions) from which this translation comes is the third edition (corrected 1983) of *The Greek New Testament* edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren,

published by the United Bible Societies (London and New York, 1966, 1968, 1975), with careful attention given to the text's companion volume *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, by Bruce M. Metzger on behalf of and in cooperation with the Editorial Committee (named above) of the United Bible Societies (London and New York, 1971). [The specific text used to translate Genesis, The Psalms, and Proverbs is unknown. Those Old Testament books were translated from Hebrew, and the text was likely the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.]

All those who love the Greek New Testament are deeply indebted to the scholars of the Editorial Committee for their many years of disciplined work and for their willingness that the results of their labors be universally shared. No one can question the vast majority of the 2040 variants (1440 in the textual apparatus, 600 more in the commentary) selected by the Committee. Instances of divergence considered important are explained below. Disputed words (Mt 18:15, Mk 16:9-20; Lk 23:34; Jn 5:3-4; Ac 1:19; 8:37; 15:34; Ro 16:25-27; Ep 1:1) considered important in this translation are bracketed. [There are some insertions by the translator, not the editor, in The Psalms which are bracketed as explanatory, but were certainly not in the original text.] Doubly bracketed words (Jn 7:53-8:11), as in UBS, indicate textual additions "of evident antiquity and importance" (*The Greek New Testament*, xlvii).

Metzger (*A Textual Commentary*, xxvf.) describes the criteria by which critics determine, when two or more variants occur, which is most likely the original reading. External evidence is gathered from the date, character, geographical distribution, and genealogical text-family of the witnesses. Internal evidence is gathered from transcriptional probabilities. Instead of counting manuscripts the textual critic weighs them

by three criteria: (1) the more difficult reading is preferred (remembering that this evidence is relative, for a reading can be "so difficult that it can have arisen only by accident in transcription"); (2) the shorter reading is preferred except when parablepsis or purposeful omission is probable; (3) a discordant reading is preferred. Internal evidence is also gathered by intrinsic probabilities (what the author is likely to have written): a reading must make "sense" and "suit the context" (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*; New York & London: Oxford University Press, 1964, 209, 232; Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 630). Sometimes, when "violence is done to the sense" an admittedly strong external support gives a reading that "appears to be intolerable." Then "one is entitled to apply David Mace's crisp dictum that no manuscript is so old as common sense" (*ibid.*). "Raccoon" John Smith, an unlearned nineteenth century gospel preacher, set up his own canons of intrinsic textual criticism, using some of the same words as employed by the erudite Metzger: "whatever word or phrase is inconsistent with the context, or with common sense," must be a translator's error (cited by R. L. Roberts, *Firm Foundation*, 10-30-73, 7 [6951]).

The present writer takes exception to Metzger's third rule (cited above) on evaluating transcriptional evidence: that a discordant reading usually is preferable. True, there is a transcriptional probability that a scribe would not intentionally make a reading discordant, whereas he would be more likely to alter a reading to achieve harmony. But any reading that leaves discordance in any part of the Bible was put there by a copyist, not by the author. Autographic discordance makes impossible the biblical claim that every scripture is "God-breathed" (*theopneustos*, 2 Ti 3:16). If he is "a God of truth" ('el 'emunah,

Deuteronomy 32:4; cf. Isaiah 65:16; Co 3:9) and "without iniquity" ('en 'awel, Deuteronomy 32:4), there can be no discordance in him. As truth never collides with itself, the autographs had no contradictions. On the other hand, if the biblical claim for itself is false, then the book is not worth a man's attention. A critic has not finished his work if he leaves in his text a contradiction. Restoration of the original text involves paradoxes, but no collisions. If he does not believe the autographs were inerrant all of his labor is much ado about nothing.

External evidence is always weighty, but "occasionally considerations relating to intrinsic evidence will cast a decisive vote in the face of what appears to be overwhelming external testimony" (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 239). Sometimes "internal considerations of the most compelling kind make it altogether likely that all of the uncials and almost all of the minuscules are wrong" (*ibid.*, 240). These considerations lead textual critics to eclecticism, "a rational criticism," in which less attention is given "to questions of date and families of manuscripts than to internal or contextual considerations" (*ibid.*, 175).

"A presumption of relatively high authority is conferred by priority of date" but it is "still no more than a presumption, because the exemplar from which a manuscript itself was copied may have been" only a little older than itself and "because corruption may be rapid on one line of transmission, slow in another" (B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1953, 543). If there is a conflict between the internal and external lines of evidence, "the ultimate determination must evidently be here left to personal judgment" (*ibid.*, 563). Metzger quotes George Foot

Moore that "the methodical elimination of the element of human intelligence can hardly be the ideal of science" (*The Text of the New Testament*, 168-169).

In several minor instances (Mt 7:14; 15:6; Mk 5:1; 6:14; 9:41; 11:3; 15:44; Lk 8:26, 37; 22:16; Jn 1:3; 3:25, 31; 16:16; Ac 7:46; 9:25; 20:4; 22:16; Ro 8:26, 28; 9:33; 11:17; 1 Co 7:14; 9:15; 10:11; 11:29; 2 Co 3:9; Ep 5:22; Co 2:13; 2 Th 3:6; 2 Ti 4:1; Ti 2:5; Ja 3:3; 4:4; 1 Pt 4:1; 5:2, 5; 2 Pt 2:6, 13, 15; 3:10, 12; 1 Jn 1:4; 5:18; 2 Jn 3; 3 Jn 9; Re 2:2, 22; 22:21) this translation departs from the UBS text. In several more important instances, reasons are given for departures from some English versions and the UBS New Testament text, as follows:

**Genesis 1:6.** The KJV, the NKJV, and the ASV err in using the word "firmament" nine times in Genesis 1, beginning at verse 6. The word "firmament" (from the Latin, *firmamentum*) means "something firm," "something solid," causing unbelievers to say that the Bible presents the sky as a solid roof with the stars as chandeliers. The NRSV uses the word "dome."

Moses' word *raqia'*, "something spread out," can refer to something solid, as gold spread out on an idol (Isaiah 40:19), or to silver spread into plates (Jeremiah 10:9), but it can also refer to a "spread out" sky (Job 37:18), "an expanse," which clearly is the meaning nine times in Genesis chapter one. The NASB and the NIV used the word "expanse," as does the FHV.

**Genesis 1:28.** Since Adam was "the first man" (1 Co 15:45), God did not command him to "replenish [refill, restock] the earth," as in the KJV and ASV of Genesis 1:28. Instead, God commanded Adam to "fill the earth," as in the NASB, NRSV, NIV, and the FHV. The Hebrew word is *male*, meaning "fill," not "refill."

**Genesis 2:13.** The fact that the word "Cush" most often refers to Ethiopia has caused some translators to think that the Gihon River, surrounding the country of "Cush" (Genesis 2:13), must be the Nile River. But they have overlooked the fact that the Gihon (the Nile?) and the Pishon and the Tigris and the Euphrates all originated in Asia (Genesis 2:10-14). Therefore, the word "Cush" in Genesis 2:13 cannot refer to Ethiopia but to an Asiatic Cush (Keil, *Commentary*, and Tragelles' correction of Gesenius, p. 389). Though the Asiatic "Cush" has disappeared from geography and from history, it existed in the days of Moses.

**Genesis 22:1.** The statement "that God did tempt Abraham" (Genesis 22:1, KJV) does not agree with the statement that God "tempteth" no man (Ja 1:13, KJV). Later versions, including the NKJV, say that God "tested" Abraham. The verb is *nasah*, to try, to prove, to test.

**Genesis 36:2, 14.** The KJV, the ASV, and the NKJV mistakenly leave the impression in Genesis 36:2, 14 that Anah the son of Zibeon was a woman. The translators of the Samaritan, the LXX, the Syriac, and the NRSV, knowing that Anah, the son of Zibeon, was a man (Genesis 36:24), and thinking that the Hebrew Masoretic text erred in using the word *bath* (daughter) in Genesis 36:2, 14, have, without any textual support, replaced the word *bath* with the word *ben* (son). The NIV translates *bath* with its extended meaning "granddaughter" (Gesenius, p. 148; B-D-B, p. 123) without denying masculinity to Anah:

Esau took his wives from the women of Canaan: Adah the daughter of Elon the Hittite, and Oholibamah, the

daughter of Anah and granddaughter of Zibeon the Hivite (Genesis 36:2, 14).

As the word *bath* ("daughter") was used both for "daughter" and "granddaughter," so the word *ben* ("son") was used for "son" and "grandson" (Gesenius, 126; B-D-B, 120). Accordingly, this translation has "grandson" in Genesis 29:5 and "grandson" in Genesis 36:12-13.

**Genesis 47:31.** The statement that Jacob "bowed himself upon the head of his bed" (Genesis 47:31) is quite different from the statement that he was "leaning upon the top of his staff" (He 11:21), as stated in the ASV, the KJV, the NASB, the NKJV, and the NRSV.

Three letters (*mth*) make up the Hebrew word in Genesis 47:31 which is translated by the ASV, the KJV, the NASB, the NKJV, and the NRSV as "bed." However, those same five versions translate the same three-letter word in Genesis 38:25 as "staff." If those five versions had used "staff" in Genesis 47:31, then Genesis 47:31 and He 11:21 would be in agreement.

The LXX in Genesis 47:31 translated *mth* as *hrabdos*, "staff." The writer of He 11:21 used the same Greek words which the LXX had used in Genesis 47:31: *epi to akron tes autou*, "on the head of his staff." The Syriac and the Latin and the FHV follow the LXX, "leaning on the head of his staff," in both Genesis 47:31 and He 11:21.

**Proverbs 4:3.** Though Bathsheba was the mother of three sons besides Solomon (Shimea, Shobab, Nathan, 1 Chronicles 3:5), translations of Proverbs 4:3 make Solomon the "only one in the sight of my mother" (NKJV), "the only beloved in the sight of my mother" (KJV, ASV), "an only child of my mother" (NIV), "the only one in the sight of my mother" (NASB), and

"my mother's favorite" (NRSV). The FHV has Solomon saying that he was "irreplaceable to my mother."

**Proverbs 25:9.** Debates are approved in Proverbs 25:9 but condemned in Ro 1:28-29 and in 2 Co 12:20 in the KJV. This error has been corrected by the ASV, NIV, NKJV, NRSV, and the FHV.

**Mt 1:7-8.** Since not Asaph but Asa was the son of Abijah and the father of Jehoshaphat (1 Chronicles 3:10) the reading here should be Asa on the principle enunciated by Metzger (regarding another variant) that at times, "despite the weight of external evidence," a seemingly inferior reading is the "only" one to "suit the context" (in this case a remote context but still within the framework that every scripture is "God-breathed" 2 Ti 3:16). Sometimes, Metzger (*The Text of the New Testament*, 232) writes (in regard to another variant) "internal considerations should be allowed to take precedence over external evidence."

**Mt 1:10.** Since Amon, not Amos, was the son of Manasseh and the father Josiah (1 Chronicles 3:13- 14) the reading here should be Amon on the remote harmony principle as in Mt 1:7-8.

**Mt 1:23.** A *parthenos* can be (1) "a young bride, newly married woman, Homer's Iliad 2, 514" (Thayer, 489) or (2) an unchaste virgin (Genesis 34:3, LXX) or (3) a chaste virgin (Mt 1:23; Lk 1:34; cf. 2 Co 11:2; Re 14:4). Since the *parthenos* of Mt 1:23 was chaste (Lk 1:34), the antecedent Hebrew *almah* and the antecedent Greek *parthenos* of Isaiah 7:14 are a chaste virgin. Therefore, the translation should be "the virgin," not "the young woman" (NRSV).

However, since there was no virgin birth in the eighth century B.C., apparently Isaiah 7:14 is saying, "Behold the

virgin [will marry and] will conceive, and bear a son," while Mt 1:23 is saying, "Behold the virgin will conceive and bear a son." Isaiah 7:14 is thus a duality, with all the details not being the same for the eighth century B.C. and the first century A.D. (Exodus 4:22; Hosea 11:1; Mt 2:15).

**Mt 5:22.** The Committee holds that *eike* is a scribal addition, but says its inclusion "is widespread from the second century onwards" (Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 13). Its omission, however, presents Jesus preaching against anger (*orge*) but not practicing what he preached (he was righteously *orge* on more than one occasion, Mt 21:12-13; Mk 3:5; 10:14; Jn 2:14-17). Further, it presents Jesus forbidding what James (1:19) permitted and what Paul ordered as the Lord's command (*orgidzo*, Ep 4:26; cf. *ragaz*, Psalm 4:4 [H, 5]. The ASV, NASB, NIV, and NRSV retain the error. The KJV, NKJV, and the FHV retain *eike*.

**Mt 9:4.** *Idon* is better supported than *eidos* but does not make sense.

**Mt 9:18.** The *arti* plus Mk 5:23; Lk 8:42 call for a present translation of *eteleutesen*, "is now dying." Sometimes an aorist verb has a present meaning: cf. Ja 1:11; Jd 14.

**Mt 9:26.** *Haute* is better supported than *autes* but does not make sense.

**Mt 12:47.** Though v. 47 in the UBS is bracketed, v. 48 shows that it is required.

**Mt 15:8.** So overwhelming is the Greek evidence for the Committee's reading in Mt 15:8 they did not think it necessary to advise the reader of an omission that is in C and W and the Byzantine texts: *engidzei moi ho laos houtos to stomata auton kai*. However, the weakness of the Greek evidence for the inclusion is convincingly offset by the fact that the clause is

found in the Masoretic text of Isaiah 29:13. For that reason it is included in this translation.

**Mt 16:17.** The ASV, the NASB, the NIV, and the NRSV say in Mt 16:17 that the father of Simon Peter was Jonah, but in Jn 1:42; 21:15, 16, 17 they say that his father was John. The KJV and the NKJV have Jonah in all five citations. Since all Greek manuscripts have Jonah (*Iona*) in Mt 16:17, but variants occur in the Johannine citations (some have Jonah, *Iona*, some have John *Ionna*), this translation has Jonah in all five citations.

**Mt 18:15.** All the Greek manuscripts except Aleph and B have *eis se*, which words apparently Jesus used, for (1) since everyone sins, who would go to whom?, and (2) Peter understood Jesus as meaning a personal offense ("Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him?", v. 21; cf. Lk 17:3-4). Therefore, *eis se* is in this translation.

**Mt 19:7.** Though *auten* is bracketed in the UBS text, it is well supported externally and internally, and is used in this translation.

**Mt 21:39.** Though poorly supported externally, the second *auton* is required internally and externally by Mk 12:8.

**Mt 23:35.** Omission of the phrase *huiou Barachiou* by the original scribe of Aleph and by Eusebius and by Luke (11:51) removes the difficulty suggested by 2 Chronicles 24:20-21 [(Zechariah son of Jehoiada, not Berechiah was murdered during the reign of Joash)] and Zechariah 1:1 [(Zechariah son of Berechiah during the second year of Darius' reign)].

**Mt 24:6.** Though poorly supported externally, the words *panta auta* are supported internally by *panta de tauta* in v. 8.

**Mt 24:31.** Though poorly supported externally, *phones* is required for internal smoothness.

**Mt 27:9.** "The reading '*Ieremiou* is firmly established" (Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 66) by the major uncials and most of the minuscules. But manifestly the reading "Jeremiah" cannot be correct, for the quotation comes from Zechariah (11:13).

A second reading, "Isaiah," (found in the it manuscripts from the second to the fourth centuries, and in lectionary 21 from the twelfth century) likewise manifestly is wrong.

A third reading, "Zechariah," has so little external evidence (syr-h from the fourth to seventh centuries, arm manuscripts from the fifth century, and minuscule 22 from the twelfth century) it cannot be chosen, though it harmonizes with the book of Zechariah.

A fourth reading omits the name of the prophet but has poor external support (though widely distributed: Tatian from the second century, cop from the third and fourth centuries, it and vg from the second to the fifth centuries, syr from the fourth to the seventh centuries, Augustine of the fifth century, uncial Phi of the sixth century, minuscules 33 and 157 of the ninth and twelfth centuries).

Metzger quotes Augustine (354-430) that one should "first take notice of the fact that the ascription of the passage to Jeremiah is not contained in all the manuscripts of the Gospels, and that some of them state simply that it was spoken 'by the prophet.' It is possible, therefore, to affirm that those manuscripts deserve rather to be followed which do not contain the name of Jeremiah. For these words were certainly spoken by a prophet, only the prophet was Zechariah." But he said his explanation is not altogether satisfactory, because "a majority of manuscripts contain the name of Jeremiah." He reasoned that the

addition of "Jeremiah" by a scribe is not as likely as its omission.

Thus he enunciated the critical canon that the more difficult reading is to be preferred. However, that canon, though reasonable, is not always accurate. If applied to Mt 27:9, it sets forth Matthew as not knowing the Old Testament and demonstrates that Jesus' promise to him ("it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaks in you," Mt 10:20) was not reliable. If the Bible is reliable Matthew did not contradict Zechariah. In this case the reading that omits the prophet's name, though poorly supported, harmonizes with the book of Zechariah. "Occasionally," writes Metzger (*The Text of the New Testament*, 246), in regard to another variant, "one must choose the solution that is the least unsatisfactory." Accordingly, this translation omits the prophet's name.

**Mt 28:1.** The KJV says that the women went to Jesus' tomb "in the end of the sabbath," while the ASV and the [original] NASB say that the women went "late on the sabbath day" (Mt 28:1). If they went "on the sabbath," and the tomb was already empty, then Jesus was raised on the sabbath, not "on the first day of the week," as Mark (16:9) states. On the other hand, Luke (23:56) says that the women "rested the sabbath day according to the commandment," and then "after the sabbath" (Mt 28:1, NKJV, NIV, NRSV) they went to the tomb.

**Mk 1:2.** Though *Esaia* is heavily supported externally, the reading is false, for the quotation in v. 2 is not written in *Esaia* [(Mk 1:3 comes from Isaiah 40:3, but not Mk 1:2)]. The external support for *en tois prophetais*, is, however, earlier than that for *Esaia*, beginning with Irenaeus in A.D. 202, followed by cop in the third and fourth centuries, syr-h from the fourth to the seventh centuries, and A and W in the fifth century. (The

original version of Aleph made another error with the name *Esaia*, wrongly writing it in Mt 13:35.) A textual critic, using the erroneous manuscripts of Mk 1:2 as if they were copies of the autograph, makes Mark an ignorant person, for any uninspired knowledgeable Jew would not have made the error.

**Mk 2:26.** The best available authorities mistakenly read Abiathar instead of Ahimelech (1 Samuel 21:1f). They copied from some careless scribe, starting a train of errors in later copyists. To say that the autograph erred is to indict (1) Mark's knowledge of the Old Testament; (2) Mark's inspiration; and (3) Jesus' knowledge (for as the matter now stands it was he who first made the mistake orally). Since sly fault-finders all during Jesus' ministry were trying "to catch" him in his speech (Mk 12:13), they would not have missed this grainfield incident to show him his blunder.

This early error in copies of the gospel of Mark makes apropos a Metzger statement (though he would not apply it to Mark 2:26): "No single manuscript and no one group of manuscripts exist which the textual critic may follow mechanically. All known witnesses of the New Testament are to a greater or less extent mixed texts, and even the earliest are not free from egregious errors" (*The Text of the New Testament*, p. 246). In view of mistakes in so many reputable witnesses, rather than doubting Mark's and Jesus' knowledge and inspiration, it is better to omit the name of Abiathar (as do D, W, a few minuscules, some it and syr manuscripts). The other two synoptics relate the incident without naming the priest (Mt 12:4, Lk 6:4).

**Mk 6:22.** Acceptance of the UBS text (though the Committee only gave it a "D" rating) forces Mark to contradict Mt 14:6, Lk 3:19, and himself. In [UBS] v. 22 Herodias is

Herod's daughter; in v. 24 the unnamed dancer is Herodias' daughter.

**Mk 16:9-20.** These verses are absent from Aleph (fourth century), B (fourth), minuscule 304 (twelfth), it-k (fourth-fifth), syr-s (fourth-seventh), about a hundred copies of arm (fifth), the two oldest geo (897, 913), Clement of Alexandria (215), and Origen (254). These verses were asserted to be spurious by Eusebius (339), and Jerome (420). They are attested by A (fifth), C (fifth), D (fifth-sixth), W (fifth, though with an expanded addition), K (ninth), Theta (ninth), L (eighth), Phi (sixth), "indeed by all the Greek manuscripts except S and B" (Albert Huck, *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels*, ninth ed., Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1949), most minuscules, versions it (second-fourth), vg (fourth-fifth), syr-c (fourth-seventh), cop-sa (third-fourth), arm (fifth), geo (fifth), eth (sixth), goth (fourth), Irenaeus (202), Tertullian (220), Aphraates (367), Apostolic Constitutions (380), and Didymus (398).

Support by B is weakened by a blank column with space that would accommodate vss. 9-20. For longer interpolations or omissions "the application of stichometric reckoning" was a "rough and ready check on the general accuracy of a manuscript, for obviously a document which was short of the total number of stichoi was a defective copy" (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 15f.) Mt has 2560 lines, Mk 1616, Lk 2750, Jn 2024. Mk in B does not have 1616 lines, but enough space is left for the lines that would make 1616. This implies "the presence of 16:9-20 in Mark" (Metzger, *ibid.*).

Critics are united in rejecting the so-called "shorter ending" (as an ending it appears in no Greek manuscript, though often as intermediate between v. 8 and vss. 9-20; as an ending it appears only in it-k). Critics likewise are united in rejecting the

expanded ending in W which was lost from the fifth to the twentieth centuries. Of the three extant endings to Mk only vss. 9-20 can be considered.

Though Metzger (*The Text of the New Testament*, 228) thinks the original text of Mk ended at v. 8, he says that v. 8 is not a fitting conclusion to the gospel. It is a "melancholy statement that the women were afraid." He continues, "The present writer cannot believe that the note of fear would have been regarded as an appropriate conclusion to an account of the Evangel, or Good News." Moreover, "to terminate a sentence with the word *gar* is most unusual and exceedingly rare" and "no instance has been found where *gar* stands at the end of a book."

However, he reasons that the style, vocabulary, and an awkward transition show that vss. 9-20 are not Markan, leading him to speculate that "the last leaf of the original copy was accidentally lost before other copies had been made." Since, however, the inspired Isaiah (40:8) and the inspired Peter (1 Pt 1:25) affirm the indestructibility of God's word, Metzger's reasoning and speculation are not tenable, for vss. 9-20 are the only possible candidate to be the end of Mk.

A misleading statement the ASV has inserted in regard to Mk 16:9-20, "The two oldest Greek manuscripts ... omit from ver. 9 to the end." As far as is known "the two oldest Greek manuscripts" (the first century autographs) have been lost. The ASV translators meant the two oldest Greek manuscripts available (namely, Aleph and B of the fourth century) omit the verses.

Though Aleph and B, two major majuscules [(or uncials)] of the fourth century omit Mk 16:9-20, the copy of Mk in the hands of Irenaeus in the second century included those verses.

About A.D. 180 Irenaeus wrote: "Mark, in the end of his gospel, says: 'And the Lord Jesus, after that he had spoken to them, was received up in heaven, and sat at the right hand of God'" (*Haer*, III, 10).

However, if one rejects Mk 16:9-20 on the strength of Aleph and B he is embarrassed, for in numerous places their combined testimony leaves the Bible contradictory and the reader confused. In the following citations Aleph and B testify jointly but erroneously: Mt 1:7, 8, 10; 5:22; 27:9; Mk 1:2; 2:26; 6:22; 7:4; Lk 2:22; 4:44; Jn 1:28, 42; 21:15, 16, 21; Ac 11:20; 12:25; 1 Th 2:7; 2 Pt 3:10.

**Lk 2:22.** The reading *auton* is best attested, but it cannot be correct because the law of Moses only specified the mother to be in a purification process, not the father, not the baby. A second reading omits the pronoun, which removes the tension with Leviticus 12:6, but is poorly supported: one minuscule 435 (tenth century), cop (third-fourth), Amphilochius (394), and Irenaeus (202). A third reading, *autes*, is accurate, but also is poorly supported: one minuscule 76 (twelfth century) and a Latin tradition including "Marie." But support of the third reading is heightened by its exact correspondence with what Moses wrote: "her purifying" (*taharah*, Leviticus 12:6), and is adopted in this translation.

**Lk 3:36.** Though "Cainan" is well supported externally, Genesis 10:24 shows the word should be omitted, as it is omitted by p75 (early third century) and by D (sixth century). Genesis 5:12 and 1 Chronicles 1:2, 24 show that "Cainan" properly belongs only in Lk 3:37.

**Lk 4:44.** Though *Ioudaias* is best attested, *Galilaias* must be accepted, else Luke did not proofread his composition, for he has Jesus in Galilee both before v. 44 (vss. 14, 31) and after it

(5:1). The readings in Mt 4:23 and Mk 1:39 likewise support *Galilaias*. Though Metzger disagrees, what he wrote in another connection well applies in Lk 4:44: "on very rare occasions the correct reading may be preserved alone in the Koine or Byzantine text" (*The Text of the New Testament*, 238). "There are other instances where almost all of the 'good' manuscripts are in error and the correct reading is preserved in 'inferior' witnesses" (*ibid.*, 239).

**Lk 9:10.** Though the reading *eis polin kaloumenen Bethsaida* is well attested (p75, the first corrector of Aleph, B, L, etc.), yet factually Jesus and his apostles did not go into Bethsaida, but *en eremoi topoi* (Lk 9:12), *eis eremon topon* (Mt 14:13; Mk 6:32; and the original author of Aleph).

**Lk 11:13.** The reading *pneuma hagion* "Holy Spirit" is one of those "instances where almost all of the 'good' manuscripts are in error and the correct reading is preserved in 'inferior' witnesses" (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 239, in regard to another variant). The reading *agatha* [(syr-s and arm)] agrees with *agatha* in the first half of Lk 11:13 and with *agatha* in Mt 7:11. Further, though *agatha* are given in answer to prayer, the *pneuma hagion* is "given to those who obey him" (Ac 5:32). [The occasions of Mt 7:11 and Lk 11:13 are separate. The substantive reason for rejecting *pneuma hagion* is Ac 5:32. Prayer was sometimes a precursor to receiving the "Holy Spirit" (Ac 8:15), but in that instance the Holy Spirit was given by "laying on of the apostles' hands" (Ac 8:17-18).]

**Lk 23:34.** Early in the third century p75 was copied from a manuscript which omitted this verse, and was followed in the fourth century by B and apparently the first corrector of Aleph. However, in the second century all available evidence attests that the use of the verse was united and widespread (Marcion,

Justin, Tatian, Hegesippus), and in the third century (except p75) it was accepted by Irenaeus, Origin, and Clement. Attestation in the fourth century includes the original Aleph, Ps-Clement, Eusebius, Ambrosiaster, Hilary, Basil Apostolic Constitutions, and Ambrose. This translation accepts the verse but with brackets.

**Lk 23:43.** Since Jesus went to Paradise the day he died (Lk 23:43), then he did not go to "hell" (Ac 2:27, 31, KJV). This mistake has been corrected by the ASV, the NASB, the NIV, and the NKJV.

**Jn 1:3-4.** Whether a period follows *hen* or *gegonen* no one knows. This translation follows Metzger's dissent from the UBS text (*A Textual Commentary*, p. 195-196).

**Jn 1:18.** Stronger external support is for *theos*. However, the context calls for *huios*: "in the bosom of the Father."

**Jn 1:28.** *Bethania* has stronger external support than *Bethabara*, but Bethany was not *peran* (beyond) the Jordan (1:28; 3:26), while Bethabara was. Bethany was not in the *mid-hbar* (Joshua 15:61), but Bethabara was. Thus the geographical difficulty renders Bethany an erroneous reading.

**Jn 1:42.** Testimony is divided whether the author wrote *'Ioannou* (cf. 21:15, 16, 17) or *'Iona*. Apparently Matthew wrote *'Iona* (16:17). Since the Johannine verses have variants, but the Matthean does not, tension is avoided by using the Matthean.

**Jn 5:4.** Omission of v. 4 is supported externally more decisively than its inclusion. However its omission leaves the reader puzzled in v. 7 how the water was stirred. Usually a shorter reading is preferable, but here the shorter reading lacks clarity and coherence, both of which are gained by including v. 4.

**Jn 7:8.** The external evidence is divided, but that having *oupo* is the earliest (p66, A.D. 200, and p75, early third century). *Ouk* leaves Jesus as deceitful.

**Jn 7:39.** The strongest external support for *dedomenon* is B, for without its presence the Holy Spirit is rendered non-existent. The Spirit's non-existence is not compatible with previous Johannine references of his existence (1:32, 33; 3:5, 6, 8, 34).

**Jn 7:53-8:11.** Much confusion exists in the manuscripts whether the *pericope adulterae* is Johannine, and if so, where it is located in his gospel. However, unquestionably external evidence says the passage is not genuine, and so in this translation is doubly bracketed as of "evident antiquity and importance" (*The Greek New Testament*, xlvii).

**Ac 2:27.** This citation is not a departure from the UBS text, but represents a departure from most translations. Luke's word *haides*, "Hades," is defined by Grimm-Thayer (p. 11) as "the common receptacle of disembodied spirits," citing Lk 16:23 for bad spirits, and Ac 2:27, 31 for good spirits. Their statement holds good for Greek mythology, which has Hades divided into two compartments, Elysian Fields for the good, and Tartarus for the bad. But the Bible does not divide Hades. The passage in Ac 2:27, 31 does not put disembodied good spirits in Hades, nor in a subdivision of it.

The OT antecedent of Hades, *Sheol*, is defined as a hollow place, a cavity, a cavern. *Sheol* (in the Hebrew Old Testament) and Hades (in the Greek Old Testament, the LXX) on occasion was a fish's stomach (Jonah 1:17-2:2), or a burial site when the earth split under the feet of Korah and his company (Numbers 16:30-37). Most often Hades is a grave, and is so translated by the KJV in Genesis 37:35; 42:38; 44:29, 31; Psalm 88:3, 5).

The usual meaning of Luke's word *psuche* is "soul," a conscious immortal spirit (Mt 10:28; Re 6:9). But that meaning in Ac 2:27 does not make sense, for Jesus' spirit (Lk 23:46), when he died, did not go to Hades, but to *paradeisos*, "paradise" (Lk 23:43). However, something about Jesus when he died did go to Hades, namely, his *psuche* (Ac 2:27). What did Luke (and before him, David, Psalm 16:10, *nephesh* "soul") mean by *psuche* in Ac 2:27? An unusual meaning of *nephesh* and *psuche* is a dead body (Numbers 5:2; 6:6; 9:6, 7, 10; 19:11, 13), a meaning which fits precisely with the words of *Sheol* and Hades when they mean the grave. So the translation of Ac 2:27, 31 becomes: "You will not leave my body in the grave, neither will you allow your holy one to see decay" and "he was not left in the grave, neither did his flesh see decay."

**Ac 2:38.** The English word "for" in the phrase "for the remission of sins" (Ac 2:38, KJV, NKJV) is ambiguous. It can mean "because of" (Mt 25:8, NRSV; Re 16:10, ASV), or "in order to" (Mt 26:12; Ac 27:34, NRSV). The translators of the 1973 NIV in Ac 2:38 have "so that your sins may be forgiven." However, "many letters from pastors and professors" caused the 1984 NIV to return to the ambiguous "for the forgiveness of your sins," concerning which Dr. Ken Baker, of the translation committee, wrote, "I believe we translated it correctly the first time."

[The phrase *eis aphesin ton hamartion humon* literally reads, "into forgiveness of sins yours." The third edition FHV translates the phrase, "so that your sins might be forgiven," and while this correctly captures the meaning in this context (in order to receive forgiveness), there is no verb "be forgiven" in the Greek. The word *aphesin* "forgiveness" is a noun. Alexander Campbell translated the phrase as, "in order to the remission of

sins" (*The Living Oracles*, 1826). The English of Campbell is accurate but sounds awkward. This translation uses, "into forgiveness of your sins."]

**Ac 7:45.** It was Joshua (Joshua 3:8; 22:4) who accompanied the tabernacle into the promised land, and gave the people rest, not Jesus, as translated incorrectly in Ac 7:45 and He 4:8 by the ASV, the KJV, the [original] NASB, the NIV, and the NKJV. The NRSV and the FHV have made the correction.

**Ac 8:26.** An angel instructed Philip to go to "the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert" (KJV). Grammatically the language, "which is desert," could refer either to "the way" or to "Gaza." The NASB has "this is a desert road," but in its margin has "this city is deserted."

Actually the road is not through a desert until beyond Gaza on the way to Egypt. Between Jerusalem and Gaza the road passes through villages, pastures, and cultivated fields. Moses' spies found grapes, pomegranates, and figs (Numbers 13:23). There are pools and streams, and Luke wrote about "a certain water" along the way (8:36).

Historically there were two Gazas. "Old Gaza" (so called by Diodorus Siculus) was built on a mound about two and a half miles from the sea. It was "utterly overthrown" by Alexander Jannaeus in 93 B.C. (Josephus, *Antiquities* 13, 13, 3), and in 32 A.D. it was "a posting-station on the Ethiopian's way home" (Blaiklock).

In 57 B.C. Pompey's general, Rulus Gabinius, built a "new Gaza" on the coast as a sea-port for the Romans, a "haven for ships on that perennially harborless coast" (Blaiklock). The Ethiopian of Ac 8, not sea-borne, "had no occasion to pass through the sea-port" (Blaiklock).

Some ancient writers confounded the two Gazas, but not Luke. Neither did Strabo, a first century geographer, who wrote of Gaza as *polis menousa eremos*, "the city remaining deserted." Another Greek geographer wrote of *he eremos Gaza*, "the deserted Gaza." This translation has "the abandoned Gaza."

**Ac 8:27.** Most translations have the literal meaning of *eunouchos*, "eunuch." The assertion that in 8:27 the word "can only refer to" the Ethiopian's "physical state" (B-G-D) is highly questionable. The Old Testament antecedent of the Greek *eunouchos* (LXX, Genesis 37:36; 39:1) is the Hebrew *saris*, which English versions do not render as "eunuch" (Potiphar was married), but as "officer."

Harper's *Analytical* shows that *eunouchos* sometimes means "a minister of a court," and cites Ac 8:27 as an example. Gesenius gives a second meaning of *saris* as "any minister of the court." He points out that the Targum sometimes renders *saris* as "prince," and the Arabic as "minister," though the LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate always translate *saris* as "eunuch." In 1 Kings 22:9 *saris* is the title of a military officer, and in 2 Kings 25:19 it refers to a military leader.

G. Abbott-Smith, after showing that *eunouchos* can refer to a physical eunuch, shows that an "actual eunuch" is not necessarily meant. He cites the Wisdom of Sirach 20:4, *epithumia eunouchos apoparthenosai neanida*, "a eunuch's craving to ravish a girl" (Goodspeed's translation). He also cites 30:20, *eunouchos perilambanon parthenon*, "a eunuch embracing a girl" (Goodspeed).

It is debatable whether Isaiah 56:3-5 is fulfilled in Ac 8. Since no New Testament writer made that connection, non-New Testament writers ought to be hesitant. The proximity of Isaiah

56 to Isaiah 53 (which the Ethiopian was reading) does not show that Ac 8 fulfills Isaiah 56.

Since no evidence indicates that the Ethiopian was either born impotent or was castrated, and since the evidence is undoubted that he was a court officer (the queen's treasurer), this translation makes him a court officer.

**Ac 8:37.** The absence of v. 37 from Aleph and B of the fourth century, and from p45 of the third, causes most textual critics to reject the verse. The earliest uncial containing it is E of the sixth century, and it is found in Latin manuscripts of the second century and in Irenaeus of the second century. On the other hand, internal evidence favors its retention, for its omission leaves an abrupt gap. The Ethiopian, asking Philip what hinders his being immersed, without waiting for an answer, stopped the chariot in preparation for immersion. Inclusion of the verse makes the account coherent. In addition the confession of Ac 8:37 harmonizes with other New Testament data (Ro 10:9-10; Ph 2:11; 1 Ti 6:13; 1 Jn 4:15).

The critical canon for choosing a shorter reading in this instance produces awkwardness. Sometimes critics accept a longer reading (as Lk 22:17-20, Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 173f). Furthermore, the reason Metzger (*The Text of the New Testament*, 227) gives for rejecting Mk 16:9-20, "the lack of a smooth juncture namely between verses 8 and 9," is a reason for accepting Ac 8:37, namely: "the lack of a smooth juncture between verses" 36 and 38.

On the principle followed by Metzger and Allen Wikgren (in regard to a different variant, as they disagreed with the other three Committee members), one can say v. 37 "seems to suit the context" and should be accepted "despite the weight of external evidence" (*A Textual Commentary*, 630). Likewise (in regard to

a different variant) Metzger shows that at times "one must rely chiefly on considerations of internal probabilities in reaching a decision" (*The Text of the New Testament*, 234).

**Ac 11:20.** Since the external evidence between *Helenistas* and *Hellenas* is divided, the Committee gave the former a "C" rating. However, the phrase *monon Joudaiois* (v. 19) is decisive that Luke wrote *Hellenas*.

**Ac 11:26.** *Chrematizo*, different from *kaleo* and *phoneo*, in the New Testament, is always a divine call (Mt 2:12, 22; Lk 2:26; Ac 10:22; 11:26; Ro 7:3; He 8:5; 11:7; 12:25), and *chrematismos* is a "divine response, an oracle: Romans 11:4" (G. Abbott Smith, p. 484). As Moses was "the mouth-piece of divine revelations" (He 12:25, Thayer, p. 671), so were Barnabas and Saul (Paul) mouth-pieces of a divine revelation first predicted as "from the mouth of the LORD" (Isaiah 62:2). God used Barnabas (a prophet, Ac 13:1) and Saul (an apostle, Ga 1:1) in Antioch to call the disciples "Christians" (Ac 11:26).

Melvin E. Elliott explains the Greek grammar of Ac 11:26: "*de* 'and' the translation from arriving at Antioch to the things that happened there; *egeneto* 'it happened' *autois* 'to them' (to whom?) dative plural, to Barnabas and Saul; to do what? 1) *sunachthenai* aorist infinitive passive 'to be gathered together' for an entire year in the church; 2) *didazai* aorist infinitive active 'to teach' a considerable crowd; 3) *chrematisai* aorist infinitive active 'to call.'"

**Ac 12:4.** The insertion of the word "Easter" (Ac 12:4) in the KJV has been corrected by all the later versions.

**Ac 12:25.** Since Barnabas and Saul were already in Jerusalem (cf. Ac 11:27-30), the reading *hypestrepsan eis Ierousalem*, though with the strength of Aleph and B, is not only an "almost impossible reading" (Metzger, *The Text of the New*

*Testament*, 243), but is contradictory. Harmony is found in following E, *apo 'Ierousalem eis Antiocheian*.

**Ac 13:18.** Metzger (*A Textual Commentary*, 405) observes that, between *etropophoresen* and *etrophophoresen*, "the evidence is singularly evenly balanced." Since *etrophophoresen* has a direct antecedent in Deuteronomy 1:31, it is used in this translation.

**Ac 14:4, 14.** The word *apostolos* (*apo*, "from," and *stello*, "send") means "one sent," and so an "apostle," or "envoy," or "messenger," or "delegate." The versions (ASV, KJV, NASB, NIV, NKJV, NRSV) that have "apostles" in Ac 14:4, 14; 1 Th 2:6-7 leave the reader wondering how Barnabas, Silas, and Timothy were apostles. The difficulty is relieved by using the translation "messengers."

**Ac 15:34.** Though external support is heavy for the omission of v. 34, contextual evidence (v. 40) calls for its inclusion.

**Ac 20:28.** External evidence is divided between *theou* and *kuriou*, each being "supported by early and diversified witnesses" (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 234). In the larger New Testament context Jesus is sometimes designated *theos* (Jn 1:1; 20:28; Ti 2:13; He 1:8). However, the immediate context (purchasing with blood) points to Jesus as *kurios* (cf. Ac 2:36; 1 Pt 1:18, 20; Re 5:9-10).

**Ac 22:9.** The ASV, the KJV, the NKJV, and the NRSV report that Paul's travel companions "heard the voice" (Ac 9:7), and then they report that they "heard not the voice" (Ac 22:9). The NASB, the NIV, and the FHV have corrected this mistake.

**Ac 28:13.** Though both *perielontes* and *parelthonentes* have strong external support, the latter is contextually more significant, and so is used here.

**Ro 7:18.** If "everything" that God created, including flesh, was "very good" (Genesis 1:31), it is a reflection of God to translate *sark*, "flesh," as "sinful nature" (NIV, Ro 7:18; 8:3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13). Moreover, it would be a reflection on Jesus, for he "became flesh" (Jn 1:14, *sark*). Flesh itself, therefore, whether of "men" or "animals" or "fish" or "birds" (1 Co 15:39), is not sinful.

However, it is with the flesh that sin is committed, "the flesh of sin" (Ro 8:3, *sarkos hamartias*, genitive case), that is, when the flesh is given over to sin, flesh that is controlled by sin, and is its property. But until a person allows himself to be "drawn away of his own lust, and enticed" (Ja 1:14), his flesh is amoral, and is not "the flesh of sin." Sin is mental (Mt 5:27-28; 15:19; Ja 1:13-15; 1 Jn 2:15-17).

**Ro 8:23.** Omission of *huiiothesian*, contrary to strong external support, is necessary to avoid an internal problem: the Romans would not have been awaiting *huiiothesian*, for they already had it (v. 15), and "who hopes for what he sees?" (v. 34). The omission has the Romans awaiting for what they did not have, namely, "the redemption of our body."

**Ro 8:23.** [Change rejected, fifth edition appendix note follows:] I erred in previous editions in following Greek manuscripts (p46, D, F, G, 614) that omit *huiiothesian*, "sonship," because it appeared redundant, for v. 15 had already put sonship in the past tense ("have received"), and so sonship is a present reality in this life: "we are God's children," v. 16. However, I had overlooked a second meaning of sonship in v. 19, one that is not a present reality, namely, "sons of God" in a future relationship when we "will be delivered" into "the glorious freedom of God's children" (v. 21).

It is this second meaning of sonship for which we now "groan" and are "expectantly awaiting," namely, "the redemption of our bodies," v. 23, on resurrection day. Paul thus designated "the redemption of our bodies" as "sonship." Jesus had announced the same teaching when he called God's people "the sons of God, being sons of the resurrection" (Lk 20:36). Therefore, I have corrected my translation, making the last part of Ro 8:23 to read, "... expectantly awaiting the sonship, namely, the redemption of our bodies."

[This change is rejected in favor of the third edition appendix note above. Certainly if the word sonship in 8:23 is original, then it has to be the second meaning given above, "the redemption of our bodies." But, the creation longing for the "disclosure of the sons of God" in v. 19 does not mean that there is a future "sonship" attained that is not in existence now, but rather that the creation does not presently know who the "sons of God" are. Additionally, v. 21 does not demonstrate a future "sonship," but rather that there is "hope that the creation itself," which was "subjected to futility," "will be delivered ... into the glorious freedom of God's children."]

**Ro 8:26.** Major translations of Ro 8:26 have "infirmities" (KJV) or "infirmity" (ASV) or "weakness" (NASB, NIV, NRSV) instead of "prayer" (uncials F and G, both ninth century). The reading "prayer" is better supported by the context (*gar*, "for," and *proseuchomai*, "pray"). Many manuscripts add a phrase, *huper hemon*, "for us," which is followed by the ASV, KJV, NASB, and NIV. These manuscripts make "explicit what is implicit in the compound verb *huperentugchano*" (Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 518).

Major translations have the Holy Spirit interceding "for us with groanings which cannot be uttered" (ASV, KJV; similarly,

NASB, NIV, NRSV). To have the Holy Spirit unable to say what he feels lowers him from the status of deity.

The difficulty is solved when one notices that the groanings are ours (cf. v. 23), not the Spirit's, and that many manuscripts have the *hemon*, "our." Further, the legitimacy of introducing a dative with the words "in regard to" is substantiated by Ro 6:20, which could be translated, "When you were slaves of sin, you were free in regard to righteousness" (cf. T. S. Green, *Greek Grammar*, 226). R. L. Whiteside has written, "It is groanings within ourselves mentioned in v. 23. These groanings are silent groanings – unutterable feelings of need. The Spirit helps these groanings, for He understands our needs and longings and can make them known to God" (*Commentary on Romans*, 186).

**Ro 11:20.** The insertion of the word "only" by the NASB and the NRSV in Ro 11:20 makes Paul contradict Paul (Ga 5:6) and James (2:24).

**Ro 12:1.** The NASB, the NIV, and the NRSV err in inserting the word "worship" in Ro 12:1 and in He 12:28, making everything a Christian does, seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day, worship. The normal word meaning "worship" (*proskuneo*) is not in Ro 12:1 and He 12:28, and for a good reason, for no one can worship (to adore and to honor God) seven days a week and twenty-four hours a day. Worship is a mental action and has to be "stop and go" (Genesis 22:1-5; 2 Samuel 12:20; Ac 8:27-28). It is invisible ("within me," Psalm 42:4-5) and vertical (toward "heaven," Jn 17:1), the human spirit concentrating on the divine Spirit.

The word *latreuo* in Ro 12:1 and in He 12:28 simply means to serve, which does involve everything a Christian does seven days a week and twenty-four hours a day. It can refer to the visible actions performed in worship services (Ro 9:4), but the

worship itself is wholly internal. A Christian glorifies God in everything that he does, seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day (1 Co 10:31), but he cannot adore God continuously.

**Ro 16:1.** The fact that the word for a congregation deacon (*diakonos*, Ph 1:1) is used about Phoebe has caused the NRSV to make her a "deacon of the church at Cenchreae" (Ro 16:1). If the scriptures set forth qualification for deaconesses of a congregation as they do for deacons (1 Ti 3:8-13), one would conclude that Phoebe was a deaconess of the congregation at Cenchreae. But qualifications for deaconesses are not listed.

The word *diakonos* means one who serves in any situation. It is used of the servants at a wedding (Jn 2:5), of a Roman emperor (Ro 13:4), and of Jesus (Mt 20:28). All we know about Phoebe is that she was a servant just as all Christians, male and female, are servants (He 6:10).

**Ro 16:7.** "Andronicus and Junia" were "of note among the apostles" (Ro 16:7, KJV, NKJV). Does the verse mean that they were "notable apostles" or "well known among the apostles?" If Andronicus and Junia were themselves apostles, then (1) "the twelve apostles" (Mt 10:2; 1 Co 15:5) had increased to fourteen, and with Paul, to fifteen (1 Co 1:1), and (2) one apostle was a woman who had been "in prison with" Paul.

If Jesus believed in sexual equality in leadership, would he have selected only one woman among twelve (or more) men? Furthermore, Paul condemned sexual equality in leadership (1 Co 14:34-35; 1 Ti 2:13-15).

Then one notices that the feminine name "Junia" is not as well supported in the Greek manuscripts as the masculine name "Junias" (ASV, NASB, NIV). The better manuscripts therefore tell us in Ro 16:7 of two male kinsmen of Paul who had been in prison with him, and who were "of note among the apostles."

**1 Co 7:36-38.** The word *gamizo*, "to give in marriage" (1 Co 7:38), shows that the ASV, the KJV, the NASB, and the NKJV are correct in describing a father-daughter situation. The NIV and the NRSV, in describing a man and his fiancée, have Paul approving of a selfish, sensual, chauvinistic, and cruel man who does not intend to marry his fiancée if he can live without sex. Her welfare and happiness are not to be considered, only his. She is a fire escape, only used in an emergency.

**1 Co 13:3.** Since it is self-contradictory to say, "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor" and "have not charity" (1 Co 13:3, KJV), all the later versions have made a correction.

**1 Co 15:5.** [Change rejected, fifth edition appendix note follows:] Though the external evidence for *hendeka* (DG latt sy) is weak, the contextual evidence is overpowering. [Fifth edition 1 Co 15:5 "and that he appeared to Cephas, and then to the eleven."]

This change is rejected based on strong external evidence for *dodeka* and the contextual evidence that Jesus appeared to Matthias (Lk 24:13-31, 33, 36; Jn 20:19-24, 26; Ac 1:21-22) in addition to the other eleven apostles. At the moment of his appearing, there were only eleven apostles, but Paul knew that Matthias was one of the twelve when he wrote 1 Co.]

**1 Co 16:19.** Since Paul was a guest in the home of Aquila and Priscilla for 18 months in Corinth (Acts 18:3, 11), the words of manuscripts D F G it vg, "with whom I am lodging," appear to be what would be expected in Ephesus where Paul and Aquila and Priscilla were together three years (Ac 20:31), during which time Aquila and Priscilla "risked their own life for mine" (Ro 16:4).

**Ep 1:1.** External evidence is divided as to *en Epheso*. However, if the Ephesian (?) letter is a general epistle, (1) the

phrase *tois ousin* requires an *en* after it and a blank space so that the location might be inserted; (2) the antecedent of *humas* and *humon* (6:22) is undetermined, leaving one wondering to what places Tychicus was sent; and (3) it is the only one in Paul's extant letters without specified addressees.

**Ep 5:18.** [Change rejected, fifth edition appendix note follows:] The passive translation of *plerousthe* leaves the impression that the Ephesians did not have the Spirit. Since Christians are automatically filled with the Spirit after their immersion (Ac 2:38; 5:32; Ga 4:6), the middle voice translation is called for: "Keep yourselves filled with the Spirit." The continued indwelling of the Spirit after their immersion is not automatic, but dependent on their conduct. They can "grieve" the Spirit (Ep 4:30), so that he will leave, though he will stand at the door of their hearts hoping they will [reform] and invite him back into them (Re 3:14-22). [Fifth edition Ep 5:18 "Be not drunk with wine, which is dissipation, but keep yourselves filled with the Spirit."

This change is rejected based on no textual variant among the manuscripts.]

**1 Th 2:6-7.** The word *apostolos* is translated as "messengers" in this translation (see Ac 14:4, 14).

**1 Th 2:7.** Stronger external attestation is for *nepioi*, but "only *epioi* seems to suite the context, where the apostle's gentleness makes an appropriate sequence with the arrogance disdained in ver. 6" (Bruce Metzger and Allen Wikgren, *A Textual Commentary*, 630). Metzger further says that the UBS text with *nepioi* involves a "violent transition in the same sentence from a reference to himself [Paul] as a babe to the thought of his serving as a mother-nurse," a transition to most

critics that is "little short of absurdity" (*The Text of the New Testament*, 231).

**1 Ti 6:10.** The KJV errs in saying that "the love of money is the root of all evils" (1 Ti 6:10). No Greek manuscript has "the root." The NKJV has corrected the KJV by saying that "the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil," as do the ASV, the NASB, the NIV, and the NRSV.

**2 Ti 2:5.** Striving is commanded in the KJV in 2 Ti 2:5, and then forbidden in v. 24. This oversight has been corrected by all the later versions.

**He 1:1.** The caption in the KJV, "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews," cannot be accurate, for Paul put his name on every letter that he wrote: "The salutation of Paul with my hand which is the sign in every letter" (2 Th 3:17), of which there are thirteen, not fourteen.

Moreover, though the book is inspired, it was not written by an apostle. Every apostle saw the Lord with his own eyes (Ac 1:22-23; 1 Co 9:1; 15:5), but the author of the book of Hebrews received his inspiration, not by a "revelation of Jesus Christ" (as did Paul, Ga 1:12), but second hand from those who had "heard" Jesus (He 2:3). All the later versions, including the NKJV, give no authorship to the book.

**He 2:14.** The KJV, the NIV, the NKJV, and the NRSV assert that Jesus in his death "destroyed" the devil (He 2:14), but years after Jesus' death they report that the devil was walking about seeking whom he might devour (1 Pt 5:8). The ASV, the NASB, and the FHV have made a correction.

**He 6:6.** The Greek text of He 6:6 cites actual apostasy, but the KJV, the NIV, and the NKJV, by inserting an "if," make the apostasy only hypothetical. This error has been corrected by the ASV, the NASB, the NRSV, and the FHV.

**He 9:4.** Metzger writes, "The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews places the golden altar of incense in the Holy of Holies (9:4), which is contrary to the Old Testament description of the tabernacle (Exodus 30:1-6). The scribe of Codex Vaticanus and the translator of the Ethiopic version correct the account by transferring the word to 9:2, where the furniture of the Holy Place is itemized" (*The Text of the New Testament*, 200). Since every rabbi knew the golden altar was not in the Holy of Holies, it is inconceivable that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews would make such a blunder, not to mention his divine inspiration.

Accordingly, Metzger's statement should be revised to say that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews correctly places the golden altar of incense in the Holy Place, and the scribe of Codex Vaticanus and the translator of the Ethiopic version correctly copied that placement from their exemplars. Unfortunately other scribes with mistaken exemplars or in oversight place the altar in the Holy of Holies; their mistake has been perpetuated by later scribes. This translation places the golden altar in the Holy Place.

**He 11:11.** I erred in the first three editions of the FHV by saying that Sarah "received strength to conceive." The Greek word for "conceive" (*sullambano*) is not in He 11:11. Reputable translations, the ASV, KJV, NASB, and NKJV, had made the same mistake. I fell into this error because Sarah is mentioned in the verse. However, what is said in v. 11 was and is biologically impossible for a woman: *katabole spermatos*, a phrase referring to "the injection depositing the virile semen in the womb" (Thayer, p. 330). Since the ability to produce seed, "virile semen," is only masculine, the "interpretation cannot stand" that Sarah "received power to conceive seed" (Thayer). This

"expression could not be used of Sarah, but only of Abraham" (B-G-D, p. 409). And, indeed, an examination of the context (vss. 8-12) makes it clear that Abraham, though he was too old, received power to produce "virile semen" and to father a son. Furthermore, the one described in v. 12 grammatically is strictly masculine (*henos* and *neneikromenou*). To be technical, *teknoo*, "to beget children," when spoken "of the father," in the first aorist active infinitive becomes *teknosai* when spoken "of the mother," the first aorist middle infinitive becomes *teknosasthai* (*Classic Greek Dictionary*). Accordingly, the phrase after *elaben* in the Greek of He 11:11 of manuscripts D, P, 81, and 2495 is masculine, *eis to teknosai*. The NIV and the NRSV corrected the mistake this edition:

By faith he received strength to father a child when he was too old (Sarah herself being barren), because he regarded him who had made the promise to be dependable (He 11:11).

**2 Pt 3:10.** *Heurethesetai*, though best attested externally, conveys no "acceptable sense" (Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 706). The reading fitting the context (cf. *kausoumena*, v. 10, and *puroumenoi* and *kausoumena*, v. 12) and having the support of A and many minuscules is *katakaesetai*.

**1 Jn 5:7b-8a.** The words of this passage (the *comma Johanneum*) contain true Bible teaching: the Godhead (*theotes*, Co 2:9) is a trinity (Father, Jn 10:30; 14:28; the Word, Jn 1:2; Co 2:9; the Holy Spirit, Jn 16:13; He 9:14), and the trinity is one (Jn 10:30; 16:13; 17:21). But the words found in 1 Jn 5:7b-8a are in no ancient Greek manuscript. The earliest manuscript containing them is a Latin copy, apparently at first only a

marginal note "that afterwards found its way into the" Latin text (Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 717).

In the sixteenth century a Dutch scholar, Desiderius Erasmus, copying only Greek manuscripts, published a Greek New Testament without 1 Jn 5:7b-8a. When he was challenged, he said that if he ever found a Greek manuscript with the passage, he would insert it in his next edition. A copy was made to order for him in 1520 by the Latin friar, Froy, who had translated the words from the Latin Vulgate into Greek, and sent his work to Erasmus. True to his word, he inserted the disputed words into his second edition (1522), noting, however, that the Greek manuscript he used had been prepared expressly to refute him. Unfortunately, Erasmus' second edition became the basic text of the *Textus Receptus*, which fathered the KJV, which has the passage. It was omitted by the ASV, the NASB, the NIV, and the NRSV, but is retained in the NKJV. It is not found in this translation.

**1 Jn 5:18.** Both *auton* and *heauton* have strong external support, and the internal evidence is not decisive. John could have written *ho gennetheis* as a unique messianic title, but it is more natural that he would be referring to a Christian's keeping himself from the evil one.

[**Re.** All editions of McCord's translation titled the last book *The Revelation of John*. The first sentence of the revelation clearly denotes that it is the revelation of Jesus Christ, not John.]

**Re 5:10.** The KJV, the NASB, the NIV, the NKJV, and the NRSV say that the Lord's blood-bought people "will reign on the earth," while the ASV puts the reign in the present tense. Metzger (*A Textual Commentary*, 738) notes that it is "difficult to choose" *basileusousin* (future) and *basileouousin* (present) since both have substantial support. *Basileusousin* has better

external support than *basileuousin*, but its use brings a contradiction. Christians now reign on the earth with Christ (in his "not of this world" kingdom, Jn 18:36; 2 Co 10:4, 5; 1 Pt 2:9; Re 1:6). Christ then delivers the kingdom to God the Father (1 Co 15:24) once he has "put all enemies under his feet," the last being death (1 Co 15:25-26). Consequently there is no future reign of Christians with Christ *epi tes ges*, but they now reign with him *epi tes ges* (Re 5:10). Moreover, they cannot reign on the earth after it has been "burned up" (2 Pt 3:10). They will in the future reign with him in heaven, after the present earth has passed away (Ro 8:17; 2 Ti 2:12; Re 21:1; 22:5).

**Re 19:13.** *Bebammenon*, though supported by A clashes with *nazah* of Isaiah 63:3. *Perirerammenon*, supported by Aleph, harmonizes with the Isaianic ancestry of Re 19:13.

Isaiah (63:3) predicted the coming of One "mighty to save" whose "garments" would be "sprinkled" with blood. However, the Greek manuscript A (fifth century) has "dipped" (*bebammenon*, from *bapto*), not "sprinkled" (*hrantizo*), leading the KJV in Re 19:13 to say that his "vesture" would be "dipped in blood."

N. L. Rice, in his debate with Alexander Campbell in Lexington, Ky., in 1843, used the KJV "dipped" to try to show that the Greek word *bapto* meant "dipped" to John and "sprinkled" to Isaiah. Therefore, he contended, baptism is scriptural either by sprinkling or by dipping.

Campbell responded that if, indeed, John used the word *bapto* in Re 19:13 with the meaning "sprinkle," it would be the only example in 120 occurrences with that meaning, and that through 1800 years in a hundred translations never has *bapto* been rendered "sprinkle." Moreover, said Campbell, since the Isaianic background of Re 19:13 originally has "sprinkle," there

is "almost a moral certainty" that Re 19:13 originally had *hrantizo*, "sprinkle," not *bapto*, "dipped." Rice replied that Campbell would change the word of God to sustain his position.

At the time of the debate, 1843, no old Greek manuscript had *hrantizo*, "sprinkle," in Re 19:13, but just one year later the fourth century Sinaiticus manuscript was found, and it has *perirerammenon*, a form of *hrantizo*, "sprinkle," in Re 19:13. Campbell's scholarship and depth of perception were astounding! Accordingly, the ASV in 1901 used "sprinkle" in Re 19:13. It is regrettable that later translations (NASB, NIV, NKJV, NRSV) still follow the erroneous KJV.