

TRANSLATING JOHN 1:11-13

By: William Finck © 2007

Sponsored By:

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836, Fax (419)435-7571
E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

Short Quotations May Be Taken From This Article, But Not To Edit

Many of those who wisely reject the universalism of modern denominational churchianity unjustly blame the writings of Paul of Tarsus for the errant positions being trumpeted by those mainstream theologians. However these critics of Paul fail to realize, or at least admit, that the errors of universalism are founded in like manner upon misinterpretations of statements found in the gospels and other New Testament scriptures, as well as in certain passages found in Paul's letters. One pericope in the gospels which has often been misinterpreted in such a fashion is John 1:11-13, which shall be discussed at length here. Once the New Testament is translated in a proper historical and scriptural context, while maintaining the integrity of scholarly Greek exegesis, it is certain that not only the gospels, but also the letters of Paul and other New Testament scriptures are not universalist, but are rather exclusivist, separatist, containing a consistent message borne only to those nations which had in ancient times descended from the Old Testament Israelites. Those nations are found in the Aryan nations of Europe, and such is fully demonstrable from both history and scripture, and especially from Paul's letters.

In the King James version, John 1:11-13 reads thusly: “¹¹ **He came unto his own, and his own received him not.** ¹² **But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:** ¹³ **Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.**” Here the Greek of this pericope shall be examined, one verse at a time.

John 1:11: εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον.

Interpretation of this verse revolves around the two phrases derived from the word ἴδιος (Strong's #2398). By itself, ἴδιος is basically “I. *one's own, pertaining to oneself ... 1. private, personal ...*” (*An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon Founded Upon The Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon*, hereinafter L&S). Here the first occurrence of ἴδιος is the neuter plural, while the second is the masculine plural. Both occurrences of the word appear with the Greek Article, where each phrase is actually a Substantive, a group of words acting as a Noun. Only the second occurrence can refer to people. The first must designate something material. The large Ninth Edition of *A Greek-English Lexicon* by Liddell & Scott (hereinafter L&S,9) has for the phrase τὰ ἴδια “*one's own property*”, citing examples from secular Greek writings.

Thayer's *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (hereinafter Thayer) has for this phrase "one's native land".

For the second phrase derived from ἴδιος here, οἱ ἴδιοι, L&S,9 has "*members of one's family, relatives*", yet the 1996 Revised Supplement to this edition of the lexicon adds for the singular τὸν ἴδιον "*fellow townsman*" in addition to "*relatives*". Thayer says of οἱ ἴδιοι: "one's fellow-countrymen, associates, Jn. i. 11 ...", citing this very passage. Here it shall be stated that οἱ ἴδιοι may just as well be referencing τὰ ἴδια, those people belonging to the land, and not to Yahshua Christ.

It must be realized that not all of the inhabitants of Judaea at the time of Christ's first coming were of His people Israel, as He Himself tells us at John 8:30-47 and 10:26, among other places. Rather, Judaea was also populated with the hated Edomites (Mal. 1:1-3), as Paul explains at Romans 9:1-13, and as attested to by historians such as Strabo (*Geography*, 16.2.34) and Josephus (*Antiquities* 13.9.1 [13:254-258]). That these Edomites came to authority in Judaea is also evident in Josephus' *Antiquities*, along with other historical accounts such as those of Eusebius, the letters of Paul (i.e. Rom. 16:20; 2 Thess. 2), and is the very theme of the parable found at Luke 19:11-27. Therefore οἱ ἴδιοι is here interpreted as referring to "the men of the country", those people inhabiting Judaea in general, and not merely to the relatives of Christ, and this interpretation is certainly in agreement with those definitions provided by the lexicons. John 1:11 may properly be read: "He came into His own land, and the men of the country received Him not". Yet if οἱ ἴδιοι refers back not to Christ, but to τὰ ἴδια, the land itself, the verse may be rendered: "He came into His own land, and its inhabitants received Him not", either version fully concurring with the parable in Luke mentioned above, and fitting the context of the entire Bible.

John 1:12: ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,

The first and third sections of this verse, which I would render "But as many who received Him" and "to those believing in His name:", are not matters of dispute when compared to the A.V. rendering of this verse. Where I must differ, however, is with the middle clause, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, which the A.V. renders "to them gave he power to become the sons of God".

The word τέκνα (τέκνον, #5043) in this plural form *children* is ambiguous since the form is the same for both the Nominative and Accusative cases, and it is debatable whether the word is the subject or the object of the verb γενέσθαι, an infinitive form of γίγνομαι (#1096), which in its most basic interpretation is "*to come into being*" (L&S). Here, for reasons that shall become evident below, I must treat τέκνα as the subject of the verb, in the Nominative case, and not as the object as the A.V. treats the word.

That the verb γίγνομαι may be understood in the active sense, here "to attain", is evident in the Apocrypha at 2 Macc. 13:13, where in his edition of the Septuagint (LXX), Brenton rendered the phrase καὶ γενέσθαι τῆς πόλεως ἐγκρατεῖς simply "and get the city". This phrase I would render more literally, and more properly word for word, "and to attain control of the city". Similarly, in my edition of *The Records of Luke* at Acts 27:16, the phrase περικρατεῖς γενέσθαι τῆς σκάφης is rendered "to attain full

control of the skiff”. These examples clearly support a similar interpretation of the verb in this context here at John 1:12.

The children of Israel cannot “become” children of Yahweh. Being children of Adam, they already are children of Yahweh (Luke 3:38), and are told as much explicitly in the Old Testament (i.e. Deut. 14:1; Isa. 45:11) as well as in the New (Romans 8:14-17; Heb. 2:13-14). Yet Abraham was never told that gentiles, or any nations, would somehow become his offspring – as universalist denominational churchianity teaches. And the other races, non-Adamites, are never addressed in the Bible but for a few exceptions where certain tribes are mentioned (i.e. Gen. 15:19-21), or to be called “beasts” (i.e. Ex. 19:12-13; Isa. 56:9; Jer. 31:27; Jonah 3:7; Heb. 12:20), and there is certainly no indication that any of them could ever become children of Yahweh! Rather, Abraham was told that his offspring would become many nations (i.e. Gen. 17:4-9; 35:10-11), which the children of Israel did become, which can be evidenced in history.

With all of this, and without violating any of the rules of Greek grammar, it may certainly be more proper to render John 1:12: “**But as many who received Him, He gave to them the authority which children of Yahweh are to attain, to those believing in His name:**”, and to see what John was referring to, see gospel passages such as those at Matt. 16:18-19; 18:18; and Luke 10:1-16, 17-19. This rendering is therefore consistent with all scripture, while the A.V. rendering of this passage produces conflicts which cannot be readily resolved.

Before proceeding, it may be appropriate to discuss the word translated “adoption” by the A.V., where it appears in Paul’s letters at Rom. 8:15, 23; 9:4; Gal. 4:5 and Eph. 1:5. This word is υιοθεσία (5206), and is literally *the placing of a son* or *the position of a son*, son being υἱός (5207). While the word may be used to describe the placing of a son for adoption, or for any other purpose, the actual act of adoption is described by the Greek words εισποιήσις, a noun, and εισποιέω, a verb. A general theme of the Bible, as reported by the prophets, the gospels, the letters of Paul, and the Revelation, is that Yahweh had put the children of Israel off in punishment, and that the children of Israel would be reconciled to Yahweh through Yahshua Christ. That reconciliation includes the restoration of each Israelite to his or her status as a child of Yahweh, upon a return to obedience. Whether one wants to translate υιοθεσία correctly as *the position of a son*, the *placing of one* who is already a *son*, or a daughter, or incorrectly as *adoption* is even immaterial in context, since Paul tells us that it pertains to Israel (Rom. 9:4), who are “them that were under the law” who Christ came to redeem (Gal. 4:5), and it pertains to no one else! There is no room for universalism in the New Testament, except in the minds of those who would pervert the Word of Yahweh and Yahshua Christ.

John 1:13: οἱ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ’ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν.

While all of the ancient mss. are consistent concerning the contents of John 1:11-12, here the 5th century Codex Bezae contains minor differences with a couple of words, although not enough to substantially affect the translation or the points of discussion here. Also, the 4th century Codex Vaticanus is wanting the phrase οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς, in the A.V. “nor of the will of man”, yet the text given here, from the Nestle-

Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th edition (NA27), is sufficiently attested by several other codices and papyri of equal or greater antiquity.

The only point of contention here is the first portion of the verse, specifically the words ἐξ αἱμάτων. The A.V. rendering of the other words, “Which were born not ... nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God”, are acceptable. The A.V. has rendered ἐξ αἱμάτων simply “of blood”, which I do not find to be acceptable. Using *A Concordance To The Greek Testament* by W.F. Moulton and A.S. Geden, Fifth Edition revised by H.K. Moulton as a guide, out of as many as 99 occurrences of the word αἷμα (#129), *blood* in the N.T., this is the only time that the word appears in the plural, and surely the phrase merits investigation. I shall begin by turning to the Greek Old Testament, the Septuagint (LXX).

According to *A Concordance to the Septuagint And the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)* by Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *Second Edition* (H&R), the word αἷμα appears in the plural in the LXX mss. on as many as 53 occasions, counting all listed variations among the LXX mss. as supplied by H&R. Examining the LXX, one must consider also the Hebrew from which it was translated. The Hebrew Dictionary in Strong’s Concordance says of the Hebrew word for blood, *dam* (#1818): “figuratively (especially in the plural) *bloodshed*”, and this is the obvious meaning in the context in 50 of 53 occasions where αἷμα is found in the plural in the LXX, which are at Jdgs. 9:24; 2 Kings 3:28; 16:7, 8 (bis); 21:1; 3 Kings 2:5, 33; 4 Kings 9:7 (bis), 26 (bis); 1 Chr. 22:8; 28:3; 2 Chr. 30:16; Esth. 8:13; Psa. 5:6; 9:12; 15:4; 25:9; 50:14; 54:23; 58:2; 105:39; 138:19; Prov. 29:10; Jer. 2:34; 19:4; Ezek. 16:36; 22:2, 3 (bis), 13; 23:45; 24:6, 7, 9, 14; Mic. 3:10; 7:2; Nah. 3:1; Hab. 2:8, 12, 17; Sir. 22:24; 31 (34):21; 1 Macc. 7:17 and 2 Macc. 8:3; 14:18 and 45. In all of these places it is apparent, and significantly important to notice, that the translators maintained the Hebraism, writing αἷμα in the plural where bloodshed is implicated. Twice Brenton’s translation recognizes this, where he rendered the word “blood-guiltiness” at Psa. 50:14, and “bloodshed” at Ezek. 24:14.

Of the other 3 occasions where αἷμα is plural in the LXX mss., one is at Amos 2:4 where only the Codex Alexandrinus has αἷματα, “bloods”, in place of μάταια, “vanities”, in all other mss., which is an obvious gloss, examining the context. The final two occurrences of αἷμα in the plural are found at Hosea 4:2, where the word appears twice, and the Greek καὶ μοιχείᾳ κέχυται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ αἷματα ἐφ’ αἷμασι μίσγουσι is rendered by Brenton: “and adultery abound in the land, and they mingle blood with blood”, even though “blood” here is plural on both occasions. This statement by Hosea is an obvious reference to race-mixing. Although the A.V. version is somewhat different, Brenton’s translation is faithful to the Greek of the LXX texts, which obviously differs from the Masorete here.

Now returning to the New Testament, apart from the passage at John 1:13, αἷμα appears on 98 other occasions, including the spurious interpolation found in Luke 22:43-44, and where the word is found in some mss. at Acts 17:26, and where at the end of Matt. 27:49 some mss. contain a line which is similar to the text of John 19:34 but which is not found in the A.V. Of all these 98 other occurrences, αἷμα appears in

the plural twice, and only in a couple of mss. The first is at Rev. 16:6, in the Codex Sinaiticus, where it appears in that ms. to be a gloss for the Hebraism since the context is bloodshed. All other codices and papyri have αἷμα in the singular at Rev. 16:6. The second is at Rev. 18:24, where the text upon which the A.V. is based, the Textus Receptus or Majority Text which is actually a large collection of late Medieval mss., has αἷμα in the plural, as do a couple of 10th century mss. designated 046 and 051 in the NA27. All of the older mss., some which date from the 4th and 5th centuries, have αἷμα in the singular here also. Therefore it is relatively safe to say that αἷμα appears in the plural in the N.T. only at this one passage, which all of the extant mss. of John attest, and that even the Hebraistic use of the word, where it is rendered in the plural where bloodshed is meant, did not carry over into the New Testament scriptures.

Thayer has at αἷμα, in part: “Since the first germs of animal life are thought to be in the blood ... the word serves to denote generation and origin (in the classics also): Jn. i. 13”, citing this very passage. L&S has at αἷμα, in part: “*blood* ... III. like Latin *sanguis*, *blood-relationship*, *kin* ... ὁ πρὸς αἵματος one of *the blood* or *race* ...”. Likewise L&S,9: “*blood* ... III. *blood-relationship*, *kin* ... *blood* or *origin* ...”. And here in John 1:13 where αἷμα appears in the plural, it must denote *multiple origins*, i.e. *mixed blood*, *bloods*, as Thayer nearly suggests, but where he does not himself address the plural, and as the usage at Hosea 4:2 in the LXX suggests, speaking of adultery in the sense of adulterous race-mixing.

Since the Hebraism concerning bloodshed certainly does not fit the context for the plural of αἷμα, at John 1:13, and that Hebraism appears nowhere else in the gospels, though bloodshed is often discussed (i.e. Luke 11:47-51), this explanation that the word denotes *mixed origins* here is the only valid alternative. Otherwise, why else should the word appear in the plural here only, of all places? And why does the word appear here at all, when in so many places in the N.T. γενεά (1074) and γένος (1085) are used of race and birth, rather than αἷμα? The plural of αἷμα here was used to convey a specific meaning, which other words and phrases could not do in so simple and eloquent a manner, especially in conjunction with the phrases which follow, concerning carnal desires and the will of man in opposition to that of Yahweh. For it is unchecked carnal desire which got Adamic man into trouble from the beginning (Gen. 3:1-21).

While all of the children of Adam were created from one (and the appearance of the word *blood* at Acts 17:26 is refuted by the older and better mss.), Adam was not merely the first man, but the first White man, as attested to by the Biblical and historical records, the anthropological and archaeological records, and the very meaning of the word *adam* in Hebrew. That reading *mixed origins* for the plural of αἷμα makes sense in the Biblical context here, as already mentioned above, is fully realized once it is understood that the Judaeen nation consisted of both Edomites and Israelites, and Esau, father of the Edomites, took his wives of the Canaanite races (Gen. 36), who themselves were mixed with the Kenites (descendants of Cain) and other non-Adamic races (Gen. 15:19-20) such as the Kenizzites, Kadmonites and Perizzites who did not descend from Adam (cf. Gen. 10) and were aboriginal, non-Adamic peoples of unrecorded origin, along with the Rephaim.

Seeing that the Edomites of Judaea were, in part, descendants of Cain, one can understand how Herod, an Edomite (as Josephus often attests in his histories), could be representative of Satan, the serpent, et al., which attempted to destroy the Christ child (Rev. 12:4), and only Herod the Edomite fulfilled such a description, as the opening chapters of Matthew's gospel attests. One can also understand how the serpent's seed had bruised the heel of the seed of the woman (Gen. 3:15), and many other aspects of the Old and New Testaments.

With all of this, I shall read John 1:11-13 thusly, and fully within the constructs and meanings of the Koine Greek as described above: “¹¹ **He came into His own land, and the men of the country received Him not.** ¹² **But as many who received Him, He gave to them the authority which children of Yahweh are to attain, to those believing in His name:** ¹³ **not those from of mixed origin, nor those from of the desire of the flesh, nor from of the will of man, but they who have been born from Yahweh”.**

Those born from Yahweh can only be those descendants of Adam endowed with the Spirit of Yahweh (Gen. 2:7), born in accordance with His law of “kind after kind” (i.e. Gen. 1:11, 12, 21, 24, 25; Lev. 19:19 et al.), rather than in fornication which is the pursuit of strange (ἕτερος, #2087, *other* or *different*) flesh (Jude 7). Rather, Adam and Eve are our example as they were of the same flesh (Gen. 2:23)! For this reason Paul warned the Corinthians not to commit fornication, as their ancestors once did with the Moabite women, and 23 thousand of them were slain (1 Cor. 10). By this Paul refers back to Numbers chapter 25 and the events recorded there. The Israelites were not punished so severely for mere idolatry here, but for fornicating with Moabite women: for the Baal religions were nothing but fertility rituals which were culminated in sexual unions! In this chapter Phineas slays a man, not upon some foreign altar, but who was coupled with a foreign woman. For his action, Phineas was greatly rewarded! The day is coming, praise Yahweh, when there shall be many more like Phineas.

The phrase “of mixed blood” is commonly used of people with multi-racial backgrounds. Had the KJV rendered αἱμάτων at John 1:13 literally, “of bloods” rather than “of blood”, surely many of our people might have recognized the meaning of such language, and they might have asked the newfangled liberal pastors of recent times some hard questions, rather than being led astray by such an erroneous premise. At the very least, the KJV and other modern versions may have rendered John 1:13: “Which were born, not of bloods, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” Yet there always seems to be a soapbox somewhere, from atop which some liberal humanist – usually a Jew or someone of some other mixed race – is found preaching the “brotherhood of man” and other universalist punch-lines, and deceiving the sheep! Yet clearly John tells us that it is not the will of the flesh – which is lust – which shall prevail, nor the will of man – which is humanism – but rather the will of Yahweh shall prevail! On which end of Phineas' spear should one be found?