

# Contextualization in Translation: A Closer Look

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	1
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 A note on the scope of this document.....	2
2 Adoption of inaccurate wording from non-biblical religious contexts.....	3
2.1 Adoption of the <i>Shahāda</i> .....	3
2.2 Adoption of the <i>Bismillāh</i> .....	6
2.3 Adoption of other problematic phrases or terms.....	7
3 Failure to confront wrong thinking.....	8
3.1 Slaughtering of cattle in Hindu contexts.....	8
3.2 Softening anti-idolatry rhetoric.....	9
3.3 Choosing obscure words for shamanistic practices.....	9
3.4 Allowing nationalistic or political ideology to skew Bible translations.....	9
4 Inaccurate handling of key terms.....	10
4.1 Divine Father-Son terms.....	10
4.2 Mutual indwelling terminology and the translation of ἐν.....	21
4.3 Distinction between יהוה <i>YHWH</i> and אלהים <i>elohim</i> .....	23
4.4 Distinction between θεός <i>theos</i> and κύριος <i>kyrios</i> .....	24
4.5 Consistency in translating <i>kyrios</i> in reference to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.....	25
4.6 Translation of <i>YHWH</i> and <i>kyrios</i> as “Allāh”.....	36
5 Conclusion.....	38
Works Cited.....	39
Appendix: Chart of key potentially affected verses.....	40

*Disclaimer: This document was produced in conjunction with the [Arlington Statement on Bible Translation](#), and written by some initial signers of the statement. The signers of the statement have signed onto the statement specifically, and have not expressed agreement or disagreement with all of what is written below or elsewhere. However, this document is presented here as a helpful in-depth guide to the issues presented in the statement.*

## 1 Introduction

This document is intended to help the Church understand the stance that many translators, theologians, and Bible scholars share about certain areas of contextualization in translation.

Much of the focus of this document is on Muslim Idiom Translations (MITs), although some translations in animist, Hindu, or Buddhist contexts have exhibited somewhat similar translation approaches and will also be noted. While not every MIT exhibits all of the issues described below, most MITs exhibit the majority of these issues.

Besides laying out the case for how we believe these issues are best handled in translation, we have provided an appendix at the end with key verses that may be affected by these issues, and which issue or issues may be present in each of these verses. Although the issues presented below all come from real examples we have seen, this document does not give the names of any specific translations or those involved, but instead is intended as a general guide to our beliefs, so that it is exceptionally clear that the focus of the statement is on critiquing ideas rather than individuals.

### **1.1 A note on the scope of this document**

Readers will note that the majority of the in-depth examples in this document are from Muslim contexts. This is not because the authors believe Islam is inherently more dangerous than other non-biblical worldviews, but due to the particular way that Bible translation has been affected by contextualization and Insider Movement theology in Muslim contexts more than in other contexts. H. L. Richard, an evangelical scholar of Hinduism, stated the following in 2009:

One of the things that has struck me in my fringe contact with the discussions and debates in the Islamic world is that we now have Muslim-friendly Bible translations, and more-Muslim-friendly Bible translations, and some hot feelings between those two camps. How many Hindu friendly Bible translations are there in the world? Zero. How many are in process? Only one that I know of..

The Muslim world I think is exciting. We have case studies, we have data, we have movements. We can say it's raining, it's drops of rain. "Mercy drops" are falling, yet "for the showers we plead." You come to the Hindu and Buddhist worlds and there's not a cloud in the sky. Which is where we were in the Muslim world 40, 50 years ago. There was not a cloud in the sky.<sup>1</sup>

Richard is an advocate of what he would call "Muslim-friendly" and "Hindu-friendly" Bible translations, and he laments the fact that the kind of approach seen frequently in Muslim contexts is so lacking in Hindu and Buddhist contexts. It is not entirely clear whether the "one" translation he mentioned ever went to print, but his comments do help explain why so many of the examples cited in this document come from Muslim contexts. However, this situation may rapidly change in the near future, as we have recently learned that there are active efforts currently underway at high levels to expand the ideas underlying Muslim

---

1. H. L. Richard (2009), "Response to Parimal Roy's Religious Conversion in Hindu India: The Complicated Case of Manilal C. Parekh", *International Journal of Frontier Missiology* 26(4).171-173. Online: [https://www.ijfm.org/PDFs\\_IJFM/26\\_4\\_PDFs/Parimal\\_Roy.pdf](https://www.ijfm.org/PDFs_IJFM/26_4_PDFs/Parimal_Roy.pdf).

Idiom Translations to Hindu and Buddhist contexts as well. This expansion underscores the need for the Arlington Statement.

Ultimately, we believe the principles espoused in the Arlington Statement on Bible Translation are universal principles that apply across different religious contexts. While we do not pretend to have addressed every important issue, nor can we foresee the need for further development of principles based on the expansion of highly contextualized Bible translations into new areas, we nonetheless hope this document will be helpful to any Bible translator or others interested in Bible translation, and that the Lord will help us to follow faithful principles in translation for all people groups everywhere.

## 2 Adoption of inaccurate wording from non-biblical religious contexts

When Paul speaks to the idolatrous Athenians, he quotes from their philosophers by saying, “as even some of your own poets have said” (Acts 17:28). Paul does not own the pagan poets as inspired prophets, and knows that what he is saying is quite different than the pagan poets would have meant by their words, and yet he finds something in them worth affirming, if perhaps in a way that is subversive to their idolatry.<sup>2</sup> This is very different from presenting the words of the pagan poets as God-breathed revelation with no comment. Some (though not all) of the phrases critiqued below, if understood from a biblical worldview, may be carefully affirmed. This does not, however, justify their inclusion in the Word of God and presentation as God’s very own words, when in fact what God inspired cannot be legitimately translated in such ways without linguistic sleight of hand, and by ignoring or failing to perceive the clear differences between the biblical meaning and the extra-biblical meaning adopted. Such is the case with the first example, the Islamic statement of faith, or the *Shahāda*.

### 2.1 Adoption of the *Shahāda*

لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ      There is no god but *Allāh*/God

مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ      Muhammad is the messenger of *Allāh*/God

The words above constitute the *Shahāda*, the Islamic confession of faith, found in the Qur’ān. Reciting this in public means that one has converted to Islam. In Islamic theology people’s sincerity of belief is not judged when they recite the *Shahāda*; they are considered converted simply by reciting it.<sup>3</sup> In a Muslim context, this text is as well-known as John 3:16

---

2. See Daniel Strange (2015), *Their Rock is Not Like Our Rock: A Theology of Religions* (Zondervan Academic), chapter 8, section 3.

3. See <https://www.muslim.org/sa-case/evidence/so1.htm#3>.

is in a Christian context; a Muslim completes in his mind “لا اله الا الله—” (There is no god but *Allāh*/God) as easily as a Christian completes “For God so loved the word—”.<sup>4</sup>

One of the troubling trends exhibited in Arabic Muslim Idiom Translations is the insertion of the first half of the *Shahāda* into the biblical text. Because the first half of the *Shahāda* easily brings up the second half (“Muhammad is the messenger of God”) in Muslims’ minds, the insertion of the first half of the *Shahāda* into the Word of God is theologically highly problematic. Moreover, doing so requires a significant shift in the meaning of the text—there is not a single place in the entire canon where a straightforward translation of the original language would result in the first clause of the *Shahāda*. Instead, translations which include the first half of the *Shahāda* do so by changing the meaning of the original language in order to match the form of the *Shahāda*.

Muslims believe that reciting the first half of the *Shahāda* earns them merit before God and protects them from hell. For example, a hadith of Bukhari quotes Muhammad as saying:

“If anybody comes on the Day of Resurrection who has said: La ilaha illal-lah, sincerely, with the intention to win Allah’s Pleasure, Allah will make the Hell-Fire forbidden for him.”<sup>5</sup>

Multiple hadith cite Muhammad urging dying Muslims to say, “*la ilaha illallāh*.” One hadith has Muhammad telling his dying friend that *la ilaha illallāh* is “a word with which I will be able to defend you before Allah.”<sup>6</sup> Saying these words is the highest “door” of faith, and is the best remembrance/*dhikr*. As such, more than any other phrase, they believe it has the power to usher them into heaven:

When a servant of Allah utters the words *la ilaha illallah* (there is no god except Allah) sincerely, the doors of heaven open up for these words until they reach the Throne of Allah, so long as its utterer keeps away from the major sins.<sup>7</sup>

Finally, by adapting the Biblical text to use well-known Islamic phrases, translators are confirming the Muslim belief that the Biblical characters and authors, who appear to know these Islamic phrases, were themselves Muslims, and in many cases these changes become obstacles to orthodox Christian theology, especially as it relates to the divinity of Christ and belief in the Trinity.

- 
4. In *To Hell and back: a study of the concepts of Hell and intercession in early Islam* (University of Oxford dissertation, 2002), Feras Hamza states that “Muslim tradition frequently only cites the first part of the *shahāda*, probably for the sake of brevity, leaving the second part implicit” (p. 8, n. 34). He also notes that it is a common belief among Muslims that “All those who profess membership of the Muslim faith through the credo ‘there is no god but God’, will be saved” (p. 8).
  5. Sahih al-Bukhari, book 81, hadith 12. Retrieved at <https://sunnah.com/bukhari/81/12>.
  6. Sahih al-Bukhari, book 83, hadith 58. Retrieved at <https://sunnah.com/bukhari/83/58>.
  7. Al-Mundhiri, al-Targhib 2:414. Retrieved from <http://sunnah.org/ibadaat/dhikr.htm>.

Given the strong associations of the words *la ilaha illallah* with Muhammad’s prophethood and with earning salvation, given the danger of confirming Muslim beliefs about Biblical characters and authors being “good Muslims,” and given the fact that God’s perfectly refined words (Psalm 12:6) contain not a single verse that would be translated with the words of the *Shahāda* without changing the meaning of the text, Bible translators should not include this phrase anywhere in their translations.

Below are examples of verses that we have seen translated with the first half of the *Shahāda* by rearranging the Hebrew or Greek form.

Key verse	Source text	English
2 Samuel 7:22	על־כן גִּדַּלְתָּ אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה כִּי־אֵין כְּמוֹךָ וְאֵין אֱלֹהִים זֹולָתְךָ	Therefore you are great, Lord YHWH, for there is none like you, and there is no God except You
2 Samuel 22:32	כִּי מִי־אֵל מִבְּלַעֲדֵי יְהוָה	For who is God, besides YHWH?
1 Kings 18:39	וַיֹּאמְרוּ יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים	and they said, “YHWH, he is God! YHWH, he is God!”
1 Chronicles 17:20	יְהוָה אֵין כְּמוֹךָ וְאֵין אֱלֹהִים זֹולָתְךָ	YHWH, there is none like you, nor is there any God except You
Psalms 18:31	כִּי מִי אֱלוֹהַּ מִבְּלַעֲדֵי יְהוָה	For who is God, besides YHWH?
Psalms 118:27	אֵל יְהוָה	YHWH is God
Isaiah 45:14	אֵךְ בָּךְ אֵל וְאֵין עוֹד אַפְסֵי אֱלֹהִים	Surely God is in you, and there is none else; no other God
1 Corinthians 8:4	οὐδεὶς Θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς	there is no God but one
1 Corinthians 8:6	ἀλλ’ ἡμῖν εἷς Θεὸς	yet for us there is but one God
Ephesians 4:6	εἷς Θεὸς	one God
1 Timothy 2:5	Εἷς γὰρ Θεός	For there is one God
James 2:19	εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός	God is one

It is worth noting that in every Old Testament verse included above, the subject of the verse is clearly YHWH. Most of the verses above that include the first half of the *Shahāda* do so by treating *YHWH* as equivalent to the Arabic *Allāh*. This is in and of itself problematic, a topic addressed below in Section 4.5. The New Testament verses, meanwhile, focus either on God being one, or that there is only one *theos* (God)—in other words, that YHWH, the *theos* of Israel, is unique. This is different from saying that there is no god but God/*Allāh*, because *theos* in these verses is being treated as a countable common noun, and not as the name of the one true God.

In addition to the full first half of the *Shahāda*, many translations also include the slightly abbreviated form, “There is no God but He,” which is frequently found in the Qur’ān (Q2 1:163, 255; Q3 1:2, 6, 18; Q4 1:87; Q6 1:102, 106; Q7 1:158; Q9 1:31, 129; Q11 1:14; Q13 1:30;

Q20 1:8, 98; Q23 1:116; Q27 1:26; Q28 1:70, 88; Q35 1:3; Q39 1:6; Q40 1:3, 62, 65; Q44 1:8; Q59 1:22-23; Q64 1:13; Q73 1:9). While this is less theologically problematic than the fuller form, since who “He” is remains unspecified, it is nonetheless noteworthy that no traditional Arabic translation includes even this more abbreviated form in any verse, suggesting that it is not the most natural way to translate the source texts.

Examples of verses where the abbreviated form of the *Shahāda* has been included are given below. There are likely many more examples that could be found.

Key verse	Source text	English
Deuteronomy 4:35	יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים אֵין עוֹד מִלְּבַדּוֹ	YHWH is God; besides him there is no other.
Deuteronomy 4:39	אֵין עוֹד	There is no other

## 2.2 Adoption of the *Bismillāh*

The exact Hebrew equivalent of the *Bismillāh* (بِسْمِ اللَّهِ “in the name of Allah/God”), בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים *bāshem elohim*, is never used unmodified in Scripture, nor is the Greek equivalent. In the Hebrew Scriptures, *elohim* is always declined with a possessive or modified with an adjective, i.e., “his god,” “your god,” “their god,” “our God,” or “other gods,” when completing the phrase “in the name of...”. The following is the complete list of all such occurrences in the OT (there are no equivalent examples in the NT). **Note:** Five of the six occurrences are used in reference to false deities!

Verse	Hebrew	English
Deut. 18:20	וְאִשֶּׁר יְדַבֵּר בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וּמַת הַנְּבִיא הַהוּא	or [he] who speaks in the name of other gods, that prophet shall die
Josh. 23:7	וּבְשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵיהֶם לֹא־תִזְכְּרוּ	or remember the name of their gods
1 Kings 18:24	וּקְרַאתֶם בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְאֲנִי אֶקְרָא בְּשֵׁם־יְהוָה	Then you call on the name of your god, and I will call on the name of YHWH
1 Kings 18:25	וּקְרָאוּ בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְאֵשׁ לֹא תִשְׂימוּ	and call on the name of your god, but do not set a fire
Micah 4:5	כִּי כָל־הָעַמִּים יֵלְכוּ אִישׁ בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהָיו וְאֲנַחְנוּ נֵלֶךְ בְּשֵׁם־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד	Though all the peoples walk, each in the name of his god, as for us, we will walk in the name of YHWH our God forever and ever
Psalms 20:5 (6 in Hebrew)	נִרְנְנָה בִישׁוּעֹתֶיךָ וּבְשֵׁם־אֱלֹהֵינוּ נִדְבֹגַל	We will rejoice in your salvation, and in the name of our God we will raise banners

By contrast, references specifically to the name of YHWH are quite common in the phrase “in the name of...”; they appear 46 times in the OT (the equivalent NT phrase “in the name of the Lord” appears 14 times). While the phrase “in the name of God (*Elohim/Theos*)” is

avoided in Scripture, it is used in some Arabic MITs to translate “in the name of YHWH” (OT) and “in the name of the Lord” (NT). This change introduces the *Bismillāh* into the text even though it does not exist in any biblical manuscripts. The *Bismillāh* is included in every Muslim prayer and is recited before all but one of the Surahs of the Qur’ān.

As noted in the *Shahāda* section, using well-known Islamic phrases in the Bible translation confirms the Muslim belief that the Prophets of the OT were themselves Muslims, creating potential barriers to Muslims accepting Christian doctrine that go against Islamic teaching, and increasing the possibility of heretical interpretations of the text.

**Potential verses affected:** Genesis 4:26, 12:8, 13:4, 21:33, 26:25; Exodus 33:19, 34:5; Deut. 18:5,7,22, 21:5; 1 Samuel 17:45, 20:42; 2 Samuel 6:18; 1 Kings 18:24,32, 22:16; 2 Kings 2:24, 5:11; 1 Chronicles 16:22, 21:19; 2 Chronicles 18:15, 33:18; Psalm 20:7 (v. 8 in Hebrew), 118:10-12,26, 124:8, 129:8; Isaiah 48:1, 50:10; Jeremiah 11:21, 26:9,16,20, 44:16; Joel 2:32 (3:5 in Hebrew); Amos 6:10; Micah 4:5; Zephaniah 3:9,12; Zechariah 13:3; Matthew 21:9, 23:39; Mark 11:9; Luke 13:35, 19:38; John 12:13; Acts 2:21, (8:16), 9:28, (19:5,13, 21:13, 22:16); Romans 10:13; (1 Corinthians 1:2,10, 5:4, 6:11; Ephesians 5:20; Colossians 3:17; 2 Thessalonians 3:6); James 5:10

## 2.3 Adoption of other problematic phrases or terms

### 2.3.1 Al-Wāhid

Whereas a text such as the Shema (Deuteronomy 6:4) states that “God is one,” adding an article to the “one” creates in Arabic the term *Al-Wāhid* “the One”, one of the 99 names of God with strongly anti-Trinitarian connotations for Muslims. The Hebrew text is as follows:

שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד

“Hear, Israel: YHWH our God, YHWH is one.”

Even if there were no Islamic implications, adding the article (which does not exist in the Hebrew source text) is an unwarranted change of meaning, but with the Islamic understanding of this name, the problem is severe. The names *الْوَّاحِدُ* *Al-Wāhid* ‘the One’ and *الْأَحَدُ* *Al-Ahid* ‘the Indivisible’ are seen in Islam as a unit and are frequently combined in the lists of 99 names. They convey a very anti-Trinitarian concept, being commonly understood as one who has no partner in His being nor in His attributes nor in His works, one who is not begotten and who does not beget.<sup>8</sup> This name has no justification for being in the Shema. In addition to Deuteronomy 6:4, Jesus quotes the Shema in Mark 12:29; both places should be checked for this wording.

---

8. <https://www.muslim.org/islam/anwarqur/ch112.htm>

### 2.3.2 Other Islamic terms

Other terms that have been included in Bible translations in places where they do not appear in a parallel form in the source texts are:

- عِلْمُ السَّاعَةِ *ilmu as-sā'ati* 'knowledge of the hour'
- الرَّحْمَنُ الرَّحِيمُ *al-rahman al-rahīm* 'the most gracious, the most merciful'
- اللَّهُ يَنْصُرُ *Allāh yansur* 'God grants victory'
- سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ وَتَعَالَى *subhān Allāh wa ta'āla* 'May God be glorious and exalted'

Use of these terms, even in those cases where the concept roughly matches biblical theology, needlessly supports the idea that the authors and characters of the Bible were Muslims. A more straightforward translation would suffice to avoid these Islamic terms.

## 3 Failure to confront wrong thinking

### 3.1 Slaughtering of cattle in Hindu contexts

Cattle are considered sacred in Hindu societies, and eating the meat of cattle is taboo. As early as the 1820s, some Christians in India were orally substituting “lamb” for “calf” in their telling of the story of the Prodigal Son, in order to avoid offending Hindu sensibilities.<sup>9</sup> In more recent times, this revision of the story for the sake of avoiding offense has extended to calls for Bible translations themselves to be changed.<sup>10</sup>

It is true that the main point of Jesus' parable about the prodigal son is not about eating cattle. However, the preservation of this accurate detail is nonetheless theologically consequential. For example, in Jesus' parable of the wedding banquet, where the father represents God the Father and the son to be married represents Jesus, the father includes the slaughtering of cattle as part of the joyful celebration (Matthew 22:1-4).

Moreover, the slaughter of cattle is commanded by the LORD over and over again in the Torah as part of the temple worship. God orders Abraham to sacrifice a heifer as a sign of His promise (Genesis 15:9), and orders Samuel to sacrifice a heifer with Jesse's family when the Lord chose David (1 Samuel 16:2). Abraham offers the three visitors in Genesis 18 a fattened calf. David offers a bull and a fatling as a celebratory offering when bringing the ark into Jerusalem (2 Samuel 6:12), and later offers oxen as a sign of repentance during the plague (2 Samuel 24:25). Solomon at the temple dedication sacrifices “so many sheep and oxen that they could not be counted or numbered,” and the LORD in response shows His

---

9. Abbé J. A. Dubois (1823/1995), *Letters on the state of Christianity in India: In which the conversion of the Hindus is considered as impracticable* (New Delhi: Asian Educational Services), 33-34.

10. See, for example, Philip Jenkins, 2006, *The New Faces of Christianity: Believing the Bible in the Global South* (Oxford University Press), 29.

approval by filling the house with a cloud of glory (1 Kings 8:5, 10-11). It is simply impossible for a Hindu, or anyone, to fully appreciate the beauty of God's ordained temple worship—worship that is a shadow of the greatest atoning sacrifice of all, namely Jesus offering Himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the world (Hebrews 9:12-24, 1 John 2:2)—without understanding that the slaughtering of cattle for food, with thanksgiving, is not inherently sinful but can give glory to God.

This does not mean that Christians are obliged to eat beef, or should flaunt their eating of beef before Hindus. It also does not mean that Christians are obliged to start their evangelism efforts with 1 Kings 8:5. But we should not be ashamed of the words of our Lord (Luke 9:26), and if God's view of cattle and of animal slaughter in true worship is hidden from the readers of the Bible, they will never be able to reevaluate their own thinking in light of the truth of God's Word.

### **3.2 Softening anti-idolatry rhetoric**

The Bible is not always gentle in the way that it rebukes sin and false teaching. The sin of idolatry, for example, is excoriated with strong words in passages such as Isaiah 44:9-20 or Jeremiah 51:17-18. We must have wisdom as to when we might quote such words to those who worship idols, but it is impossible to please God and at the same time produce a Bible translation that tries to soften what His Word says regarding sin. "For the word of God is alive and active. Sharper than any double-edged sword, it penetrates even to dividing soul and spirit, joints and marrow; it judges the thoughts and attitudes of the heart" (Hebrews 4:12).

### **3.3 Choosing obscure words for shamanistic practices**

Sometimes the Word of God enters a culture in which animistic interaction with spirits is common. People in such situations need to hear what God has to say about such practices, so they may be spiritually healthy and fully devoted to Christ. If a translator uses foreign or otherwise obscure words to describe these practices or those who practice them, people will not see the clear prohibition declared in the word of God. Translators therefore need to translate passages such as Deuteronomy 18:10-12 using clear, common terms for divination and sorcery rather than obscure terms that mask the meaning, so that everyday readers recognize that the magical or animistic interactions of their local shamans violate God's law.

### **3.4 Allowing nationalistic or political ideology to skew Bible translations**

Christians often face pressure from governments or societies to fall in line with nationalist or political ideologies. Sometimes this pressure can extend to the translation of the Bible itself. Christians should resist attempts to remake the Bible to suit government-supported ideologies rather than allow God to speak for Himself to all people, regardless of nationality,

ethnicity, or political ideology.<sup>11</sup> Likewise, in contexts where there is strong opposition to the modern state of Israel, Bible translations should not replace the name “Israel” with “Jacob” or “my people” as is done in some Muslim Idiom Translations.<sup>12</sup> Although Israel and Jacob refer to the same man and the same nation, the name “Israel” is given directly by God, and should not be removed from any passage to accommodate modern political positions. As FOBAI’s Basic Principles and Procedures for Bible Translation state, translators should “make every effort to ensure that no political, ideological, social, cultural, or theological agenda is allowed to distort the translation.”

## 4 Inaccurate handling of key terms

### 4.1 Divine Father-Son terms

The translation of *ab* and *pater* (“Father”) and of *ben*, *bar*, and *huios* (“Son”) with respect to God has been addressed in the past, particularly through the World Evangelical Alliance (WEA) guidelines drawn up at the request of the Wycliffe/SIL family of organizations. However, there still remain some areas of concern to many.

The WEA guidelines exhibit a preference for normal father-son language, correctly noting the many biblical themes connected to direct father-son language, and the fact that the meaning of these terms cannot be easily reduced to mere Messianic titles, for example. However, they allow several possible exceptions to an unmodified, direct translation of divine Father-Son terms, if translators decide that it is necessary to block the misunderstanding that God procreated Jesus sexually by Mary.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, renderings such as “spiritual Son” or “Son who comes from God” are allowed under the WEA guidelines and have been used in recent translations.<sup>14</sup>

- 
11. See, for example, <https://www.chinalawtranslate.com/en/outline-of-the-five-year-plan-for-promoting-the-sinification-of-christianity-%25ef%25bc%25882018-2022%25ef%25bc%2589/>.
  12. This is separate from, but in a sense related to, the also-problematic translation of “Israel” in the recent Danish translation. Although the Danish translators have disavowed any political agenda, their choice to avoid the term “Israel” in the New Testament exhibits a failure to appreciate the intertextual links between the Old and New Testament and the God-given nature of the name and identity of the people of Israel.
  13. It is often claimed that Muslims reject the phrase “Son of God” because they misunderstand it as requiring a sexually procreative meaning. There must be some Muslims who do indeed reject it because of this misunderstanding, but one Muslim-background believer from Pakistan argued that the rejection of Jesus being the “Son of God” is based on the claim “Son of God” makes to Jesus’ deity, and that, according to him, most Muslims do not in fact believe that Christians believe Jesus is the “Son of God” by sexual procreation (see Matthew Carlton, “Jesus, the Son of God: Biblical meaning, Muslim understanding, and implications for translation and Bible literacy,” *St. Francis Magazine*, 2011, Vol. 7, no. 3, p. 10).
  14. The WEA guidelines also contain other exceptions that are actively being used by translators today, such as the ability of translators to categorize their work as a “Scripture-based product” instead of a “Scripture product,” and thereby avoid any restrictions on their handling of divine Father-Son terms. The guidelines also do not restrict translators from explaining the meaning of divine Father-Son terms in the paratext in ways that avoid key aspects of the biblical meaning.

While it is crucial that such misunderstandings be corrected in the paratext and in teaching, any modifications to the translation itself that are designed to correct this misunderstanding will inevitably cause collateral damage to the divinely inspired meaning that outweigh any gains. To put it another way, the natural, biological meaning of normal human fatherhood and sonship is part of the God-breathed message and is a positive resource for biblical meaning, not a liability. As such, it should not be blocked. We will support this claim in the following sections.

#### **4.1.1 Terms applied to Jesus that rely on normal father-son language**

##### **Jesus is the exact image of God**

“You look just like your father!” Many a son has heard these words. The English expression of a son being the “spitting image of his father” expresses the same idea idiomatically. These expressions assume a biological, genetic relationship between father and son that causes physical resemblance.

When Philip asks Jesus, “Show us the Father,” Jesus replies, “Have I been among you all this time and you do not know me, Philip? The one who has seen me has seen the Father. How can you say, ‘Show us the Father?’” (John 14:8-9). Likewise, God’s Son is “the radiance of God’s glory and the exact expression of his nature” (Hebrews 1:3) and the “image of the invisible God” (Colossians 1:15; see also 2 Corinthians 4:4). All of these instances are given in the context of Father-Son language, and rely on the picture of the physical resemblance of biologically related fathers and sons. Any attempts therefore to block biological meaning will also make this picture harder for readers to understand.

This does not, of course, mean that translators should go out of their way to especially emphasize the biological aspects of sonship as opposed to relational sonship in translation. Just as the English “sire” would be a far inferior translation for *pater* than “father,” a word with special emphasis on physical procreation at the expense of other aspects of sonship should be avoided in favor of more normal and neutral father-son terms. But all normal father-son terms (including those inspired by God in Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew) typically indicate a relationship of physical descent, with its ultimate source in sexual procreation. The existence of misunderstanding based on a biological component of meaning, therefore, is not a reason to reject or modify these words, because, as we will see in greater detail below, so much of the meaning of the divine Father-Son relationship depends on this very picture of natural, biological fatherhood and sonship, not just spiritual or adoptive fatherhood and sonship.

##### **Jesus is God’s natural heir**

Hebrews 1:2 states that God appointed His Son as “heir of all things.” Likewise, Jesus tells His disciples, “Everything the Father has is mine” (John 16:15). Jesus also tells His disciples a story about the owner (*kyrios*) of a vineyard with rebellious tenants, who finally decides to

send his beloved son to collect the fruit owed him. But “when the tenant farmers saw the son, they said among themselves, ‘This is the heir. Come, let’s kill him and take his inheritance!’” (Matthew 21:38).

All of these instances occur in the context of father-son language, and all refer (directly or in parable) to Jesus as the heir of God’s kingdom. The idea of Jesus as heir is dependent on natural, physical father-son language, since Jesus has always been God’s heir, unlike an adopted son who exists for a time before becoming an heir.

### **Jesus is the firstborn and the firstfruits**

Paul tells us that God’s beloved Son is “the firstborn of all creation” (Colossians 1:15) and the “firstborn among many brothers” (Romans 8:29). The idea of Jesus as the firstborn relies on a physical picture of sonship and natural birth, and is strongly connected to Jesus being the natural heir of God’s kingdom. Psalm 89:27 calls David (and by extension, the Messiah) the “firstborn, highest of the kings of the earth,” after he declares, “You are my Father” (Psalm 89:26).

This term also connects Jesus to God’s covenant love with Israel, whom He also calls His “firstborn” (Exodus 4:22, also Jeremiah 31:9). Yet while the LORD punished Egypt’s firstborn in the last plague in order to set Israel His firstborn free, Jesus as God’s firstborn took on the plague of our punishment—we who, because of sin, were children of the devil (John 8:41-44), with no rights of inheritance to God’s kingdom—in order to make us children of God and heirs with Christ, the “firstborn among many brothers.” The theme of adoption will be further discussed below in the section entitled “Our adoption as believers.”

Just as the term “firstborn” is used in Scripture for humans and animals, “firstfruits” is used for the same concept of physical generation applied to plants. Paul calls Jesus “the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep” (1 Corinthians 15:20; see also 15:23). It is fitting, then, that Jesus rose on the day appointed to celebrate the Day of the Firstfruits, the first day after the Passover Sabbath (Leviticus 23:9-11, Matthew 28:1).

### **Jesus is God’s “Only One”**

The Hebrew word *yaḥid* “only one” and the Greek word *monogenes* (which could be understood as “one of a kind” or as “only begotten”) both indicate an only son. Jesus is described as the “*monogenes* from the Father” (John 1:14), the “*monogenes* God<sup>15</sup>, who is at the Father’s side” (or “bosom”, John 1:18), the “*monogenes* Son” and the “*monogenes* Son of God” (John 3:16, 18), and God’s “Son, the *monogenes*” (1 John 4:9). Likewise, God tells Abraham to offer up Isaac, “your son, your only one” (Genesis 22:2; see also Genesis 22:12, 16), while Hebrews 11:17 describes Isaac as Abraham’s “*monogenes*.” Zechariah 12:10 uses *yaḥid* in the same context as “firstborn.” Whether the Greek term *monogenes* directly

---

15. Other manuscripts have “*monogenes* Son”.

indicates physical generation or not, then, it, along with the Hebrew *yaḥid*, is closely tied to the idea of an only, natural-born son with the birthright of the firstborn.

### **Jesus actually is God’s “biological” Son, but not by normal human means**

The argument for renderings such as “spiritual Son of God” relies on the conflation of *biological* sonship and *sexually procreated* sonship. Of course, in nearly every case, they are one and the same. However, while it is emphatically *not* true that Jesus is God’s Son by sexual procreation with a human mother, the Scriptures *are* clear that God Himself, and no human father, is responsible for the biological conception of Jesus in Mary’s womb, and that this is part of why Jesus is called the “Son of God”:

Mary asked the angel, “How can this be, since I have not been intimate with a man?”

The angel replied to her: “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. Therefore, the holy One to be born will be called the Son of God.” (Luke 1:34-35)

In the previous sections, the physical, biological component of human father-son relationships acts as a God-ordained picture, as an earthly shadow of a deeper, truer, and more fundamental heavenly reality, just as the priests and the tabernacle were shadows of a deeper, earlier reality found in Christ (Hebrews 8:15, 9:23-24). However, here we have a direct biological component to the meaning of the divine Father-Son relationship. This shows even more clearly why the physical, biological component of meaning cannot be blocked without losing important, divinely intended meaning.

### **Jesus is the Last Adam and the Son of Man**

The idea of physical descent from an ancestor or root is key to understanding the meaning of Jesus as the “Second” and “Last Adam”. Adam is described as “son of God” (*huios...tou theou*, Luke 3:23, 38) in Jesus’ genealogy. As with Jesus, Adam’s divine sonship entails a biological component, for in both cases, God gave life directly, with no human father involved. Though the biblical concept of Jesus as “the Son of God” entails far more than is intended for Adam here, there is nonetheless a sense in which Jesus inherits divine sonship in this more limited sense as well from Adam, who was created in the “image of God” (Genesis 1:26, cf. Colossians 1:15), by being the “son of Adam” in the sense of physical descendant. This connects to the meaning of Jesus being the “Second Adam” and the “Last Adam” (1 Corinthians 15:45, 47).

The Hebrew phrase for “son of Adam” is *ben adam*, which is rendered in Aramaic as *bar enash* (Daniel 7:13), and in Greek as *huios (tou) anthropou* or “Son of Man,” since Adam’s name means “man.” So Jesus’ self-appellation as “the Son of Man” also entails a connection to Adam, “son of God.”

All of this, again, relies on the concept of biological descent inherent in normal sonship, though the means of that descent in the cases of Adam and Jesus was through direct divine action, not by normal human reproduction.<sup>16</sup>

### **Jesus is the Root of David and Jesse**

The meaning of Jesus being the “Son of God” is, of course, far deeper than in Adam’s case, because Jesus was God’s Son before Adam was ever created. We can see this through the description of Jesus as the “Root of David” (Revelation 5:5, 22:16).

Isaiah 11:1 describes the Messiah by saying, “Then a rod will grow from the stump of Jesse, and a shoot from his roots will bear fruit.” The words “rod” and “shoot” indicate physical descent. Thus the Messiah is described here as physically descending from Jesse and David, in keeping with many other places in Scripture (e.g. Jeremiah 33:15, Zechariah 3:8, Luke 1:32-33, Romans 1:3).

Yet a few verses later, Isaiah says, “On that day the Root of Jesse will stand as a banner<sup>17</sup> for the peoples. The nations will seek Him, and His resting place will be glorious” (Isaiah 11:10). If the “shoot” from Jesse’s roots is the Messiah, who is the “Root of Jesse”? The term “root” (Hebrew *shoresh*, Greek *riza*) in a genealogical context in Scripture always refers to an ancestor, not a descendant (e.g. Isaiah 11:1, Isaiah 14:29, Daniel 11:7, Romans 11:16-18). So who is this “Root of Jesse” that Isaiah refers to?

Paul, quoting this same verse, tells us that “the Messiah became a servant of the circumcised on behalf of God’s truth, to confirm the promises to the fathers, and so that Gentiles may glorify God for His mercy. As it is written... “The Root of Jesse will appear, the One who rises to rule the Gentiles; the Gentiles will hope in Him” (Romans 15:8-9a, 12). Jesus is also described as “the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David” (Revelation 5:5). And finally, Jesus Himself declares: “I am the Root and the Offspring of David” (Revelation 22:16).

Gloriously, Jesus is revealed as not only the Son or Offspring of David, but his Root. Since “root” is used to indicate physical ancestry, we can see from Luke’s genealogy of Jesus that the Root referred to here is God Himself, the One from whom Adam, Abraham, David, and the Messiah spring up.

---

16. One might be inclined to say that Adam and Jesus were both given physical life “miraculously,” while other sons are created “normally.” However, the creation of a unique new human life by means of sexual procreation is itself an amazing, miraculous, and beautiful event that only God could accomplish, whether or not laws of physics are superseded.

17. Beautifully, the word “banner” here (Hebrew *nes*) is the same word used to describe the pole on which Moses placed the bronze serpent (Numbers 21:9), which Jesus later connects to His own lifting up on the cross (John 3:14-15). Isaiah’s description of the “root of Jesse” as a “banner” thus foretells the cross and Jesus’ death, yet Isaiah says His “resting place will be glorious,” foretelling His resurrection. This “banner” is thus the rallying flag of Jesus, victorious even on the cross, through which the nations will seek Him.

### **“Whose son is he?”**

Jesus’ question to the Pharisees about the identity of the Messiah now takes on deeper meaning:

“What do you think about the Messiah? Whose son is he?”

“David’s,” they told him. (Matthew 22:42)

Jesus’ question presupposes physical descent, and the Pharisees answer “David” accordingly. But Jesus shows them they are missing the most important piece of the puzzle:

He asked them, “How is it then that David, in the Spirit, calls Him ‘Lord’:

‘The Lord declared to my Lord, “Sit at My right hand until I put Your enemies under Your feet?’”

“If David calls Him ‘Lord,’ how then can the Messiah be his Son?” (Matthew 22:43-45)

The Messiah, then, is not just David’s son, but his Lord (and who could the “Lord” of God’s anointed king be but YHWH Himself?). He is not just the “shoot” of Jesse (Isaiah 11:1), but the very Root—just as He is the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last. This is beautiful high Christology, a true Chalcedonian feast—and it all relies on the idea of normal, physical descent.

### **“Whose son?” “God’s Son!”**

This example also illustrates the problems with another rendering allowed in the WEA guidelines, namely “Son who comes from God” or “Son who derives from God.” Certainly, if the natural way in a given language to refer to a human father-son relationship involves a source construction like this (e.g. “Jacob is the son who comes from Isaac, and Isaac is the son who comes from Abraham”), then such a rendering is perfectly acceptable. However, the WEA guidelines only give this type of construction as an *alternative* to more natural constructions for “Son of God” if the more natural constructions are misinterpreted as including the idea of God sexually procreating. Such alternatives are chosen specifically because they do not answer in the clearest way possible in the language *whose* Son Christ is.

Yet this question about Christ (“Whose son is he?” *Tinos huios estin?*—which, again, the Pharisees naturally interpret to mean physical descent) is the very question that the Holy Spirit answers clearly and simply, over and over in Scripture: He is not just David’s son, He is God’s Son (*Huios Theou*)! Praise God! Every translation therefore needs to answer it just as clearly, using the normal way to describe father-son relationships as Greek does.

### **4.1.2 Links to other fathers and sons in Scripture**

Thus far we have considered ways in which the idea of physical sonship or descent plays a role in terms directly applied to Jesus in Scripture. We shall now move to other intertextual links that elucidate the meaning of the divine Father-Son relationship. One such link is the concept of mourning for a son, especially an only son.

#### **Mourning for the Son**

The loss of an only son is treated in Scripture as the epitome of suffering and loss. “O daughter of my people, put on sackcloth, and roll in ashes; make mourning as for an only [son]” (Jeremiah 6:26); “I will cause everyone to wear sackcloth and every head to be shaved. I will make that grief like mourning for an only [son] and its outcome like a bitter day” (Amos 8:10). The depth of this mourning is a powerful factor in the story of Jesus raising the widow’s son at Nain (Luke 7:12-15) and Jairus’ daughter and only child (Luke 8:41-42, 49-56), along with Elijah’s raising of the widow’s son in Zarephath (1 Kings 17:17-24) and Elisha’s raising of the Shunammite woman’s son (2 Kings 4:18-37), all of whom were the only children of their parents. This mourning is powerfully represented in David’s lament for Absalom (though he was not David’s only son): “O my son Absalom! My son, my son Absalom! If only I had died instead of you—O Absalom, my son, my son!” (2 Samuel 18:33). All of these examples would require normal words for referring to one’s son or only son by physical descent.

These pictures of the heart of a mourning father or mother shed powerful light on the depth of God’s love for us, that he would be willing to give “his only Son” (John 3:16). Paul says, “He who did not spare his own Son, but gave him up for us all—how will he not also with him graciously give us everything?” (Romans 8:32). If the terms used in these verses are not consistent because the same normal, biological words for son that are required in the stories above are not also used to describe Jesus’ Sonship, this powerful link is diminished, and the God-breathed intertextual meaning along with it.

Likewise, in Zechariah 12:10, the LORD states, “They will look at me, the one they have pierced, and they will mourn for him as one mourns for an only [son] and weep bitterly for him as one weeps for a firstborn.” This dramatic prophecy that the LORD Himself (Hebrew *YHWH*) is the “one they have pierced” (John 19:37) also ties together with the themes of Jesus as the “only [son]” and the firstborn. In Zechariah 12:10, the context demands normal words for the only son of a human father, and the firstborn of a human father. If these same terms are not used for Jesus, readers will have a harder time understanding that this prophecy is clearly referring to Jesus—perhaps even missing the fact that the one who was pierced on the cross, and who will be mourned for as one mourns for an only, firstborn Son, is none other than *YHWH* Himself.

### **Abraham's offering of Isaac**

The powerful story of Abraham's offering up of his only son (which Muslims celebrate every year, though they consider the son to be Ishmael) provides us with an example of anticipatory mourning for an only son. Even more, the story is a direct type of God's offering of His only Son, the "Lamb of God" (John 1:29), whom God "provided" (Genesis 22:14) for us as a substitute on the same mountain that Isaac carried the wood up for his own sacrifice (Genesis 22:6, cf. John 19:17). The words chosen in this passage to describe Isaac's relationship with Abraham need to indicate physical descent; consistent translation of the words for "son" and "only [son]" for both Isaac and Jesus allows readers—including those that are already aware of the basics of the story of Abraham's son from their religious background—to perceive these important connections.

### **The Parable of the Tenants**

In our discussion of Jesus as the "heir" to God's kingdom, we briefly mentioned the Parable of the Tenants (Matthew 21:33-45, Mark 12:1-12, Luke 20:9-19), where the owner of a vineyard sends his servants to collect the fruit from the tenants, who instead beat and kill the servants. Then he sends his "beloved son,"<sup>18</sup> but they kill him too. Inconsistent translation between this normal, biological son example and Jesus would make it more difficult for readers to see the key point that the son represents Jesus, and the lord of the vineyard is God the Father.

### **The Merciful Father**

The story of the prodigal son (Luke 15:11-32) tells us a great deal about the nature of God as our Father, as well as our rebelliousness. By its nature as a parable it will use normal, biological father-son terms. Any lack of consistency in the father-son terms used in the parable with the terms used for God, or for us as His children, will obscure the meaning of this parable.

Other examples where a human father-son relationship, naturally including a biological meaning, is used in relation to God as Father are Malachi 1:6, Psalm 103:13; Isaiah 1:2-4, 30:1,9; Jeremiah 3:4, 14, 19, 22; Matthew 7:9-11, 21:28-31, 23:9; Luke 11:11-13, and John 8:19.<sup>19</sup>

---

18. Note that the word *agapeton* "beloved" from Luke 20:13, besides being spoken by God from heaven to Jesus, is also the way the Septuagint translates *yahid* "only [son]" in the story of Abraham's offering up Isaac.

19. In John 8:19, though Jesus was referring to God as His Father, the people thought He was speaking about a normal human father. Any modifiers here when Jesus refers to His "Father" (e.g. "heavenly Father") would make it very difficult for the passage to make sense; the passage must leave room for ambiguity and confusion on the part of His listeners. We should not be surprised if readers as a result are confused by Jesus' usage of "father," for so too were those who heard Jesus' wise and perfect words.

### 4.1.3 Our adoption in Christ

The Bible repeatedly refers to followers of Jesus as God’s “sons” (*huiōi*) or “children” (*tekna*), both of which normally refer to sons or daughters physically descended from a parent. Unlike Jesus, who is God’s Son eternally and by His very nature, those who reject Jesus are, in a sense, children of the devil our “father” (*pater*), not children of God (John 8:41-44). Because of our sin, all of us were “by nature children [*tekna*] of wrath” (Ephesians 2:3). The sinful nature which we all possess apart from Christ contrasts dramatically with the nature of the Son of God, and this is reflected in the Bible with straightforward father-son terms (see also 1 John 3:10).

But as Paul beautifully writes:

[W]hen the time came to completion, God sent His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, to redeem those under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons. And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba, Father!” So you are no longer a slave but a son, and if a son, then an heir through God. (Galatians 4:4-7)

Here we see the titles of “son” and “heir,” which properly belong to Jesus, now being given to us who were once His enemies. Likewise, through the gospel we are being “conformed to the image of His Son” (Romans 8:29; see also 1 Corinthians 15:49, 2 Corinthians 3:18). We are even called “firstfruits” (James 1:18) and “firstborn” (πρωτοτόκων; the Greek is plural) in Hebrews 12:23—though we, like Esau, had sold our birthright. By God’s grace we are made His true sons—and unlike the firstborn brother in the story of the merciful Father, who refers to his redeemed brother disparagingly and coldly as “this son of yours” (Luke 15:30), Jesus is “not ashamed to call [us] brothers” (Hebrews 2:11).

Only Jesus is God’s eternal Son and heir, the only one who perfectly bears the image of the Father, the firstborn of all creation. He is also the only one who is called God’s “one and only” (*monogenes*) Son, the Root of David and of Jesse, and “the Son of Man” (*ho huios tou anthropou*, in articular form). Yet through adoption we too are called “sons,” “heirs,” “firstborn,” “firstfruits,” and “brothers” of the Lord Jesus. We are destined to reflect the Son’s image as well, which is the image of the Father. The theme of our adoption through Christ is found in several other places in the New Testament (John 1:12-13, Ephesians 1:3-5, Romans 8:14-29), often playing a key, climactic role in the proclamation of the gospel. All of this meaning relies on normal father-son language, including biological sonship as one important component of meaning.

### 4.1.4 God-breathed words to Greek pagans

The depth and breadth of meaning apparent in the divine Father-Son language of the Bible shows us what we lose if we fail to use normal father-son terms that are consistent with their human parallels. However, some may still object, arguing that the problem of

misunderstanding the nature of the Father-Son language is too great to be ignored in translation, and that surely some modifiers or changes could block this misunderstanding without doing *too* much damage to the intertextual meaning.

However, the idea that these terms may need modifying assumes that in their original contexts they were clear and free from possible misunderstanding, and that it is only because of some semantic restriction in a particular language that changes are needed. But in reality, the Greek terms *pater* and *huios* in relation to God are very likely to have been misunderstood by pagan Greek readers, who were used to stories about Zeus gallivanting off with who knows what nymph or mortal to produce various demigods such as Dionysus or Heracles, whom Greeks also called “sons of God.” Yet even in this context, where the same exact misunderstanding that Muslims are often said to have would likely have been present in many Greek readers’ minds, God chose to breathe out the terms *pater* and *huios*, Father and Son—with no modification, no caveats, no weakening of their force to avoid this problem. God—whose Word is flawless (Psalm 12:6)—revealed Himself as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, despite the likely misunderstanding among pagan Greek readers. What justification, then, do we have for adding modifiers or qualifications to these terms that God did not add when facing the same problem?

#### **4.1.5 Redeeming fatherhood and sonship**

One might respond to the above point by saying, “God knew that once Greek readers had been taught the true meaning of these terms, their language allowed for other uses of ‘father’ and ‘son.’ But some languages simply do not allow such non-sexually procreated use for their father-son terms.”

The actual existence of such a language is uncertain; similar claims have turned out to be false or exaggerated,<sup>20</sup> and to our knowledge no such claim has been successfully documented and withstood scrutiny. Moreover, the idea that a word simply cannot be understood in a new light, where sexual procreation is not required, runs counter to what we know about language and human cognitive abilities. But even if it turns out that such a language does exist, it does not therefore follow that modifying father-son language to

---

20. For example, translators de Kuiper and Newman claimed that the Malay word *anak* “son” means “child in the sense of a very immediate physical relation to the parents,” and that “this word cannot very well be used as a metaphor” (Arie de Kuiper and Barclay M. Newman Jr., “Jesus, Son of God—a translation problem,” *The Bible Translator*, 1977, 28:4, p. 435). Though de Kuiper and Newman rely extensively on a letter from Matt Finlay, a long-time missionary among Malay speakers, Finlay himself rebutted their claims about *anak* (Matt Finlay, “Jesus, Son of God—a translation problem: Some further comments,” *The Bible Translator*, 1979, 30:2, p. 242). Likewise, Rick Brown claimed, “In Arabic, for example, the words for son and father have a biological meaning only” (Rick Brown, “The Son of God: Understanding the Messianic titles of Jesus,” *International Journal of Frontier Missions*, 2000, 17:1, p. 41). Yet the Qur’an itself uses the phrase *ibn al-sabil* “son of the road” in a non-biological sense in Surah 2:177 and 17:26, showing that though “son” and “father” terms are normally understood biologically, as they are in all languages, the word can be understood in Arabic as having other than biological meaning.

accommodate such a group's understanding of fatherhood and sonship is a wise option for translators. In fact, a culture that forbids the use of father-son terms beyond sexually procreated relationships is in need of the transforming power of the gospel. A concept of fatherhood and sonship that strictly requires sexual procreation must be expanded for the truth of the Bible to dwell in a culture.

To take one key example, as we saw above, the concept of adoption is crucial to New Testament soteriology. Without an idea of the possibility of adoption—of orphans becoming true sons and daughters—it is impossible for people to understand this deeply biblical, central theme. They must come, through the work of the Holy Spirit, to understand that though we, through sin, were by nature children of wrath, children of the devil, nevertheless through Christ—the Firstborn Brother, the only faithful Son—we are made sons, heirs, children of God—“born not of natural descent, or of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man, but of God” (John 1:13). Jesus is therefore “not ashamed to call us brothers” (Hebrews 2:11), without any qualifiers or caveats that might suggest that we are, in Christ, not “true” children.

Satan tried to make Jesus doubt His Sonship (Matthew 4:3-6). Likewise, Satan wants those who are in Christ to doubt whether we truly belong to God, whether we can truly receive an inheritance with Christ—whether, after all we have done in selling our birthright, rejecting our Father and squandering our inheritance, we can truly be embraced and called God's sons and daughters again. Any language group that insists that the normal words for fathers and sons can only be applied to children born through sexual procreation is not just denying the beautiful truth that orphans can truly belong to a family on equal footing with biologically related children. As tragic as that loss is for orphans, for whom God shows such special care in Scripture, the loss of meaning when the possibility of non-sexually produced fatherhood and sonship is denied goes far deeper—such a mindset, in essence, denies God's Word, by insisting that we can never be called true “children” of God. Yet if the Holy Spirit Himself causes us to cry out “Abba! Father!”, who are we to deny His resounding answer to our shame?

That God is our true Father, and we are His true children—who, like Adam, were “sons of God,” made in His image, but who disowned our true Father and became children of the devil, and yet who are now restored to our true Father through Christ the Firstborn, the *monogenes*—is a deep, beautiful, liberating, healing truth of Scripture. Yet this truth requires the normal words for fathers and sons to be used in ways that allow meaning beyond a sexually procreative relationship, even if this at first confuses or grates against the sensibilities whose ideas of fatherhood and sonship have been twisted by unbiblical thinking. Surely we can be patient with people who have not yet seen the beauty of the biblical theme of adoption and its connection to the divine Father-Son relationship, and work in prayer and love to bring them to a deeper knowledge of the truth. But to accept such restrictions on what true fatherhood and sonship means, in any language, and to incorporate them into

God's Word, is, in the final analysis, to allow Satan's lies to take precedence over God's truth. Or, to quote Jan de Waard and Eugene Nida, "There are certain important religious symbols which, though often obscure in their meaning, are necessarily important for the preservation of the integrity and unity of the biblical message."<sup>21</sup>

Before any human father or son existed, God existed in an eternal loving Father-Son relationship through the Spirit. He chose to create human father-son relationships to act as a picture, an earthly shadow of the perfect Father-Son relationship in heaven. God defines true Fatherhood and true Sonship, not us. Paul shows us that the biblical meaning of Fatherhood is primary, and our concept of fatherhood should be derived from it and not the other way around, when he writes, "For this reason I kneel before the Father (*pater*), from whom every family (*patria*)<sup>22</sup> in heaven and on earth is named" (Ephesians 3:14-15). Earthly fathers get their name from Him, not Him from them. Just as God wants our understanding of marriage to be transformed by the relationship of Christ to His Church, so He desires our understanding of the parent-child relationship to be transformed by the perfect love that flows between Father and Son. Our minds, and the minds of all language groups, need to be transformed and renewed by the Word of God, not the Word of God transformed and skewed by our sinful minds.

**Potential affected verses:** Gen 22:2; 2 Sam 7:14, 18:33; Ps 2:7; Prov 30:4; Is 7:14, 9:6; Mt 3:17, 4:3, 5:9, 6:9, 21:37, 28:19; Mk 9:7, 13:32, 14:36, 15:39; Lk 1:32, 1:35, 11:2, 20:13, 20:36; Jn 1:12, 3:16, 5:18, 11:52, 17:5, 20:31; Acts 13:33; Rom 1:4, 8:14-19, 8:21, 8:29, 9:8; 2 Cor 6:18; Gal 2:20, 3:26, 4:4-7; Eph 1:3-5, 3:14-15; Philip 2:15; Col 1:13; Heb 1:2, 1:5, 1:8, 2:10, 5:5, 7:3, 12:7-8; James 1:17; 1 Jn 3:1-2, 3:10, 5:2, 5:20

## 4.2 Mutual indwelling terminology and the translation of *ἐν*

Prepositions are notoriously difficult to map from language to language. The Greek preposition *ἐν en*, usually translated "in" in English but also sometimes "among," "by," etc., is no exception. However, when *en* is used to describe the relationship within the Trinity or our relationship to the Trinity, *en* functions as a key term, with connected meaning across several passages. This occurs when *en* is found in phrases such as "in Christ," "in the Lord," "in the Father," "in the Son," "in God," "in him," "in you," "in us," etc., and is usually found in predicate form or with verbs like *katoikeo* "to dwell, settle," *meno* "to abide, remain,"

---

21. Jan de Waard and Eugene Nida, *From One Language to Another* (Nelson, 1986), p. 38.

22. The Greek *patria* "family, patrilineage" is derived from *pater* "father." Paul's word play here makes the link between God's Fatherhood and our earthly familial relationships even stronger in Greek than in English. As John Stott writes, "the very notion of fatherhood is derived from the Fatherhood of God. In this case, the true relation between human fatherhood and the divine fatherhood is neither one of analogy ('God is a father like human fathers'), nor one of projection (Freud's theory that we have invented God because we needed a heavenly father figure), but rather one of derivation (God's fatherhood being the archetypal reality, 'the source of all conceivable fatherhood')" (John Stott, *The Message of Ephesians*, 2014, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press).

*enoikeo* “to dwell in,” *oikeo* “to inhabit, dwell”. While translators should not and cannot translate *en* in the same way in every verse in the New Testament, nevertheless, when *en* occurs in a relational context within the Trinity or between God and us, in places where the basic meaning of “being in,” “dwelling in,” or “remaining in” is present, translators should strive for a high degree of consistency in translating this term.

In particular, it is very important that the terms used to describe the relationships within the Trinity be the same as the terms used to describe *our* relationship to the Trinity. The NT authors deliberately use the same phrasing to describe these relationships, for example:

- **“I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you”** (John 14:20)
- Jesus prays “that they may all be one, just as **you, Father, are in me, and I in you, that they also may be in us**” (John 17:21)
- **“For in him the whole fullness of deity dwells** bodily, and **you have been filled in him**, who is the head of all rule and authority” (Colossians 2:9-10)
- Paul, Silas, and Timothy pray “that the name of our Lord Jesus may be **glorified in you, and you in him**” (2 Thessalonians 1:12)
- “Whoever keeps his commandments **abides in God, and God in him**. And by this we know that **he abides in us**, by the Spirit whom he has given us.” (1 John 3:24)
- “No one has ever seen God; if we love one another, **God abides in us** and his love is perfected in us. By this we know that **we abide in him and he in us**, because he has given us of his Spirit...Whoever confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, **God abides in him, and he in God**. So we have come to know and to believe the love that God has for us. God is love, and whoever abides in love **abides in God, and God abides in him**.” (1 John 4:12-13, 15-16)

This reciprocity of mutual indwelling—both within the Trinity and in our relationship to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—communicates deep, God-breathed truth about the nature of the Trinity and our relationship to God. Though translators should of course be aware of the fact that a preposition like *en* may require flexibility in translation at times, this reciprocity of mutual indwelling can and must be maintained in translation. Translators should also strive to maintain the picture, found in many of these passages, of the Holy Spirit “dwelling in” us as God dwells in his temple (e.g. 1 Corinthians 3:16, 6:19; see also James 4:5, Romans 8:9-11, 2 Corinthians 6:16, John 14:17, Ephesians 3:17).

Translators should also not be surprised if readers initially are confused by the mutual indwelling language, because in our normal human experience, two people cannot both dwell “in” each other at the same time. This is as true of first century Greeks as it is of any modern readers of a translation. Such initial lack of understanding is not therefore a reason to reject using language that matches the picture of indwelling in the above passages, or to reduce it to mere explanations of “unity” or “togetherness,” any more than people’s initial shock and confusion about Jesus saying that people must “eat his flesh” and “drink his

blood” was an indication that Jesus spoke poorly and that his “words of eternal life” should be revised (John 6:51-69). Instead, while translators should be sensitive to how prepositions like *en* vary in function from language to language, nonetheless the beautiful, mysterious, and deeply intimate picture of the mutual indwelling of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—and the glorious, gracious invitation of God for us to participate in this unity by God being “in” us and we in God—should be maintained, so that everyone can know the deep, intimate, and rich relationship within the Trinity and how graciously He has offered us the same mutual indwelling through Christ.

**Possibly affected verses:** Jn 10:37-38; 14:9-13, 16-17, 20; 17:10, 20-23, 26; Rom 8:9-11, 12:5; 1 Cor 3:16, 6:19, 15:22; 2 Cor 5:17-21, 6:16, 13:5; Gal 2:20, 3:26-28; Eph 1:1-14, 2:6-22, 3:17; Col 1:19, 27; 2:9-11; 2 Thes 1:12; James 4:5; 1 Jn 2:5-6, 24-28; 3:24; 4:12-16

### 4.3 Distinction between יהוה *YHWH* and אלהים *elohim*

The Hebrew term אלהים *elohim* is often used to refer to the one true God of Israel, but it is also frequently used to refer to the false gods of the nations. Often these two usages can be distinguished by whether the associated verb is singular or plural, but not always (see, for example, Judges 11:24, 1 Samuel 5:7, 1 Kings 18:24, where singular verbs are used with pagan gods). *Elohim* is also used sometimes for humans (Psalm 82:6, Exodus 7:1) or for Samuel’s spirit (1 Samuel 28:13). *Elohim* can be declined (as in “my God, your God,” etc.) or specified (as in “the God of Israel,” “the gods of Egypt”). This term is therefore best translated by a title that can refer to both the true God and false gods.

The term יהוה *YHWH*, on the other hand, is not a title or category, but is the name of the one true God, which He revealed to Moses (Exodus 3:15). It is never declined or specified. *YHWH*’s identity is known only through His acts and nature which He revealed in Scripture. The name of *YHWH* always and only refers to the one true God of Israel, and never to false gods, so that we never attribute to Him any aspects of the false “gods” of the nations. As Hellmut Rosin states:

[I]t would be unwise to treat *YHWH* and *elohim* (or *ha’ elohim*) like synonyms in such cases [as Jonah 2-4]. Synonyms are interchangeable. If *YHWH* and *Elohim* were to be regarded “like synonyms”, it would to a certain degree be justifiable to translate the Old Testament uniformly either in a “Yahwistic” or in an “Elohistic” sense and thus to use either *YHWH* or *Elohim* like a common denominator. A concordant rendering of each of the two main “designations of God” would then not be absolutely necessary.

But the equation “YHWH is GOD” (1 Kings 18:39) is irreversible. Its reversion “GOD is YHWH” is not to be found in the Old Testament. In all its sentences the one sentence: YHWH is GOD is repeated again and again.<sup>23</sup>

---

23. Hellmut Rosin (1956), *The Lord Is God: The Translation of the Divine Names and the Missionary Calling of the Church* (Amsterdam: Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap), 20.

And again:

YHWH is GOD! This sentence with its two intonations precedes every translation of the designations of God: The NAME translates itself into the general conception *elohim*, before it becomes our task to render both, and differently, in other languages. This “self-translation” of the NAME does not mean that we are also entitled to put our conception of god in its place in a translation of the Scriptures. The sentence is not reversible: GOD (or what we understand by this term) is YHWH. As a sign of the irreversible way the revelation takes from the Jews to the Gentiles, the duplicity of the designation of God must be fully preserved for the congregation.<sup>24</sup>

In other words, humanity has a multitude of ideas about *elohim*. And YHWH has condescended to reveal to us in His Word that He is an *elohim*—in fact, He is THE *elohim*, the only true *elohim*—but *elohim* is not YHWH. The distinction between the name YHWH, which sets Him apart as unique and personal, and the title *elohim*, has great theological significance. Translations that do not consistently distinguish between the two terms do not accurately reflect God’s self-revelation as YHWH, the only true *elohim* amidst the false *elohim* of the nations.

**Possibly affected verses:** Hundreds throughout the OT

#### 4.4 Distinction between θεός *theos* and κύριος *kyrios*

When the New Testament includes a quote or an allusion to the Old Testament, it usually translates YHWH as κύριος ‘Lord’ (following the Hebrew tradition of verbally substituting אֲדֹנָי *Adonai* out of reverence when vocalizing the name YHWH). In contrast, the term *elohim* is usually translated as θεός ‘God’. Unlike YHWH in Hebrew, however, the Greek term *kyrios* is used not just for the one true God of Israel, but also for other more earthly lords and masters. In addition, *kyrios* is often used as a title for Jesus, either in a somewhat more earthly sense (e.g. John 4:11) or in reference to Jesus as YHWH (e.g. Philippians 2:11, which refers back to Isaiah 45:23). *Theos*, on the other hand, is used to refer either to the true God of Israel or to false gods (e.g. Acts 28:6, 2 Corinthians 4:4), and only rarely as a title for Jesus.<sup>25</sup> Because the theological roles of *theos* and *kyrios* are quite distinct, it is important to distinguish between the two in translation (see the next section for further development of the theological function of *kyrios*).

**Possibly affected verses:** Hundreds throughout the NT

---

24. Rosin (1956), 53–54.

25. In John 10:34, quoting Psalm 82:6, *theos* in the plural is also used to refer to human beings besides Jesus.

## 4.5 Consistency in translating *kyrios* in reference to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit

More than any other term in Greek, *kyrios* ties together the three members of the Trinity. *Kyrios*, typically translated “Lord” in English, is very commonly used to refer to God the Father and Jesus, and in a few verses also refers to the Holy Spirit (2 Corinthians 3:16-18). Whereas *theos* nearly always refers to God the Father, and Χριστός *Christos* “Christ” refers to Jesus, *kyrios* is very frequently applied to both—it is used to refer to God the Father roughly 100 times, and to Jesus the Son around 240 times.<sup>26</sup> In addition, there are roughly 200 times where *kyrios* is used to refer to God, but the specific member of the Trinity is not clear.<sup>27</sup> *Kyrios* is the second-most common title for Jesus (after *Christos*), and the third most common for the Father (after *theos* and Πατήρ *pater* “Father”).

The usage of *kyrios* for God the Father primarily results from its use as a translation of *YHWH*, although other uses are also found (e.g. Matthew 11:25, Acts 17:24). Many uses of *kyrios* for Jesus arise from it being a natural term of address that disciples and social inferiors use for their master, teacher, or superior. However, several examples of *kyrios* as applied to Jesus come from quotes of or allusions to *YHWH* in Hebrew, thus establishing that Jesus is indeed *YHWH*, the God of Israel. In other words, the term *kyrios*, like Jesus Himself, connects heaven and earth, God and Man. This theological function of *kyrios* is crucial to New Testament Christology, and translations must faithfully maintain the function of this key term as much as possible.

Key verses	RSV	Notes
Mt 3:3, Mk 1:3, Lk 3:4	“Prepare the way of the Lord”	quoting <i>YHWH</i> from Isaiah 40:3, referring to Jesus
John 1:23	“Make straight the way of the Lord”	
Mt 22:43-45, Mk 12:36-37, Lk 20:42-44, Acts 2:34	“The Lord said to my Lord”	quoting Psalm 110:1—see “Additional comments...” section below
Luke 1:28	“The Lord is with you”	the angel Gabriel to Mary; referent is delightfully ambiguous

---

26. Seth Vitrano-Wilson (2020), *Κύριος in the New Testament: Christology, Trinity, and Translation* (Biblical Missiology).

27. Vitrano-Wilson (2020).

Key verses	RSV	Notes
Acts 7:59	“Lord Jesus, receive my spirit”	Stephen, alluding to Psalm 31:5 which originally applies to YHWH
Romans 10:9, 11-13, 16	<p>9...if you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved...<sup>11</sup>The scripture says, “No one who believes in him will be put to shame.”<sup>12</sup>For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; the same Lord is Lord of all and bestows his riches upon all who call upon him. <sup>13</sup>For, “every one who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved.”...<sup>16</sup>But they have not all obeyed the gospel; for Isaiah says, “Lord, who has believed what he has heard from us?”</p>	Verse 11 quotes Isaiah 28:16. Verse 16 quotes Isaiah 53:1 which has <i>YHWH</i> . Verse 13 quotes Joel 2:32 (see also Acts 2:21), which has <i>YHWH</i> , but Paul applies it to Jesus in verse 9. Also note that the phrase “call upon the name of the Lord” is a common OT motif that always refers to YHWH, but here, as well as other places in the NT, the phrase and related variations are applied to Jesus (see Acts 9:14,21; 22:16; 1 Corinthians 1:2).
1 Corinthians 8:6	yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist.	Many theologians argue that Paul here is expanding the Shema (Deuteronomy 6:4), “YHWH our God, YHWH is one.” <sup>28</sup> Here Paul applies “one Lord” ( <i>heis kyrios</i> , cf. Hebrew <i>YHWH echad</i> ) to Jesus, but also includes God the Father in his formulation. Paul’s analysis would have been striking to his Jewish contemporaries, yet understanding his argument requires consistent use of <i>kyrios</i> for both YHWH and Jesus the Lord/Rabbi/Master.
1 Corinthians 10:21-22, 26	<p><sup>21</sup>You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons. You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons. <sup>22</sup>Shall we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?...<sup>26</sup>For “the earth is the Lord’s, and everything in it.”</p>	The context of this chapter is strongly Old Testament in character, with <i>kyrios</i> evoking YHWH (for example, v. 26 quotes Psalm 24:1, where <i>kyrios</i> is <i>YHWH</i> ). At the same time, the “cup” and “table” of the Lord clearly refer to communion and Jesus (see v. 16).

28. An excellent compilation of these arguments is found at <http://inthenameofwhowhat.blogspot.com/2009/03/splitting-shema-how-not-to-guide.html>.

Key verses	RSV	Notes
2 Corinthians 3:16-18	<sup>16</sup> but when a man turns to the Lord the veil is removed. <sup>17</sup> Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom. <sup>18</sup> And we all, with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit.	In verse 16, the previous context is strongly OT, suggesting YHWH, but the phrase “turn to the Lord” typically refers to Jesus (as does the reference to “Christ” in verse 14). Yet verse 17 explicitly says that the Holy Spirit is the “Lord” referred to. Immediately after, in the same verse, Paul calls Him the “Spirit of the Lord,” indicating that the “Lord” here is a reference to God the Father or Jesus the Son (or both). Verse 18 refers to Exodus 34, in which YHWH is the “Lord.” Thus, the three members of the Trinity are explicitly or implicitly included as referents of <i>kyrios</i> in this passage.
Ephesians 4:4-6	<sup>4</sup> There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope that belongs to your call, <sup>5</sup> one Lord, one faith, one baptism, <sup>6</sup> one God and Father of us all, who is above all and through all and in all.	Here is arguably another example of an expansion of the Shema (Deuteronomy 6:4), including the Father, Jesus as the “one Lord,” and the Spirit.
Philippians 2:9-11	<sup>9</sup> Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name which is above every name, <sup>10</sup> that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, <sup>11</sup> and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.	quoting Isaiah 45:23 in which YHWH is speaking, but Paul applies it to Jesus here. This is reinforced even more by the phrase “name which is above every name,” which in Paul’s Jewish context could only have been the name of YHWH. <sup>29</sup> Paul also quotes Isaiah 45:23 in Romans 14:11 and applies it to God (the Father). In other words, Paul takes the Hebrew <i>YHWH</i> in Isaiah 45:23, translates it <i>kyrios</i> , and applies it to both God the Father and Jesus in two separate places. This is an excellent example of the theological role of <i>kyrios</i> in the NT as a link between the Father and the Son.
Hebrews 1:10	“Thou, Lord, didst found the earth in the beginning, and the heavens are the work of thy hands”	Ps 102:25 refers to YHWH (actual word <i>kyrie</i> is in LXX); the author applies this to Jesus

29. See Norm Mundhenk (2010), “Jesus is Lord: The Tetragrammaton in Bible Translation,” *Bible Translator* 61(2), p. 60. Mundhenk states, “Verses 9-11 in Philippians, then, specifically refer to some of the most monotheistic passages in the Old Testament, yet they say that God himself has given the Name (*YHWH*) to Jesus, so that everyone on earth will bow and confess that Jesus Christ is Lord (= *YHWH*).”

Key verses	RSV	Notes
1 Peter 1:25	<p>“but the word of the Lord abides for ever.” That word is the good news which was preached to you.</p>	<p>Quote of Isaiah 40:6-8, which has “our God” here and not <i>YHWH</i> (although <i>YHWH</i> is clearly the referent, and the word <i>YHWH</i> occurs in the previous verse). However, Peter uses <i>kyrios</i> here and not “our God,” and follows up with: “That word is the good news which was preached to you.” This has the effect of making it easier for readers to think of the “word of <i>kyrios</i>” as referring specifically to the good news about Jesus that they heard in their own day, in addition to its broader meaning of “divine revelation.” Peter’s (anarthrous) use of <i>kyrios</i> here therefore links <i>YHWH</i> and Jesus together, when a direct quote of the Hebrew or the Septuagint would not have had this effect. This is reinforced by Peter’s quote just a few verses later of Psalm 34:8, where he applies <i>YHWH</i> directly to Jesus (see immediately below).</p>
1 Peter 2:3	<p>if indeed you have tasted that the Lord is good. (ESV)</p>	<p>Quote of Psalm 34:8, “Taste and see that <i>YHWH</i> is good”, but Peter applies this to Jesus (see following verse, clearly Jesus, starting with “him”)</p>
1 Peter 3:12, 14-15	<p><sup>12</sup>For the eyes of the Lord are on the righteous, and his ears are open to their prayer. But the face of the Lord is against those who do evil.”...<sup>14</sup>...“Do not fear what they fear nor be in dread,” <sup>15</sup>but in your hearts reverence Christ as Lord...</p>	<p>Verses 14-15 are adapted from Isaiah 8:12-13, which has <i>YHWH tsava’ot</i>, but Peter applies it to Christ here. Peter’s quote in verse 12 of Psalm 34:15-16 strengthens the association here of <i>kyrios</i> with <i>YHWH</i>. Notice how Peter quotes Psalm 34 in both chapter 2 and 3; in the first case (2:3), <i>YHWH</i> is clearly applied to Jesus, while the second case (3:12) is more open in its referent. This is a good example of both the way that <i>YHWH</i> is applied to Jesus in the New Testament, as well as the ability of <i>kyrios</i> to transcend intra-Trinitarian boundaries.</p>

Key verses	RSV	Notes
Jude 4-5	<p><sup>4</sup>For certain people have crept in unnoticed who long ago were designated for this condemnation, ungodly people, who pervert the grace of our God into sensuality and deny our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ. <sup>5</sup>Now I want to remind you, although you once fully knew it, that Jesus/Lord, who saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe.</p>	<p>There is a significant textual variation in verse 5 between “Jesus” and “Lord.” Most modern scholars believe “Jesus” is the most likely original reading. Even if <i>kyrios</i> were the original reading, the referent of the verse would likely still be Jesus as YHWH, since Jesus is referred to as “our only <i>kyrios</i>” just one verse before. However, at least one Arabic MIT translates this debated word as <i>Allāh</i>, which would make it highly unlikely that readers would understand the referent to be Jesus, thus missing this key text for establishing high Christology written by the Lord’s brother, who knew both His humanity and divinity.</p>
Revelation 17:14, 19:16	<p>the Lamb will conquer them, for he is Lord of lords and King of kings...On his robe and on his thigh he has a name inscribed, King of kings and Lord of lords.</p>	<p>The title “Lord of lords” is used of YHWH (<i>Adonei ha’ adonim</i>) in Deuteronomy 10:17 and Psalm 136:3. In these two verses it is applied to Jesus. 1 Timothy 6:15 has similar Greek wording applied to Jesus.</p>

These verses and others make it extremely clear that *kyrios* is an essential linking key term in establishing the high Christology of the NT, as well as the indivisible divinity and humanity of Christ.

#### 4.5.1 Addressing arguments in favor of separating out the translation of *kyrios*

Leith and Andrea Gray (pseudonyms) argue that for Muslims, the term *kyrios* should be translated differently based on whether it refers to God the Father or God the Son:

As for the messianic title “Lord,” one of the most common of the titles for the promised Messiah, its traditionally translated form has created significant offense and confusion among Muslim audiences. Many translations do not distinguish between the Greek word *kýrios* as referring to YHWH and “the *kýrios*” as referring to the Messiah, even though the Greek itself very consistently makes distinctions in usage (as do ancient translations such as Syriac). As a result, some Muslims understand the title to mean “the deity Jesus,” and that the Bible is declaring the existence of Jesus as another God besides God the Father. Others take it to mean that Jesus is the same being as the Father. This has been corrected in a recent Muslim-sensitive translation of the Bible...which uses the term *as-sayyid* (the master) when “the *kýrios*” is found as a title for the Messiah, and Allah when the the [sic] Greek *kýrios* is referring to God. For a thorough exegetical treatment of the Greek *kýrios*, see Brown and Samuel (2002).<sup>30</sup>

30. Leith Gray and Andrea Gray (2008), “A Muslim encounters the Gospel of Mark: Theological implications of contextual mismatch,” *International Journal of Frontier Missiology* (25)3, 127–134.

When the Grays state,

some Muslims understand the title to mean “the deity Jesus,” and that the Bible is declaring the existence of Jesus as another God besides God the Father. Others take it to mean that Jesus is the same being as the Father. This has been corrected in a recent Muslim-sensitive translation...

it is difficult to understand how this differs from saying, “Muslims misunderstand the Trinity. Therefore we separated out this term which was too loaded with Trinitarian theology.” What people group in the world does not misunderstand the Trinity without careful teaching? The Grays’ response to such a critique might focus on the Greek article, which they say “very consistently” distinguishes between *kyrios* as God and *kyrios* as Messiah. They seem to base this claim on an unpublished article by Richard Brown and Christopher J. Samuel.<sup>31</sup>

Brown and Samuel claim in their introduction:

Unfortunately, most English translations of the New Testament have made no distinction between ‘Lord’ as a messianic title and ‘LORD’ as a substitute for the divine name, even though the Greek text makes a distinction in 96% of the instances.

Presumably this is the source of the Grays’ claim. Brown and Samuel claim in the rest of the paper that when *kyrios* has an article, it nearly always refers to Jesus, and when it has no article (“anarthrous”), it nearly always refers to God the Father. However, Vitrano-Wilson (2020) has analyzed the New Testament use of *kyrios* with and without the article, and found instead that, when all uses of *kyrios* that refer to God (Father, Son, or Holy Spirit) are included, this pattern is followed not 96%, but a mere 50% of the time. Brown and Samuel’s shockingly high number seems to derive from the fact that they make a large number of exceptions to their rule, some of more debatable validity than others, and only count the remaining instances in their final statistic. However, if the articular usage were truly important to the meaning that the NT authors wanted to communicate, there were other ways they could have made this distinction more than half the time. If grammatical requirements or patterns of naturalness in Greek made the article unavailable as a distinguishing marker (as for example in the vocative, where articles are not allowed), they could instead have found entirely separate terms to maintain the distinction, similar to the way Hebrew uses *YHWH* and *Adon(ai)* as two separate terms. *Kyrios* was not the only possible Greek word God could have inspired them to use for these various meanings. (Most obviously, the New Testament authors could have kept the name of *YHWH* in the text, just as early Greek Old Testament manuscripts did.<sup>32</sup>) Although it would be too much to say that

---

31. Richard Brown and Christopher J. Samuel (2003), *The meanings of κυριος in the New Testament* (unpublished manuscript).

32. Bruce M. Metzger (1981), *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Palaeography*, Oxford University Press, 33–35.

the article is entirely irrelevant to the meaning of the passage, the fact that Brown and Samuel’s pattern is ignored as often as it is followed by the NT authors strongly suggests that they did not use the article with *kyrios* to distinguish between two separate concepts, and that modern translators therefore should treat *kyrios* as a single key term rather than two. It should also be noted that if the Grays’ suggestion were truly followed—namely, that when referring to God the Father or Jesus, articular *kyrios* be translated with *sayyid* in Arabic, and anarthrous *kyrios* as *Allāh*, one would end up with back translations such as these, which all have no article in the Greek:

- “God Jesus, into your [sg.] hands I commit my spirit” (Acts 7:59)
- “If you confess ‘Jesus is God,’ you will be saved” (Romans 10:9)
- “Every tongue will confess that Jesus the Messiah is God” (Philippians 2:11)
- “Sanctify the Messiah as God” (1 Peter 3:15)

Somehow it seems doubtful that the “Muslim-sensitive” translation the Grays mention, or any other translation for that matter, has actually used the article consistently to bisect the meaning of *kyrios* in this way.<sup>33</sup> If they did, it would hardly help them with their stated problem of Muslims misunderstanding the Trinity, since the article is clearly not the most relevant factor at play.

#### **4.5.2 *Nomina sacra* and early Christian orthographic treatment of *kyrios***

A further indication that the presence or absence of the article was not the most relevant factor in the early Church’s understanding of *kyrios* is the use of *nomina sacra* forms, where scribes abbreviated certain key words, written as capitals, with a line above the abbreviation. As New Testament textual expert Philip Comfort says, “the *nomina sacra* for ‘Lord,’ ‘Jesus,’ ‘Christ,’ ‘God,’ and ‘Spirit’ are present in *all* the earliest copies of the New Testament (and Christian Old Testament), beginning in the second century, thereby pointing to a first-century creation date.”<sup>34</sup> Comfort concludes that these abbreviations date back to “either the writers themselves or the very earliest copyists.”<sup>35</sup> Comfort states that early Christian scribes—perhaps even the apostles themselves—used the *nomina sacra* form to distinguish between *kyrios* referring to God, Jesus, or the Holy Spirit, written  $\overline{\text{KC}}$  (the first and last letters of κύριος), and *kyrios* referring to other “lords,” written out in full, and that this distinction is intricately tied in to the Jewish treatment of the name *YHWH*:

---

33. Lest one respond, as Brown and Samuel might, that all these examples should not be translated with “God/Allāh” because they are predicate nominative and non-referential, we should remember that each of these examples quotes or strongly alludes to Hebrew verses with *YHWH*, so “God/Allāh” can hardly be argued to be too high a Christology for these verses.

34. Philip Wesley Comfort (2005), *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography & Textual Criticism*, B&H Publishing Group, 214. Emphasis in original.

35. Comfort (2005), 199.

To name Jesus as “Lord” was no small matter to a Jewish Christian, who would have understood clearly that Yahweh has the same title...The presence of the nomen sacrum  $\overline{\text{K}\overline{\text{C}}}$  in New Testament writings was a way for Christians to show that the title *kyrios*, assigned to Yahweh in the Old Testament, was now ascribed to Jesus. In other words, the nomen sacrum  $\overline{\text{K}\overline{\text{C}}}$  would signal that Jesus was worthy of as much sacred reverence as was given to Yahweh...

In writing *kyrios* as  $\overline{\text{K}\overline{\text{C}}}$ , the New Testament writers and scribes were signaling that Jesus was the divine Lord, superior to Caesar and any god. Furthermore the nomen sacrum indicated a distinction between Jesus’ lordship and that of others who were masters and landowners, for which the term *kyrios* (written in *plene*) was also used.<sup>36</sup>

Larry Hurtado, one of the foremost scholars on *nomina sacra*, concurs:

[T]here has been widespread agreement that this Christian scribal convention has some historical relationship to Jewish scribal practices that involved according special treatment to the Tetragrammaton.<sup>37</sup>

In other words, rather than treating *kyrios* translations of *YHWH* separately from other instances of *kyrios*, as MIT translators sometimes do, early Christians understood *kyrios* in relationship to Jesus as inherently carrying associations of His divinity, and treated *kyrios* with a similar type of special treatment afforded the name of *YHWH*. Early Christians, possibly the apostles themselves, *did* make a distinction in their treatment of *kyrios*—but this distinction was between the divine Lord and merely human lords, *not* between the Father and the Son. This type of early Christian treatment of *kyrios* as a term of divinity—completely irrespective of the presence or absence of the Greek article—is in striking contrast to the treatment of *kyrios* in several Muslim Idiom Translations.

As a final note, the theological dangers of separating out this key term can be seen in the fact that of all major English language translations, only the Jehovah’s Witness “New World Translation” separates out the translation of *kyrios* in the way that we see some Muslim Idiom Translations do. Even if the motivation for such translation practices differs significantly between Jehovah’s Witnesses and MIT translators, one may be properly concerned that these practices may lead readers to weaken or even deny Trinitarian doctrine.<sup>38</sup>

---

36. Comfort (2005), 215.

37. Larry W. Hurtado (2006), *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*, Eerdmans, 121.

38. For further discussion of this point, see Mike Tisdell, *Common Theology Results in Common Translation Practices* (unpublished manuscript).

### 4.5.3 Additional comments on “The Lord said to my Lord”

In four places (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Acts), the NT quotes the first part of Psalm 110:1, “The Lord said to my Lord.” Let us compare the Greek of Matthew 22:44 with the Hebrew of Psalm 110:1:

Εἶπεν Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου

נָאֻם יְהוָה לַאֲדֹנָי

The Greek is an exact quote of the LXX for Psalm 110:1; there is no distinction made between either instance of “Lord.” The Hebrew text reads *nə’um YHWH ladoni*, but this would have been pronounced as “נָאֻם אֲדֹנָי לַאֲדֹנָי” *nə’um Adonai ladoni*, which is what is represented in the Greek text. Traditional Arabic translations convey this in the same way, i.e., “قَالَ الرَّبُّ لِرَبِّي”.

The three instances in the gospels of these words come from when Jesus is teaching and asking the people about who David is referring to as “my Lord.” In Matthew 22:43, Jesus says that “David in the Spirit calls him ‘Lord’” (quoted with no article, incidentally, even though the full Greek quote has an article here—clearly the article was not crucial to the meaning in Jesus’ mind, counter to the Grays’ and Brown & Samuel’s argument). This verse often confuses readers, leading translators to want to “clarify” the meaning by separating out the two instances of *kyrios*.

However, by doing so, they completely undercut Jesus’ line of argument. The point of Jesus’ question is that David could not refer to the Messiah as ‘my Lord’ unless the Messiah was greater than he. And since there could be no mere human greater than David—God’s anointed King and ancestor of the entire Messianic line—that would require the Messiah to be divine. By using the exact same term to translate *YHWH* and *adoni* “my lord,” the inspired Greek text even hints (without saying outright in this passage) that the Messiah is not just “divine” in some Arian sense, but in fact IS the very *kyrios*—*YHWH*—referred to in Psalm 110:1. This does not deny that the first and second “Lords” are two distinct persons, as the God-breathed Hebrew clearly tells us. Yet the New Testament authors’ combining of the two terms *YHWH* and *adoni*, especially in conjunction with the rest of New Testament usage of *kyrios* for *YHWH* and as a title for the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, adds to the truth expressed in the Hebrew by showing us that both persons—the “Lord” speaking and the Messiah being spoken to—can truly be called “Lord” in the highest sense possible. Using two different terms in translation obscures these key meanings and dampens the effect Jesus’ words would have had to the original listeners and readers.

The following commentators support this interpretation of this key verse, repeated four times in the NT:

45. [If, therefore, David calls Him Lord, how is He His Son?] Mk. has: “David himself calls Him Lord, and whence is He His Son?” Christ here raises a difficulty which He does not solve. If the Messiah is David’s Son, how is it that David, speaking by divine inspiration, ascribes to Him a divine title and divine prerogatives? The solution suggested, though not expressed, is that the Messiah is not only Son of David, but Son of God. See Dalm. Words, pp. 285 f.<sup>39</sup>

Verse 44. The Lord (יהוה Yehve or Jehovah) said unto my Lord, אדני Adni or Adonai, my prop, stay, master, support), Sit thou on my right hand. Take the place of the greatest eminence and authority. Till I make thine enemies thy footstool—till I subdue both Jews and Gentiles under thee, and cause them to acknowledge thee as their sovereign and Lord. This quotation is taken from Psa. cx. 1; and, from it, these two points are clear: 1. That David wrote it by the inspiration of God; and 2. That it is a prophetic declaration of the Messiah.

Verse 45. How is he his son? As the Jews did not attempt to deny the conclusion of our Lord’s question, which was, the Messiah is not only the son of David according to the flesh, but he is the Lord of David according to his Divine nature, then it is evident they could not. Indeed, there was no other way of invalidating the argument, but by denying that the prophecy in question related to Christ: but it seems the prophecy was so fully and so generally understood to belong to the Messiah that they did not attempt to do this; for it is immediately added, No man was able to answer him a word—they were completely nonplussed and confounded.<sup>40</sup>

#### **4.5.4 Semantic challenges in maintaining absolute verbal correspondence when translating *kyrios***

The theological role of *kyrios* in declaring that Jesus is YHWH, Lord of all, and that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are One must be maintained in any faithful translation. The more consistently *kyrios* is translated, the more this function is maintained.

This does not, however, mean that 100% verbal correspondence for *kyrios* is an absolute requirement for faithful translation. For example, some languages have complex honorific or deferential systems for terms of address, where a single term used as broadly as *kyrios*, extending from the Lord God Himself all the way down to a polite term of address for a stranger (e.g. John 4:11, where the Samaritan woman is skeptical toward Jesus and is only using *kyrios* in a formal, polite way rather than indicating any kind of belief in His Lordship or desire to follow Him), is simply not possible with a single term. Even in English, the use of “Lord” in John 4:11 stretches the usage of the English word “Lord” beyond its normal range, which is why nearly all translations use a term like “Sir” instead.

---

39. Willoughby C. Allen, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*; ed. by Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles A. Briggs; 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), paragraph 3308.

40. Adam Clarke, *Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Whole Bible*, Accordance electronic ed. 6 vols.; (Altamonte Springs: OakTree Software, 2004), paragraph 36998.

On the other hand, even in a place like John 4:11, loss of consistency carries some cost. It could be argued that John's use of *kyrios* in this verse has a delightful anticipatory irony for the reader who already knows what's going to happen in the story. We might imagine Jesus thinking something like, "You call me 'Lord,' and rightly so—if you only knew who I Am, you'd see just how right you are!" Even in this verse, then, one option would be to retain the term "Lord", with a footnote saying that this was the common respectful term for a stranger, but that literarily, it could be read as anticipating a fuller understanding of the sense in which Jesus is "Lord."

John's use of *kyrios* is even more delightfully ironic in 20:15, where Mary, in the presence of the risen Lord, thinks He is the gardener and says, "Kyrie, if you've carried him away, tell me where you've put him, and I will take him away." Mary is clearly using *kyrios* as a respectful term for a male stranger, not as a divine title—yet the reader knows full well that she is speaking to the One who, more than all others, deserves the title she gives Him! Here, at the moment where His full Lordship over death is about to be revealed to another human being for the first time, Mary declares Him "Lord" without even understanding it!<sup>41</sup> On the one hand, to use "Lord" in English here would be especially misleading to readers, and yet the loss of John's literary device of dramatic irony is also especially poignant. Paratext such as footnotes are therefore even more valuable here in helping readers see the beauty of this literary device.

Another semantic role of *kyrios*, which may or may not overlap with the core use as a title for God, is to indicate a "master" or "owner" when a master-slave relationship or ownership of property is in view (e.g. Matthew 21:40, in which the *kyrios* "owner" clearly represents God the Father, or Luke 12:37, where the *kyrios* of the slaves clearly represents Jesus). Yet even here, something is lost when the same term is not used, even if that loss may be unavoidable in certain passages and in certain languages.

Different languages may have different fault lines where the full range of *kyrios* cannot be translated with the same word in specific contexts, but translators should strive to maintain concordance when possible. Crucially, there exists a wide core set of instances in the New Testament for which consistent translation truly is required. This core set, which ties together the Trinity and exalts Jesus as YHWH, cannot be just a shriveled core with a few instances that clearly tie Jesus to YHWH, along with a smattering of Old Testament references. Instead, it must be a truly robust core that includes every Old Testament reference with *kyrios* (being a translation of either *YHWH* or *Adon*), along with any place where Jesus is declared to be Lord by His apostles and disciples post-resurrection. Ideally, it

---

41. Note, indeed, the rich parallels between John 4:11 and John 20:15. In John 4:11, Jesus is called *kyrie* by another person for the first time. Likewise, in John 20:15, Jesus is called *kyrie* by another person after his resurrection for the first time. In both cases, the woman calls him *kyrie* without knowing who Jesus is, but in the course of their interaction, Jesus reveals Himself as Lord, and she believes.

would include most or all pre-resurrection instances as well, though this will depend more on the semantic fault lines of the language of translation. If a word being considered for the role of consistently translating this core set cannot play this broad a role, then translators should look hard to find a better term that can, given the crucial theological importance of consistency within this core set.

Every culture and every language has ways of referring to someone of high status. If necessary, it would be better to use a term that loses distinction between *kyrios* and *basileus* (“king”) or *archon* (“leader, chief”) than to lose the main theological role that *kyrios* plays in the New Testament. Regardless of language or culture, differentiating between Father, Son, and Spirit as referents of *kyrios* is never linguistically necessary and is theologically destructive. This is why the Arlington Statement declares that *kyrios* “should not be translated differently based on whether translators determine that it refers to God the Father or God the Son.”

#### **4.5.5 Concluding remarks on the translation of *kyrios***

One of the most striking features of the New Testament translation of *YHWH* and its use of *kyrios* is the way that God, His wisdom, sovereignly and marvelously used the fear that post-exilic Jews had of pronouncing the name of *YHWH* to communicate crucial Trinitarian doctrine in the New Testament. The avoidance of saying the name *YHWH* out loud is clearly not based on a biblical injunction—after all, Joel specifically prophesies that “everyone who calls on the name of *YHWH* will be saved” (Joel 2:32), and prophets from Moses to David to Isaiah spoke boldly and publicly in the name of *YHWH*. Yet God allowed the Jews to develop what arguably is nothing more than a superstition about pronouncing the name of *YHWH*, which led them to substitute the term *Adonai*, which was translated *kyrios*—only for God to turn around and use this term, born of superstition, to declare plainly in the Greek New Testament what was only hinted at in the Law and the Prophets: That *YHWH*, the LORD, is not only God but also Messiah, not only Father but also Son and Spirit, not only divine but also human—and not just human, but a humiliated slave, naked and dead on a cross. And *that* is why God gave Him the Name that is above all names: the name of *YHWH*, the name of *kyrios*, the name of LORD. He is Father, Son, and Spirit, and He truly is **Κύριος**<sup>42</sup>—Lord, Owner, Master of all (Acts 10:36, Romans 10:12).

---

42. Mere ink or pixels cannot fully communicate the holiness of God. As J.L. Mundhenk states: “Few readers today will feel the charge of power that we assume was felt by many early readers of the Name. To provide that sort of experience, we should perhaps write the Name with letters of fire that blaze but do not consume the page” (Mundhenk 2010, 63).

## 4.6 Translation of *YHWH* and *kyrios* as “Allāh”

### 4.6.1 “Allāh” for *YHWH*

The use of the *Bismillāh* in the Bible in large part derives from the choice to translate *YHWH* and *kyrios* as “Allāh” in certain Arabic translations. Besides creating the issue of mimicking Islamic forms more than the original languages justify, and also commonly leading to the inclusion of the *Shahāda* (see, for example, 1 Kings 18:24 or Psalm 18:31, where the *Shahāda* would never be considered as a possible translation apart from the use of *Allāh* to translate *YHWH*), the idea that *Allāh* is a good translation for God’s name *YHWH* is by itself problematic.

The form *Allāh* الله can function as either a common noun or a proper name, and it has been used as a common noun to translate אֱלֹהִים/אלוהים *eloah/elohim* and θεός *theos* for many centuries. Standard Arabic translations regularly use both *Allāh* الله and *ilah* إله which allows for the declension and pluralization of these terms. *Allāh* has been used as a generic term for God, irrespective of whether the God of the Bible or the God of the Qur’ān is being described. In contrast, the term *YHWH* is only used of the God of the Bible.

The best example of a common noun that is also used as the proper name of a false god in Scripture is בעל *ba’al*, which in meaning could easily be used to speak about *YHWH* as master/owner; however, in this case, using this term in reference to *YHWH* is avoided. In Scripture we see בעליך *bo’alayik* ‘your husband’ or the idiom בעל חמה *ba’al chemah* ‘master of fury’ used in reference to *YHWH* once each (Isaiah 54:5 and Nahum 1:2 respectively), but the absolute, undeclined form בעל *ba’al* is always used for the false Canaanite god or to speak about men, and it is frequently used to describe Ba’al in opposition to *YHWH*. When the people of Israel call *YHWH* בעלי *ba’li* ‘my master,’ *YHWH* corrects them: “You will call me ‘my husband (*ishi*)’ and will no longer call me ‘my master (*ba’li*)” (Hosea 2:16). The authors of Scripture carefully avoided confusion between reference to *YHWH* and other gods, like Ba’al, and this should serve as an example for us as we translate God’s Word. When God chose to reveal His name to Moses and the people of Israel, He specifically chose a name that was different from the general terms shared by the pagan nations such as *elohim*, *el*, *ba’al*, etc. He chose a unique name to identify Himself uniquely to His people. He takes His unique identity very seriously, and commands us to do the same:

אֲדַבֵּר בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים  
אֲחֵרִים וּמַתְּ הַנְּבִיא הַהוּא:

But the prophet who presumes to speak a word in my name that I have not commanded him to speak, or who speaks in the name of other gods, that same prophet shall die.  
(Deuteronomy 18:20)

As YHWH showed His people through His dramatic encounter with Ba'al at Mount Carmel, there is a difference between an *elohim* of the nations and YHWH, the true *elohim*:

וְקָרָאתֶם בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְאֲנִי אֶקְרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה וְהָיָה הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר יִעֲנֶנּוּ בְּאֵשׁ הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים

Then you call on the name of your *elohim*, and I will call on the name of YHWH, and the *elohim* who answers by fire, He is *elohim*.” (1 Kings 18:24)

Hellmut Rosin aptly states:

[B]eside its proper function of designating the true God, the word “god” represents a neutral medium of communication, a meeting-place for God and the gods, which however does not mean confusion but always a decision between true and false: The neutral term will always be either in process of appreciation or depreciation, and eventually it will become clear again and again that no other but YHWH is God.<sup>43</sup>

Like Mount Carmel, the term *elohim* is contested space. Who is truly *elohim*—Ba'al or YHWH? The *Allāh* of the Qur'ān or the *Allāh* of the Bible? The *God* of Mormon “revelation” or the *God* of what alone is God-breathed? All these general terms—*elohim*, *Allāh*, *God*, etc.—can be used for both true and false gods, for true or false conceptions of God. But *YHWH* is always and only the one true God of the Bible. Therefore, the term *Allāh* should not be used to translate *YHWH*.

#### 4.6.2 “Allāh” for *kyrios*

Meanwhile, translating *kyrios* as *Allāh* makes it impossible to maintain consistency between the key texts given above for *kyrios*, and therefore necessarily splits up the theological function of *kyrios*. Even if *kyrios* were consistently translated *Allāh* every time an Old Testament quote or reference to *YHWH* were present, including the many times where Jesus is the referent, this would unnecessarily obscure the difference between *kyrios* and *theos* (unless yet another term were chosen to consistently translate *theos*, which would probably have its own disadvantages). Moreover, translating every *kyrios* = *YHWH* references as *Allāh* would still destroy the important link between the use of *kyrios* as a translation of *YHWH* and *kyrios* as Lord, Master, Rabbi for Jesus, the combination of which carries deep Christological meaning. Separating out these strongly linked meanings of *kyrios*, which the earliest Christian scribes consciously joined together, would imply that the nature of *kyrios* is in some sense divisible, that we can separate the meaning out according to our best hermeneutics. But is this really true? Can we really know for sure that a given use of *kyrios* has no connotations of *YHWH*, or, alternatively, that another instance only refers to *YHWH* and not to the meaning of “Lord, Master, Owner” that *kyrios* naturally carries? Dividing up the theological function of such a key term inevitably leads to avoidable problems in translation.

---

43. Rosin (1956), 70–71.

## 5 Conclusion

This document is not meant to address every issue involved in contextualization and translation. However, we hope that readers can see the need for more careful application of biblical theology to the work of Bible translation, and the need for the Church as a whole to be aware of trends occurring in Bible translation, so that we can ensure as much as possible that what is produced in our name and with our support matches the biblical principles we hold to. May the Lord bless His Church with wisdom, love for each other and for the lost, and most of all, love for God and a desire to see His name exalted among the nations. *Soli Deo gloria!* !المجد لله وحده

## Works Cited

- Allen, Willoughby C. 1912. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles A. Briggs, eds. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Brown, Richard, and Christopher J. Samuel. 2003. *The meanings of κύριος in the New Testament* (unpublished manuscript).
- Carson, D. A. 2012. *Jesus the Son of God: A Christological Title Often Overlooked, Sometimes Misunderstood, and Currently Disputed*. Crossway.
- Clarke, Adam. 2004. *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Whole Bible*. Accordance electronic edition. Altamonte Springs: OakTree Software.
- Comfort, Philip Wesley. 2005. *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography & Textual Criticism*. B&H Publishing Group.
- Gray, Leith, and Andrea Gray. 2008. A Muslim encounters the Gospel of Mark: Theological implications of contextual mismatch. *International Journal of Frontier Missiology* 25(3).127–134.
- Hurtado, Larry W. 2006. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Eerdmans.
- Mundhenk, Norm. 2010. Jesus is Lord: The Tetragrammaton in Bible Translation. *Bible Translator* 61(2).55–63.
- Rosin, Hellmut. 1956. *The Lord Is God: The Translation of the Divine Names and the Missionary Calling of the Church*. Amsterdam: Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap.
- Tisdell, Mike. n.d. *Common Theology Results in Common Translation Practices* (unpublished manuscript).
- Vitrano-Wilson, Seth. 2020. *Κύριος in the New Testament: Christology, Trinity, and Translation*. Biblical Missiology.

## Appendix: Chart of key potentially affected verses

The chart below uses the following abbreviations:

K = verses relevant to the translation of *kyrios*,

Sh = verses where the *Shahāda* has been included

B = verses where the *Bismillāh* has been included

FS = verses relevant to the translation of divine Father-Son terms

O = verses relevant to other issues discussed in this paper

Verse	Source	English	K	Sh	B	FS	O
Genesis 4:26	אָז הוֹחִיל לְקַרְא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה	At that time people began to call <b>upon the name of YHWH</b> .			x		
Genesis 21:33	וַיִּקְרָא שֵׁם בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה אֵל עוֹלָם	there he called <b>on the name of YHWH</b> , the Eternal God.			x		
Genesis 22:2	קַח-נָא אֶת-בְּנֶךָ אֶת-יִצְחָק אֲשֶׁר-אֶהְבֵּת אֹתוֹ וְלֵךְ לְאֶרֶץ מֹרְיָה וְהַעֲלֵהוּ שָׁם לְעֹלָה עַל אֶחָד הַהָרִים אֲשֶׁר אֹמַר אֵלֶיךָ	“Take <b>your son, your only</b> [son], Isaac, whom you love, and go to the land of Moriah, and offer him there as a burnt offering on one of the mountains of which I shall tell you.”				x	
Exodus 33:19	וַיִּקְרָא שֵׁם יְהוָה לְפָנַי	and I will proclaim <b>the name of YHWH</b> before you			x		
Exodus 34:5	וַיֵּרַד יְהוָה בְּעָנָן וַיִּתְיַצֵּב עִמּוֹ שָׁם וַיִּקְרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה	And YHWH descended in the cloud and stood with him there, and proclaimed <b>the name of YHWH</b> .			x		
Deuteronomy 4:35, 39	יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים אֵין עוֹד מִלְּבַד...וְאֵין עוֹד	<sup>35</sup> YHWH is God; besides him there is no other... <sup>39</sup> There is no other		x			x
Deuteronomy 6:4	שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד	Hear, Israel, YHWH our God, <b>YHWH is one</b> .		x			x

Verse	Source	English	K	Sh	B	FS	O
Deuteronomy 18:10-11	לֹא-יִמְצָא בְךָ מַעֲבִיר בְּנִוּוֹתָוּ בָאֵשׁ קִסְם־קְסָמִים מְעוֹנֵן וּמְנַחֵשׁ וּמְכַשֵּׁף: וְחֹבֵר חֶבֶר וְשֹׂאֵל אוֹב וַיִּדְעֵנִי וְדָרַשׁ אֶל-הַמֵּתִים:	<sup>10</sup> There shall not be found among you anyone who burns his son or his daughter as an offering, anyone who <b>practices divination</b> or <b>tells fortunes</b> or <b>interprets omens</b> , or a <b>sorcerer</b> <sup>11</sup> or a <b>charmer</b> or a <b>medium</b> or a <b>necromancer</b> or <b>one who inquires of the dead</b> ,					x
1 Samuel 17:45	וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל-הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי אַתָּה בָּא אֵלַי בַּחֶרֶב וּבַחֲנִית וּבְכִידּוֹן וְאֲנֹכִי בְאֵלֶיךָ בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵי מִעְרַכּוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר חָרַפְתָּ:	Then David said to the Philistine, “You come to me with a sword and with a spear and with a javelin, but I come to you <b>in the name of YHWH</b> of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom you have defied.			x		
2 Samuel 7:14	אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה-לּוֹ לְאָב וְהוּא יִהְיֶה-לִּי לְבֵן	I will be to him a <b>father</b> , and he shall be to me a <b>son</b>				x	
2 Samuel 7:22	עַל-כֵּן גָּדַלְתָּ אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה כִּי-אֵין כְּמוֹךָ וְאֵין אֱלֹהִים זֹלָתְךָ	Therefore you are great, Lord YHWH, for <b>there is none like you, and there is no God except You</b>		x			
2 Samuel 18:33	וַיִּרְגַז הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיַּעַל עַל-עֲלִית הַשַּׁעַר וַיִּבֶךְ וַיֹּכֵחַ   אָמַר בְּלִכְתּוֹ בְּנֵי אַבְשָׁלוֹם בְּנֵי בְנֵי אַבְשָׁלוֹם מִי-יָתֵן מוֹתִל אֲנִי תַחְתֶּיךָ אַבְשָׁלוֹם בְּנֵי בְנֵי:	The king was deeply moved and went up to the chamber over the gate and wept. And thus he said as he walked, "O <b>my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom!</b> Would I had died instead of you, O Absalom, <b>my son, my son!</b> "				x	
2 Samuel 22:32	כִּי מִי-אֵל מִבְּלַעֲדֵי יְהוָה	For <b>who is God, besides YHWH?</b>		x			
1 Kings 18:24	וַיִּקְרָאֲתָם בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְאֲנִי אֶקְרָא בְּשֵׁם-יְהוָה וְהָיָה הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר-יַעֲנֶנּוּ בָאֵשׁ הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים	Then you call <b>on the name of your god</b> , and I will call <b>on the name of YHWH, and the God who answers by fire, He is God.</b> ”			x		x
1 Kings 18:32	וַיִּבְנֶה אֶת-הָאֲבָנִים מִזְבֵּחַ בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה	and with the stones he built an altar <b>in the name of YHWH.</b>			x		x
1 Kings 18:39	וַיֹּאמְרוּ יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים	and they said, “ <b>YHWH, he is God! YHWH, he is God!</b> ”		x			x

Verse	Source	English	K	Sh	B	FS	O
2 Kings 5:11	אָמַרְתִּי אֵלַי   יֵצֵא יְצוּא וְעָמַד וְקָרָא בְּשֵׁם־יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו וְהִנִּיף יָדוֹ אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם וְאָסַף הַמַּצְרָע	I thought that he would surely come out to me and stand and call <b>upon the name of YHWH his God</b> , and wave his hand over the place and cure the leper.			x		x
1 Chronicles 17:20	יְהוָה אֵין כַּמוֹד וְאֵין אֱלֹהִים זֹלָתְךָ	YHWH, there is none like you, nor is there any God except You		x			
Psalms 2:7	אֶסְפְּרָה אֵל חַק יְהוָה אָמַר אֵלַי בְּנִי אַתָּה אֲנִי הַיּוֹם יְלִדְתִּיךָ	I will surely tell of the decree of YHWH: He said to Me, 'You are My Son, Today I have begotten You.				x	
Psalms 18:31	כִּי מִי אֱלוֹהַּ מִבְּלַעֲדֵי יְהוָה	For <b>who is God, besides YHWH?</b>		x			
Psalms 20:7 (v. 8 in Hebrew)	אֱלֹהֵי בָרֶכֶב וְאֱלֹהֵי בָסוּסִים וְאֶנְחָנוּ   בְּשֵׁם־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ נִזְכִּיר	Some trust in chariots and some in horses, but we trust <b>in the name of YHWH our God</b> .			x		x
Psalms 118:26-27	בָּרוּךְ הַבָּא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה בְּרַכְנוּכֶם מִבֵּית יְהוָה אֵל   יְהוָה	<sup>26</sup> Blessed is he who comes <b>in the name of YHWH!</b> We bless you from the house of YHWH. <sup>27</sup> <b>YHWH is God...</b>		x	x		
Proverbs 30:4	מִי הִקְיָם כָּל־אֲפֻסֵי־אָרֶץ מִה־שָׁמַיִם וּמִה־שָׁמַיִם כִּי תִדְעֶה:	Who has established all the ends of the earth? What is his name, and what is <b>his son's</b> name? Surely you know!				x	
Isaiah 7:14	הִנֵּה הָעַלְמָה הָרָה וְיִלְדֵת בֵּן וְקָרָאת שְׁמוֹ עִמָּנוּ אֵל:	Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear <b>a son</b> , and shall call his name Immanuel.				x	
Isaiah 9:6	כִּי־יֵלֵד יְלִד־לָנוּ בֵן נִתַּן־לָנוּ וְתַהֲיֵי הַמְשָׁרָה עַל־שִׁכְמוֹ וְיִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ פֶּלֶא יוֹעֵץ אֵל גִּבּוֹר אָבִיעַד שְׂרֵשֶׁלּוֹם:	For to us <b>a child</b> is born, to us <b>a son</b> is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called Wonderful <b>Counselor</b> , Mighty God, Everlasting <b>Father</b> , Prince of Peace.				x	x
Isaiah 45:14	אֲךָ בָּךְ אֵל וְאֵין עוֹד אַפְסֵי אֱלֹהִים	Surely God is in you, and <b>there is none else; no other God</b>		x			
Joel 2:32 (3:5 in Hebrew)	וְהָיָה כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה יִמָּלֵט	And it will come about that whoever calls <b>on the name of YHWH</b> will be delivered			x		

Verse	Source	English	K	Sh	B	FS	O
Micah 4:5	כִּי כָל־הַעַמִּים יִלְכוּ אִישׁ בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהָיו וְאֲנַחְנוּ נִלְךְ בְּשֵׁם־יְהוָה לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד:	For all the peoples walk each <b>in the name of its god</b> , but we will walk <b>in the name of YHWH our God</b> forever and ever.			x		x
Zephaniah 3:9	כִּי־אֶזְכֹּר אֶל־עַמִּים שֶׁפָּה בְרוּרָה לְקַרְא כָּלֶם בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה לְעַבְדוֹ שְׂכָם אֶחָד:	For then I will give to the peoples purified lips, That all of them may call <b>on the name of YHWH</b> , To serve Him shoulder to shoulder.			x		
Matthew 3:3	Ετοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου	“Prepare the way of <b>the Lord</b> ”	x				
Matthew 3:17	καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα “Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.”	And behold, a voice from heaven said, “This is <b>my beloved Son</b> , with whom I am well pleased.”				x	
Matthew 4:3	Καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ πειράζων εἶπεν αὐτῷ “Εἰ Υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰπέ ἵνα οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι ἄρτοι γένωνται.”	And the tempter came and said to him, “If <b>you are the Son of God</b> , command these stones to become loaves of bread.”				x	
Matthew 5:9	Μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ κληθήσονται.	Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called <b>sons of God</b> .				x	
Matthew 6:9	‘Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· Ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου·	Pray then like this: “ <b>Our Father</b> in heaven, your name be honored as holy.				x	
Matthew 21:9	“Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ·” “Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου·” “Ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.”	“Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he who comes <b>in the name of the Lord!</b> Hosanna in the highest!”	x		x		x
Matthew 21:37	Ὑστερον δὲ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ λέγων ‘Ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου.’	Finally he sent <b>his son</b> to them, saying, “They will respect <b>my son</b> .”				x	
Matthew 22:43-45	<sup>43</sup> ...Πῶς οὖν Δαυὶδ ἐν Πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν Κύριον λέγων, <sup>44</sup> Εἶπεν (ὁ) Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου? <sup>45</sup> Εἰ οὖν Δαυὶδ καλεῖ αὐτὸν Κύριον, πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστίν?	<sup>43</sup> ...“Then how does David in the Spirit call Him ‘ <b>Lord</b> ,’ saying, <sup>44</sup> “ <b>The Lord</b> said to my <b>Lord</b> , “Sit at my right hand, until I put your enemies beneath your feet””? <sup>45</sup> If David then calls Him ‘ <b>Lord</b> ,’ how is He <b>his son</b> ?”	x			x	

Verse	Source	English	K	Sh	B	FS	O
Matthew 23:39	λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ με ἴδητε ἀπ’ ἄρτι ἕως ἂν εἴπητε ‘Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος <b>ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου.</b> ”	For I tell you, you will not see me again, until you say, ‘Blessed is he who comes <b>in the name of the Lord.</b> ”	x		x		
Matthew 28:19	πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς <b>εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ</b> καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος,	Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them <b>in the name of the Father and the Son</b> and the Holy Spirit,		x		x	
Mark 1:3	Ετοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν <b>Κυρίου</b>	“Prepare the way of <b>the Lord</b> ”	x				
Mark 9:7	Καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης “Οὗτός ἐστιν <b>ὁ Υἱός μου</b> ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.”	Then a cloud formed, overshadowing them, and a voice came out of the cloud, “This is <b>My beloved Son</b> , listen to Him!”				x	
Mark 11:9	<b>“Ὡσαννά.”</b> “Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος <b>ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου.</b> ”	<b>“Hosanna!”</b> “Blessed is he who comes <b>in the name of the Lord!</b> ”	x		x		x
Mark 12:29	Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς “Ὅτι Πρώτη ἐστὶν Ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ, <b>Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Κύριος εἷς ἐστιν,</b>	Hear, O Israel: <b>The Lord our God, the Lord is one.</b>	x	x			x
Mark 12:36-37	<sup>36</sup> Εἶπεν ( <b>ὁ</b> ) <b>Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ</b> μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου? <sup>37</sup> Αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν <b>Κύριον</b> , καὶ πόθεν <b>αὐτοῦ</b> ἐστὶν <b>υἱός?</b>	<sup>36</sup> “ <b>The Lord</b> said to my <b>Lord</b> , “Sit at my right hand, until I put your enemies beneath your feet””? <sup>37</sup> David himself calls Him <b>‘Lord’</b> ; so how is He <b>his son?</b> ”	x			x	
Mark 13:32	Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ <b>ὁ Υἱός</b> , εἰ μὴ <b>ὁ Πατήρ.</b>	But of that day or hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor <b>the Son</b> , but <b>the Father</b> alone.				x	
Mark 15:39	Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν, εἶπεν “Ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος <b>Υἱὸς Θεοῦ</b> ἦν.”	When the centurion, who was standing right in front of Him, saw the way He breathed His last, he said, “Truly this man was <b>God’s Son!</b> ”				x	
Luke 1:28	<b>ὁ Κύριος</b> μετὰ σοῦ	“ <b>The Lord</b> is with you”	x				

Verse	Source	English	K	Sh	B	FS	O
Luke 1:32, 35	<sup>32</sup> οὗτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ <b>Υἱὸς Υψίστου</b> κληθήσεται, καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ <b>Κύριος</b> ὁ Θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ... <sup>35</sup> Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ “Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις Υψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται <b>Υἱὸς Θεοῦ</b> .”	<sup>32</sup> He will be great and will be called <b>Son of the Most High</b> . And <b>the Lord</b> God will give to him the throne of his father David... <sup>35</sup> And the angel answered her, “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy—the <b>Son of God</b> .”	x			x	
Luke 3:4	Ετοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν <b>Κυρίου</b>	“Prepare the way of <b>the Lord</b> ”	x				
Luke 13:35	“οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἕως ἣξει ὅτε εἶπητε ‘Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος <b>ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου</b> .”	“you will not see me until you say, ‘Blessed is he who comes <b>in the name of the Lord!</b> ’”	x		x		
Luke 15:23	“καὶ <b>φέρετε τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν, θύσατε, καὶ φαγόντες εὐφρανθῶμεν</b> ”	“And <b>bring the fattened calf and kill it, and let’s eat and celebrate!</b> ”					x
Luke 19:38	“Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ Βασιλεὺς <b>ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου</b> .” “Ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις.”	“Blessed is the King who comes <b>in the name of the Lord!</b> Peace in heaven and glory in the highest!”	x		x		
Luke 20:13	Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ <b>κύριος</b> τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος ‘Τί ποιήσω; πέμψω <b>τὸν υἱόν μου</b> τὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἴσως τοῦτον ἐντραπήσονται.’	Then <b>the lord</b> of the vineyard said, ‘What shall I do? I will send <b>my beloved son</b> ; perhaps they will respect him.’	x			x	
Luke 20:36	οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται, ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσιν, καὶ <b>υἱοὶ</b> εἰσιν <b>Θεοῦ</b> τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες.	for they cannot even die anymore, because they are like angels, and are <b>sons of God</b> , being sons of the resurrection.				x	
Luke 20:42-44	<sup>42</sup> Εἶπεν (ὁ) <b>Κύριος</b> τῷ <b>Κυρίῳ</b> μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου <sup>43</sup> ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου. <sup>44</sup> Δαυὶδ οὖν αὐτὸν <b>Κύριον</b> καλεῖ, καὶ πῶς <b>αὐτοῦ υἱὸς</b> ἐστίν;	<sup>42</sup> “ <b>The Lord</b> said to my <b>Lord</b> , “Sit at my right hand, <sup>43</sup> until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet.” <sup>44</sup> David thus calls him <b>Lord</b> , so how is he <b>his son?</b> ”	x			x	
John 1:12	ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν <b>τέκνα Θεοῦ</b> γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,	But to all who did receive him, who believed in his name, he gave the right to become <b>children of God</b> ,				x	
John 1:23	Εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν <b>κυρίου</b>	“Make straight the way of <b>the Lord</b> ”	x				

Verse	Source	English	K	Sh	B	FS	O
John 3:16	Οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν Υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχη ζωὴν αἰώνιον.	“For God so loved the world, that he gave <b>his only Son</b> , that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life.”				x	
John 5:18	Διὰ τοῦτο οὖν μάλλον ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἔλυεν τὸ σάββατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγεν τὸν Θεόν, ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ Θεῷ.	This was why the Jews were seeking all the more to kill him, because not only was he breaking the Sabbath, but he was even calling God <b>his own Father</b> , making himself equal with God.				x	
John 12:13	“Ὡσαννά,” “Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου,” “Καὶ ὁ Βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.”	“ <b>Hosanna!</b> Blessed is he who comes <b>in the name of the Lord</b> , even the King of Israel!”	x		x		
John 20:31	ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύητε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.	but these are written so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, <b>the Son of God</b> , and that by believing you may have life in his name.				x	
Acts 2:21	καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἐὰν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου σωθήσεται.’	And it shall be that everyone who calls <b>upon the name of the Lord</b> will be saved.’	x		x		
Acts 2:34, 36	<sup>34</sup> Εἶπεν (ὁ) Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ μου... <sup>36</sup> Ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ὅτι καὶ Κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ Χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεός, τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε.	<sup>34</sup> “ <b>The Lord</b> said to my <b>Lord</b> ...” <sup>36</sup> Therefore let all the house of Israel know for certain that God has made Him both <b>Lord</b> and Christ—this Jesus whom you crucified.”	x				
Acts 7:59	Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου	“ <b>Lord</b> Jesus, receive my spirit”	x				
Acts 9:28	Καὶ ἦν μετ’ αὐτῶν εἰσπορευόμενος καὶ ἐκπορευόμενος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, παρρησιαζόμενος ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου,	And he was with them, moving about freely in Jerusalem, speaking out boldly <b>in the name of the Lord</b> .	x		x		
Acts 13:33	Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.	You are <b>my Son</b> , today I have <b>begotten</b> you.				x	
Romans 1:4	τοῦ ὀρισθέντος Υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν,	and was declared to be <b>the Son of God</b> in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord,				x	

Verse	Source	English	K	Sh	B	FS	O
Romans 8:14, 19, 21, 29	<sup>14</sup> ὅσοι γὰρ Πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι <b>υἱοὶ</b> εἰσιν <b>Θεοῦ</b> ... <sup>19</sup> ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν <b>τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ</b> ἀπεκδέχεται... <sup>21</sup> (δι)ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης <b>τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ</b> ... <sup>29</sup> ὅτι οὐς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνης <b>τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ</b> , εἰς τὸ εἶναι <b>αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς</b> .	<sup>14</sup> For all who are led by the Spirit of God are <b>sons of God</b> ... <sup>19</sup> For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of <b>the sons of God</b> ... <sup>21</sup> that the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to corruption and obtain the freedom of the glory of <b>the children of God</b> ... <sup>29</sup> For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of <b>his Son</b> , in order that he might be <b>the firstborn among many brothers</b> .				x	
Romans 9:8	τοῦτ' ἔστιν, οὐ <b>τὰ τέκνα</b> τῆς σαρκὸς ταῦτα <b>τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ</b> , ἀλλὰ <b>τὰ τέκνα</b> τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα.	That is, it is not <b>the children</b> of the flesh who are <b>children of God</b> , but <b>the children</b> of the promise are regarded as descendants.				x	
Romans 10:9, 11-13, 16	<sup>9</sup> ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματί σου <b>“Κύριον Ἰησοῦν,”</b> καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ... <sup>11</sup> Λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή <b>“Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυθηθήσεται.”</b> <sup>12</sup> οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν διαστολὴ Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἑλλήνου· ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς <b>Κύριος</b> πάντων, πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν. <sup>13</sup> <b>“Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου</b> σωθήσεται.”... <sup>16</sup> Ἀλλ’ οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει <b>“Κύριε,</b> τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν”	<sup>9</sup> because, if you confess with your lips that Jesus is <b>Lord</b> and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved... <sup>11</sup> The scripture says, “No one who believes in him will be put to shame.” <sup>12</sup> For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; the same <b>Lord</b> is [Lord] of all and bestows his riches upon all who call upon him. <sup>13</sup> For, “every one who calls <b>upon the name of the Lord</b> will be saved.”... <sup>16</sup> But they have not all obeyed the gospel; for Isaiah says, “ <b>Lord,</b> who has believed what he has heard from us?”	x		x		

Verse	Source	English	K	Sh	B	FS	O
1 Corinthians 8:4, 6	<sup>4</sup> ...ούδεις Θεός εἰ μὴ εἷς... <sup>6</sup> ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς Θεός ὁ Πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ.	<sup>4</sup> ...there is no God but one... <sup>6</sup> yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist.	x	x		x	x
1 Corinthians 10:21-22, 26	<sup>21</sup> οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον Κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων· οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης Κυρίου μετέχειν καὶ τραπέζης δαιμονίων. <sup>22</sup> ἢ παραζηλοῦμεν τὸν Κύριον; μὴ ἰσχυρότεροι αὐτοῦ ἐσμεν... <sup>26</sup> “Τοῦ Κυρίου” γὰρ “Ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς.”	<sup>21</sup> You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons. You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons. <sup>22</sup> Shall we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?... <sup>26</sup> For “the earth is the Lord’s, and everything in it.”	x				
2 Corinthians 3:16-18	<sup>16</sup> ἡνίκα δὲ ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς Κύριον, περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα. <sup>17</sup> Ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστιν· οὗ δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα Κυρίου, ἐλευθερία. <sup>18</sup> ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος.	<sup>16</sup> but when a man turns to the Lord the veil is removed. <sup>17</sup> Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom. <sup>18</sup> And we all, with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit.	x				
2 Corinthians 6:18	Καὶ “Ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας, λέγει Κύριος Παντοκράτωρ.”	and “I will be a father to you, and you shall be sons and daughters to me, says the Lord Almighty.”	x			x	
Galatians 4:4-7	<sup>4</sup> Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, <sup>5</sup> ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν. <sup>6</sup> Ὅτι δὲ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν, κρᾶζον “Ἀββᾶ ὁ Πατήρ.” <sup>7</sup> ὥστε οὐκέτι εἶ δοῦλος ἀλλὰ υἱός· εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ Θεοῦ.	<sup>4</sup> But when the fullness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the Law, <sup>5</sup> to redeem those who were under the law, for us to receive adoption as sons. <sup>6</sup> And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!” <sup>7</sup> So you are no longer a slave but a son; and if a son, also an heir through God.				x	

Verse	Source	English	K	Sh	B	FS	O
Ephesians 1:3-5	<sup>3</sup> Εύλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ <b>Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου</b> ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ εὐλόγησας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ, <sup>4</sup> καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἀγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ <sup>5</sup> προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς <b>υἰοθεσίαν</b> διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ <b>εἰς αὐτόν</b> , κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ	<sup>3</sup> Blessed be the God and <b>Father of our Lord</b> Jesus Christ, who has blessed us in Christ with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places, <sup>4</sup> even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and blameless before him. In love <sup>5</sup> he predestined us for <b>adoption to himself as sons</b> through Jesus Christ, according to the purpose of his will	x			x	
Ephesians 3:14-15	<sup>14</sup> Τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς <b>τὸν Πατέρα</b> , <sup>15</sup> ἐξ οὗ <b>πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς</b> ὀνομάζεται,	<sup>14</sup> For this reason I bow my knees before <b>the Father</b> , <sup>15</sup> from whom <b>every family in heaven and on earth</b> is named,				x	
Ephesians 4:4-6	<sup>4</sup> Ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν Πνεῦμα, καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν μῇ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν· <sup>5</sup> εἷς <b>Κύριος</b> , μία πίστις, ἐν βάπτισμα· <sup>6</sup> <b>εἷς Θεὸς</b> καὶ <b>Πατὴρ</b> πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν.	<sup>4</sup> There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope that belongs to your call, <sup>5</sup> one <b>Lord</b> , one faith, one baptism, <sup>6</sup> <b>one God</b> and <b>Father</b> of us all, who is above all and through all and in all.	x	x		x	
Philippians 2:9-11	<sup>9</sup> Διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν, καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα, <sup>10</sup> ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψη ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, <sup>11</sup> καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὅτι <b>ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ</b> εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ <b>Πατρός</b> .	<sup>9</sup> Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name that is above every name, <sup>10</sup> that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, <sup>11</sup> and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is <b>Lord</b> , to the glory of God the <b>Father</b> .	x			x	
1 Timothy 2:5	<b>Εἷς γὰρ Θεός</b>	For <b>there is one God</b>		x			

Verse	Source	English	K	Sh	B	FS	O
Hebrews 1:2, 5, 8, 10	<sup>2</sup> ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν <b>Υἱῷ</b> , ὃν ἔθηκεν <b>κληρονόμον πάντων</b> , δι’ οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας... <sup>5</sup> Τίνι γὰρ εἶπεν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων “ <b>Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε</b> ”; Καὶ πάλιν “ <b>Εγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς Υἱόν</b> ”... <sup>8</sup> Πρὸς δὲ τὸν Υἱόν “Ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ Θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ ἡ ράβδος τῆς εὐθύτητος ράβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου/ αὐτοῦ.”... <sup>10</sup> Καὶ “Σὺ κατ’ ἀρχάς, <b>Κύριε</b> , τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας, καὶ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσὶν οἱ οὐρανοί.”	<sup>2</sup> but in these last days he has spoken to us by <b>his Son</b> , whom he appointed <b>heir of all things</b> , through whom also he created the world... <sup>5</sup> For to which of the angels did God ever say, “ <b>You are my Son, today I have begotten you</b> ”? Or again, “ <b>I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son</b> ”?... <sup>8</sup> But of <b>the Son</b> he says, “Your throne, O God, is forever and ever, the scepter of uprightness is the scepter of your kingdom...” <sup>10</sup> And, “Thou, <b>Lord</b> , didst found the earth in the beginning, and the heavens are the work of thy hands”	x			x	
Hebrews 12:7-8	<sup>7</sup> Εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε· ὡς <b>υἱοῖς</b> ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ Θεός· τίς γὰρ <b>υἱὸς</b> ὃν οὐ παιδεύει <b>πατήρ</b> ; <sup>8</sup> εἰ δὲ χωρὶς ἐστε παιδείας, ἧς μέτοχοι γεγόνασιν πάντες, ἄρα <b>νόθοι καὶ οὐχ υἱοὶ ἐστε</b> .	<sup>7</sup> It is for discipline that you have to endure. God is treating you as <b>sons</b> . For what <b>son</b> is there whom <b>his father</b> does not discipline? <sup>8</sup> If you are left without discipline, in which all have participated, then <b>you are illegitimate children and not sons</b> .				x	
James 2:19	εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός	God is one		x			
James 5:10,14	<sup>10</sup> Υπόδειγμα λάβετε, ἀδελφοί, τῆς κακοπαθίας καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας τοὺς προφήτας, οἱ ἐλάλησαν ἐν <b>τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίου</b> ... <sup>14</sup> ἀσθενεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν; προσκαλεσάσθω τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ προσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἀλείψαντες <αὐτὸν> ἐλαίῳ ἐν <b>τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου</b> .	<sup>10</sup> As an example of suffering and patience, brothers, take the prophets who spoke <b>in the name of the Lord</b> ... <sup>14</sup> Is anyone among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil <b>in the name of the Lord</b> .	x		x		
1 Peter 2:3	εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ <b>Κύριος</b> .	if indeed you have tasted that <b>the Lord</b> is good.	x				

Verse	Source	English	K	Sh	B	FS	O
1 Peter 3:12, 14-15	<sup>12</sup> “ὅτι ὀφθαλμοὶ <b>Κυρίου</b> ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ὦτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν, πρόσωπον δὲ <b>Κυρίου</b> ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακά.”... <sup>14</sup> ...“Τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε,” <sup>15</sup> Κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιασάτε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν...	<sup>12</sup> For the eyes of <b>the Lord</b> are on the righteous, and his ears are open to their prayer. But the face of <b>the Lord</b> is against those who do evil.”... <sup>14</sup> ...“Do not fear what they fear nor be in dread,” <sup>15</sup> but in your hearts reverence Christ as <b>Lord</b> ...	x				
Jude 4-5	<sup>4</sup> παρεισέδυσαν* γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον Δεσπότην καὶ <b>Κύριον</b> ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι. <sup>5</sup> Υπομνήσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδόμενος ὑμᾶς ἅπασι πάντα, ὅτι <b>Ἰησοῦς/Κύριος</b> λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν,	<sup>4</sup> For certain people have crept in unnoticed who long ago were designated for this condemnation, ungodly people, who pervert the grace of our God into sensuality and deny our only Master and <b>Lord</b> , Jesus Christ. <sup>5</sup> Now I want to remind you, although you once fully knew it, that <b>Jesus/the Lord</b> , who saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe.	x				
Revelation 17:14	τὸ Ἄρνιον νικήσει αὐτούς, ὅτι <b>Κύριος κυρίων</b> ἐστὶν καὶ Βασιλεὺς βασιλέων	the Lamb will conquer them, for he is <b>Lord of lords</b> and King of kings	x				
Revelation 19:16	καὶ ἔχει ἐπὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν μηρὸν αὐτοῦ ὄνομα γεγραμμένον ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΚΑΙ <b>ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΚΥΡΙΩΝ.</b>	And on his robe and on his thigh he has a name inscribed, King of kings and <b>Lord of lords.</b>	x				



