Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 1:2

Original text:

τῆ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ τῆ οὕση ἐν Κορίνθω, ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἀγίοις,...

HCSB rendering:

To God's church at Corinth, to those who are sanctified in Christ Jesus and called as saints,

Suggestion:

To God's church at Corinth, to those who <u>have been</u> sanctified in Christ <u>Jesus</u>, called as saints,

Rationale:

The translation "are sanctified" is ambiguous. It could be a present passive of repeated action (implying that God sanctifies them again and again), or it could be a stative passive (their current status: sanctified). The latter understanding fits Paul's use of a perfect tense ($\dot{\eta}\gamma \iota \omega \sigma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \iota \omega c)$ indicating the present state resulting from a past act, but the former is likely to be assumed by many readers. That is especially likely if they have been taught to distinguish *justification* as God's complete bestowal of righteousness the moment one comes to faith in Christ and *sanctification* as God's ongoing work of leading the Christian more and more to live a holy life, a process that is never complete in this life. It is a helpful distinction, but as we see here, Paul does not limit himself to using the word $\dot{\alpha}\gamma \iota \dot{\alpha}\zeta \omega$ in a manner consistent with that distinction.

HCSB's insertion of "and" before "called as saints" could give the impression that Paul is moving on to a quite different facet of his readers' blessedness when really Paul is expanding on the point he just made. The Corinthian Christians have the status "sanctified in Christ Jesus" by virtue of the gospel *call* to salvation in Christ that brought them to faith. We could paraphrase κλητοῖς ἀγίοις with the words "saints by a [divine] call," just as Paul's self-designation κλητὸς ἀπόστολος (verse 1) could be paraphrased, "an apostle by a [divine] call." (Cf. Barrett on 1:2.)

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 1:17

Original text:

οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλέν με Χριστὸς βαπτίζειν ἀλλὰ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, οὐκ ἐν σοφία λόγου, ἵνα μὴ κενωθῆ ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

HCSB rendering:

For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to evangelize—not with <u>clever words</u>, so that the cross of Christ will not be emptied of its effect.

Suggestion:

For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to evangelize—not with <u>words of human wisdom</u>, so that the cross of Christ will not be emptied of its effect.

Rationale:

Though HCSB has some support in the BDAG translation of this phrase as "cleverness in speaking" (s.v. σοφία 1a), there are disadvantages in translating σοφία λόγου as "clever words":

- 1) Paul is here launching a lengthy discussion that contrasts human wisdom with God's saving wisdom, the foolishness of Christ crucified, and so he highlights already in this verse the key term $\sigma o \phi i \alpha$. It seems desirable to make that evident in 1:17 with an English term that connects clearly to the ensuing discussion. HCSB makes no use of "clever" or "cleverness" in the rest of 1 Corinthians, but it uses "wise" and "wisdom" repeatedly in 1:18 4:21 ("wise" 8 times, "wisdom" 17 times).
- 2) The phrase "clever words" suggests mere wit, the kind of skill that produces puns, catchy slogans, and advertising jingles. To understand Paul as distancing himself specifically from such words would miss a large part of his meaning and suggest that the problem in the Corinthian church was simply a matter of stylistic preferences in the use of language. On the contrary, Paul wants the Corinthian Christians to see the great chasm between two worldviews and thus the danger of compromising and eventually destroying Christianity by applying alien standards of judgment instead of taking seriously the message of the cross and its implications.

Our committee wrestled with several possible suggestions for improvement. The proposed rendering above ("with words of human wisdom") includes the word "wisdom," it makes clear the nature of that "wisdom" in this phrase, and it indicates that it is a wisdom communicated through words ($\lambda \acute{o}\gamma o\nu$). This was the solution used in NIV84.

Another possibility would be to translate "with the sort of wisdom used in speeches." In this rendering, $\lambda \acute{o}\gamma ov$ would be understood to have a specific connotation and a non-trivial function. In the Greco-Roman world, rhetoric was a highly cultivated skill for self-advancement and for the persuasion of others. The

reference here could be similar to 2:1-5, where Paul distances himself from the kind of speaking that relies on conventional rhetorical persuasion.	

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 1:19

Original text:

γέγραπται γάρ· Άπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν, καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν ἀθετήσω.

HCSB rendering:

For it is written: I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and I will set aside the <u>understanding of the experts</u>.

Suggestion:

For it is written:
I will destroy the wisdom of the wise,
and I will set aside the <u>intelligence of the intelligent</u>.

Rationale:

The sense in the HCSB translation of this verse is fine, but the suggested change better mirrors the artistry in the source text. HCSB already preserves the pattern in the first half of the verse $(\sigma o \phi i \alpha v \dots \sigma o \phi \delta v)$ wisdom...wise), and with the suggested change it will preserve the pattern also in the second half $(\sigma v v v v v)$ intelligence...intelligent). The words "intelligence" and "intelligent" are among the glosses suggested for the corresponding Greek words in BDAG.

A further advantage from our point of view is that the elimination of "experts" from 1:19 will make it easier for us to suggest using "expert in the Jewish law" to translate a different noun in 1:20. We have written up our suggestions for 1:20 in a separate recommendation.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 1:20

Original text:

ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεύς; ποῦ συζητητής τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου; οὐχὶ ἐμώρανεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου;

HCSB rendering:

Where is the <u>philosopher?</u> Where is the <u>scholar</u>? Where is the debater of this age? Hasn't God made the world's wisdom foolish?

^a Or wise

Suggestion:

Where is the <u>wise man</u>? Where is the <u>expert in the Jewish law</u>? Where is the debater of this age? Hasn't God made the world's wisdom foolish?

Rationale:

There is debate as to the referent of $\sigma\sigma\phi\dot{\phi}\varsigma$. Does Paul start with the Greek wise man (a philosopher would be a prominent example), move on to the Jewish expert in the law, and finish up with a "debater" who could be Greek or Jewish? Or does he start with a broad term (the Jewish or Gentile wise man), and then narrow his view by looking first at the Jewish expert in the law and then at the Greek philosophical debater? Or is some other view worth entertaining, such as Hengel's view that all three terms reflect a Jewish perspective on wisdom, which the Corinthians would have recognized from the information Paul gave them about his past?

HCSB unnecessarily settles the debate about $\sigma o \phi \delta \zeta$ by translating it as "philosopher." If we are thinking of Paul's era, the word "philosopher" immediately brings to mind Greeks and their Roman successors but not the Jews. (Philo of Alexandria, an oddity among extant ancient Jewish writers, is an exception that proves the rule.)

If HCSB errs on the side of being over-specific by translating σοφός as "philosopher," it errs on the side of being too general by translating γραμματεύς as "scholar." Among ordinary Greeks, the word γραμματεύς brought to mind a person in a range of responsible positions requiring literacy (clerk/secretary/registrar/city administrator), but hardly a person noted for wisdom, scholarship, or religious insight. The only area we know of in which a γραμματεύς claimed to have those qualities was Judaism (and then also Christianity, which for a time had Christian teachers called γραμματεῖς as an outgrowth of the Jewish usage), and so almost certainly Paul is using the term here to refer to the Jewish γραμματεύς or expert in the law of Moses.

It is unfortunate that HCSB blurs the point. One could read this verse in HCSB and think that Paul is going after secular philosophers, secular scholars, and secular debaters as opposed to religious people in the Judeo-Christian tradition. But Paul's targets include even the Jewish experts possessing the most

intimate acquaintance with the Hebrew Scriptures who failed to take seriously the saving grace documented in those Scriptures and manifested now in the cross of Christ. When readers see that, they will be in a better position to use Paul's words also against any form of "wisdom" that has become embedded within Christian churches despite its incompatibility with the gospel.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 2:4,5

Original text:

(We print the text HCSB seems to follow; the variants don't change the thought much and don't affect our recommendation at all.)

καὶ ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις ἀλλ' ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως, ⁵ ἵνα ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν μὴ ἦ ἐν σοφία ἀνθρώπων ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ.

HCSB rendering:

My speech and my proclamation were not with persuasive words of wisdom but with <u>a powerful</u> <u>demonstration by the Spirit</u>, ⁵ so that your faith might not be based on men's wisdom but on God's power.

Suggestion:

My speech and my proclamation were not with persuasive words of wisdom but with <u>a demonstration of the Spirit and power</u>, ⁵ so that your faith might not be based on men's wisdom but on God's power.

Rationale:

The more literal translation we are suggesting seems to us more likely to be understood in a manner consistent with the Greek grammar and the context and Paul's manner of speaking elsewhere. In the phrase ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως Paul is using objective genitives to indicate what his preaching demonstrated: it demonstrated the Spirit and his (the Spirit's) power as the factors which brought about the miracle of conversion for the Corinthian Christians (cf. verse 5). (If anyone wants to change "of the Spirit and power" into "of the Spirit's power," we don't object; it's the same idea.) Any other miracles, whether by Paul or by the Corinthians after their conversion, are simply not in view here. The context has identified the *message* about Christ crucified as God's *power* (1:18,24) in spite of the fact that that message seems foolish, offensive, and weak to those who reject it (1:18,23,25). Such a message shows its power when it wins people over in spite of its perceived foolishness, offensiveness, and weakness. Since the power in the message itself has been emphasized in this general way in chapter 1, it is fitting for Paul to make that theology personal for the Corinthians in chapter 2 by recalling for them how he preached to them and what an impact his gospel had on them. Such an interpretation is perfectly viable in 2:4, and we would be ignoring the context if we were to see in this verse a reference to some other manifestation of power such as healing miracles. Worse yet, the implication would be that the real power on which the Corinthians' faith rests is in that other manifestation and not in the gospel itself, which thus would turn out to be a poor, weak thing after all, even in Paul's view.

Our interpretation is confirmed elsewhere in Paul's epistles. In 1 Thessalonians 1:5 Paul infers the election of the Thessalonian Christians from the fact that his preaching to them was "in power and in the Holy Spirit and in much conviction." Their conviction, i.e., their faith, was the evidence for the invisible power of the Holy Spirit in Paul's message and for God's choosing of these Thessalonians to be brought to faith in this way. And in Romans 1:16 Paul once again identifies the gospel as the power of God for

salvation. The saving power of the Spirit is in the message itself regardless of whether additional miracles are or are not done by the preacher or his converts.

By contrast, HCSB's rendering in 1 Corinthians 2:4, "with a powerful demonstration by the Spirit," seems to rest on the grammatically unlikely supposition that Paul here uses $\kappa\alpha$ to join a subjective genitive (of the Spirit = by the Spirit) and a genitive of quality/description (of power = powerful). The translation itself inevitably raises the question, "If Paul considers it important that the Spirit powerfully demonstrated something, what is it that the Spirit powerfully demonstrated?" Either we ignore context and go off on a tangent by saying, the Spirit powerfully demonstrated support for Paul's message by healing people through Paul, etc., or we say, The Spirit powerfully demonstrated his ability to convert people through Paul's message. But in saying that, we made ability the object of the verb demonstrated. Ability is a synonym for power. If the thought we need to arrive at in this context is that Paul is talking about a demonstration of the Spirit's converting power, and if the genitive $\delta v v \alpha \mu \epsilon \omega \zeta$ lends itself to such an understanding (objective genitive), why not put that idea directly into the translation instead of beating around the bush?

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 2:14

Original text:

Ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ, μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστίν, καὶ οὐ δύναται γνῶναι, ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται·

HCSB rendering:

But the <u>unbeliever</u> does not <u>welcome</u> what comes from God's Spirit, because it is foolishness to him; he is not able to understand it since it is evaluated printingly.

- ^a Or *unspiritual*; lit *natural*
- ^b Or *judged*, or *discerned*

Suggestion:

But the <u>unspiritual person</u> does not <u>accept</u> what comes from God's Spirit, because it is foolishness to him; he is not able to understand it since it is evaluated spiritually.

^a Or *judged*, or *discerned*

Rationale:

The word ψυχικός is hard to translate concisely with precision. The translation "unbeliever" is an inference that shifts the focus a little from the person's operating principle (mere ψυχή) to his status vis-à-vis God and his message. The contrast in context with πνευματικὸς (verse 15) suggests that "unspiritual" is a good enough approximation. We notice that HCSB handles ψυχικός this way at James 3:15. If there is a desire to offer "natural" in a footnote, it should not be labeled as a literal translation. We are dealing with ψυχικός (not φυσικός), and "natural" is no more literal than "unspiritual" is.

According to BDAG δέχομαι 3, the verb can mean "welcome" when it is used with a *personal* object. With cognitive content as the object, BDAG takes it to mean "to indicate approval or conviction by accepting, *be receptive of, be open to, approve, accept*" (meaning 5). Our concern in 2:14 is that the translation "welcome" could open the door to a distinction not intended by Paul between *welcome* and *accept*. We do not welcome the news of a friend's death, but we may nonetheless accept the veracity of the report if it comes from someone we respect and adjust our plans accordingly. A reader of HCSB might in a similar way interpret 2:14 to mean that an unbeliever is not eager for or delighted by a spiritual lesson from God's Word, but he does have the capacity to accept it on some level (albeit reluctantly in view of its perceived foolishness) and thus benefit from it. Paul by contrast means to say that an unspiritual person has no such natural capacity. Only when the Spirit illuminates him does he accept gospel teachings as true and benefit from them.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 3:6

Original text:

έγω έφύτευσα, Άπολλως έπότισεν, άλλα ό θεός ηὔξανεν-

HCSB rendering:

I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the growth.

Suggestion:

I planted, Apollos watered, but God was giving the growth.

Rationale:

After two aorist verbs Paul shifts to the imperfect ηὕξανεν. The change is easy to reflect ("was giving the growth"), and it is worth doing so. Paul is not portraying a simple chronological sequence (first I planted, then Apollos watered, *and then* God gave the growth). Instead we are to see that both when Paul ministered and when Apollos ministered, God was at work along with them, giving the growth; in fact, he was doing so *through* their ministries, as we can see from Paul's identification of himself and Apollos in the preceding verse as ministers "through whom you came to believe."

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 3:15

Original text:

εἴ τινος τὸ ἔργον κατακαήσεται, ζημιωθήσεται, αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός.

HCSB rendering:

If anyone's work is burned up, <u>it will be lost</u>, but <u>he</u> will be saved; yet it will be like an escape through fire.^a

^a Lit yet so as through fire

Suggestion:

If anyone's work is burned up, <u>he will lose out</u>, but <u>he himself</u> will be saved; yet it will be like an escape through fire.^a

^a Lit yet so as through fire

Rationale:

To the best of our knowledge, the verb ζημιόω is normally used in reference to human beings who incur losses or fines or other punishments, and so the understood subject of ζημιωθήσεται is "he," not "it." This is worth bringing out in translation because it makes the warning more incisive. A modern minister reading the HCSB here might shrug off the words "it will be lost" and think, "That doesn't affect me so long as I will be saved"; but the personal impact is evident if the translation says instead, "he will lose out." That understanding still leaves room for a meaningful use of αὐτὸς in the next clause: although he will lose something (the reward he could have had if he had conducted a proper ministry), "he himself" will nevertheless be saved. The pronoun is in emphatic first position in the clause and in the nominative case, so that it retains its force as an intensive pronoun; it is not weakened to a mere personal pronoun here (as in HCSB, "he").

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 3:16-17

Original text:

Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; 17 εἴ τις τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ θεός· ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἄγιός ἐστιν, οἴτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς.

HCSB rendering:

Don't <u>you yourselves</u> know that <u>you</u> are God's sanctuary and that the Spirit of God lives <u>in</u> you? ¹⁷ If anyone destroys God's sanctuary, God will destroy him; for God's sanctuary is holy, and that is what <u>you</u> are.

Suggestion:

Don't <u>you</u> know that <u>you yourselves</u> are God's sanctuary and that the Spirit of God lives <u>among</u> you? ¹⁷ If anyone destroys God's sanctuary, God will destroy him; for God's sanctuary is holy, and that is what <u>you yourselves</u> are.

Rationale:

HCSB inserts "yourselves" once to signal that Paul is speaking in the second person plural, but that one insertion will probably be insufficient, especially since it is not placed where it will do the most good. It is all too easy for readers of HCSB to understand these verses this way: "Don't you yourselves know that each of you is God's sanctuary and that the Spirit of God lives in each of you as an individual believer? ...God's sanctuary is holy, and that is what each of you is." That is likely to happen because many Christian parents and preachers stress what Paul teaches in 1 Corinthians 6:19, i.e., that each Christian's body is a temple of the Holy Spirit. We think the changes we are suggesting will help readers see that here in 3:16-17 Paul is speaking of a Christian congregation as a temple of God's Spirit.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 4:9

Original text:

δοκῶ γάρ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐσχάτους ἀπέδειξεν ὡς ἐπιθανατίους, ὅτι θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις.

HCSB rendering:

For I think God has displayed us, the apostles, in last place, like men condemned to die: We have become a spectacle to the <u>world and</u> to angels and to <u>men</u>.

Suggestion:

For I think God has displayed us, the apostles, in last place, like men condemned to die: We have become a spectacle to the <u>world</u>, <u>both</u> to angels and to <u>human beings</u>.

Rationale:

HCSB unnecessarily confronts the reader with an awkward choice. It seems that either Paul has a strange notion of a world without men as one of the spectators to the apostles' suffering, or he has carelessly repeated himself by adding "men" to a little list that already included them under "the world."

The Greek text signals a slightly different conception. Already on a formal level we do not have a series of three perfectly parallel items since only the first noun has the article. That noun has the more comprehensive sense, and the remaining nouns can easily be seen as unpacking and explaining the first one since the combination $\kappa\alpha$... $\kappa\alpha$... often has the sense "both...and...." The superior sense achieved in this way commends this interpretation, and it is easy to bring it out in English. The only additional change in our recommendation is that "human beings" is a better rendering than "men" in current usage since $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \sigma \omega c$ is not referring specifically to males here.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 4:13

Original text:

ώς περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐγενήθημεν, πάντων περίψημα ἕως ἄρτι.

HCSB rendering:

Even now, we are like the world's garbage, like the dirt everyone scrapes off their sandals.

Suggestion:

Even now, we are like the world's garbage, like everyone's trash.

Rationale:

A number of lexicographers and philologically astute commentators we consulted agree in recognizing that π ερικάθαρμα and π ερίψημα are close synonyms. Spicq says, "These two terms, which are quite vulgar and very close in meaning..., are used for the wash-water and scrapings from dirty dishes, which is thrown out after washing or purification, thus any kind of uncleanness or filth. Finally, they are terms of abuse and base insult when applied to humans" (*Theol. Lex. of the NT*, III, 93).

HCSB's very specific and vivid phrase, "the dirt everyone scrapes off their sandals," seems to derive from Thiselton's 2000 commentary, and Thiselton in turn was working with debatable inference and imagination rather than actual usage when he explained πάντων περίψημα as "probably the scrapings from everyone's shoes" (364-65).

The result is a striking distinction in meaning between the two phrases in HCSB where there is practically no distinction in Greek, and a recurring term of abuse in Greek gets replaced in HCSB with a phrase no one hears in current English. Calling a person $\pi\epsilon\rho i\psi\eta\mu\alpha$ back then was like calling a person "scum" or "trash" now: no one wonders about the details (does the speaker mean pond scum, scum on shower tiles...? paper trash, plastic trash...?). But the unusualness of the HCSB phrase triggers further flights of imagination (just what would a person find on the soles of his sandals after walking in the streets back then...?). It would be better to avoid distracting the reader with details that aren't communicated by the Greek text and probably didn't cross Paul's mind.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 5:3-4

Original text:

Έγὼ μὲν γάρ, [a]ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, ἤδη κέκρικα ὡς παρὼν τὸν οὕτως τοῦτο κατεργασάμενον ⁴ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῆ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ,

[a] ὡς ἀπὼν D¹ F G Y Byz b d sy; Lcf Ambst Pel

HCSB rendering:

For though I am absent in <u>body but present</u> in spirit, I have already decided about the <u>one</u> who has done this thing <u>as though I were present</u>. When you are assembled in the name of our Lord Jesus with my spirit and with the power of our Lord Jesus,

Suggestion:

For though I am absent in <u>body</u>, I am <u>present</u> in spirit, <u>and as one who is present</u> I have already decided about the <u>person</u> who has done this thing. ⁴ When you are assembled in the name of our Lord Jesus with my spirit and with the power of our Lord Jesus,

Rationale:

It makes sense to use "though" to bring out the implication of ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι in context, as HCSB does in the words, "For though I am absent in body." But as HCSB continues, "present in spirit" is also governed by "though I am," and here "though" does not make sense. Paul can hardly mean to say, "Though absent in body, though present in spirit, I have decided…" Accordingly we have turned the thought of $\pi\alpha\rho$ ων δὲ τῷ $\pi\nu$ εύματι into an independent clause so that it is no longer governed by "though I am." That in turn has led us to supply an "and" to lead into the rest of verse 3.

There HCSB's "as though I were present" emphasizes Paul's bodily absence, whereas Paul himself is emphasizing the reality of his Spirit-mediated connection with the Corinthians. While Paul is bodily in Ephesus, his spirit is in the omnipresent Spirit of God, and that provides the connection both when Paul decides what to do and when the Corinthians subsequently gather in the same Spirit to carry out the necessary church discipline. When we say, "I'll be with you in spirit," that often means only, "I'll be thinking about you." Paul means more than that; in verse 4 he says, "When you are assembled...with my spirit," which can hardly be reduced to "I'll be thinking about you." HCSB's "as though I were present" takes Paul's "but present in spirit" to mean "not really present," and so the reader can only wonder why Paul adds, "When you are assembled...with my spirit," i.e., why he makes so much of something that really isn't true.

An interesting body of ancient witnesses reads $\dot{\omega}_{\varsigma}$ $\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{\omega}_{v}$ earlier in the verse. That may be a secondary reading, but even so it would imply an understanding of $\dot{\omega}_{\varsigma}$ both here and in $\dot{\omega}_{\varsigma}$ $\pi\alpha\rho\dot{\omega}_{v}$ in the sense "as = in my capacity as." The understanding "as though" does not fit the first $\dot{\omega}_{\varsigma}$ in these witnesses; the sense of

 $\dot{\omega}$ ς ἀπὼν must be "as one absent," and so it is implausible to switch to the sense "as though" for the second $\dot{\omega}$ ς (to do that would require a different word, e.g., $\dot{\omega}$ σεί). Thus there is ancient support for our understanding of $\dot{\omega}$ ς παρὼν.

Finally, in view of these changes we recommend that "the <u>one</u> who has done this thing" be shifted to "the <u>person</u> who has done this thing" to avoid two occurrences of "one" in the same verse, referring to two different people.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 5:5

Original text:

παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ Σ ατανῷ εἰς ὅλεθρον τῆς σαρκός, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῆ ἐν τῆ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου.

HCSB rendering:

turn that one over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, so that his spirit may be saved <u>in</u> the Day of the Lord.

Suggestion:

turn that one over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, so that his spirit may be saved <u>on</u> the Day of the Lord.

Rationale:

English idiom requires "on" here.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 5:7

Original text:

έκκαθάρατε τὴν παλαιὰν ζύμην, ἵνα ἦτε νέον φύραμα, καθώς ἐστε ἄζυμοι. καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός·

HCSB rendering:

Clean out the old yeast so that you may be a new <u>batch</u>. You are <u>indeed unleavened</u>, for <u>Christ our Passover</u> has been sacrificed.

Suggestion:

Clean out the old yeast so that you may be a new <u>batch</u>, <u>since you</u> are <u>unleavened</u>. For Christ, <u>our Passover lamb</u>, has been sacrificed.

Rationale:

καθώς here is either causal, "since" (so BDAG καθώς 3), or comparative, "as, just as, even as"; it is not an affirmative or emphatic adverb ("indeed"). HCSB's punctuation distorts the structure of Paul's line of thought somewhat: $\kappa\alpha\theta$ ώς makes a closer connection between "Clean out the old yeast so that you may be a new batch" and "you are unleavened" than the connection made by $\kappa\alpha$ γὰρ. In fact, as Dieter Zeller points out, there is some doubt as to whether the clause introduced by $\kappa\alpha$ γὰρ explains just "you are unleavened" or the whole preceding sentence going back to the beginning of verse 7. The punctuation in our suggestion keeps both options open. More important, we have here a prime opportunity for readers to see a key point in Pauline theology: the imperative of sanctification (e.g., "Be holy," "live a holy life") has its foundation in the indicative of justification ("you are holy"). The appeal to "be what you are" is more transparent in the suggested translation, which in effect says be an unleavened batch since you are unleavened.

Most often in current English "Passover" refers to the festival. Some standard dictionaries list no other meaning. But here πάσχα obviously refers to the Passover lamb (BDAG πάσχα 2), and that is worth bringing out in translation.

The Greek has climactic word order, with the word $X\rho\iota\sigma\tau\delta\varsigma$ standing by itself at the end. In English it doesn't work so well to reproduce that word order, but perhaps the word "Christ" could at least be set off by commas.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 5:9-11

Original text:

 9 Έγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῆ ἐπιστολῆ μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι πόρνοις, 10 οὐ πάντως τοῖς πόρνοις τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἢ τοῖς πλεονέκταις καὶ ἄρπαξιν ἢ εἰδωλολάτραις, ἐπεὶ ἀφείλετε ἄρα ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελθεῖν. 11 νῦν δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος ἦ πόρνος ἢ πλεονέκτης ἢ είδωλολάτρης ἢ λοίδορος ἢ μέθυσος ἢ ἄρπαξ, τῷ τοιούτω μηδὲ συνεσθίειν.

HCSB rendering:

- ⁹ I wrote to you in a letter not to associate with sexually immoral people. ¹⁰ I did not mean the immoral people of this world or the greedy and swindlers or idolaters; otherwise you would have to leave the world. ¹¹ But now I am writing a you not to associate with anyone who claims to be a believer who is sexually immoral or greedy, an idolater or verbally abusive, a drunkard or a swindler. Do not even eat with such a person.

 - ^a Or <u>now I wrote</u> ^b <u>Lit</u> anyone named a brother

Suggestion:

- ⁹ I wrote to you in a letter not to associate with sexually immoral people. ¹⁰ I did not mean the immoral people of this world or the greedy and swindlers or idolaters; otherwise you would have to leave the world. ¹¹ But as it is I wrote^a you not to associate with anyone who claims to be a brother^b and is sexually immoral or greedy, an idolater or verbally abusive, a drunkard or a swindler. Do not even eat with such a person.
 - ^a Or <u>But now I am writing</u>
 - ^b Or anyone named a brother

Rationale:

The verb HCSB translates in verse 11 as "I am writing" is ἔγραψα, the same agrist form Paul used in verse 9 to refer to his writing of the previous letter. We cannot assume that Paul routinely uses the epistolary agrist in preference to a present tense when he refers to the writing of the present epistle. In 4:14 he uses the present tense (γράφω) to do that. We also cannot assume that his use of vũv in 5:11 marks ἔγραψα as an epistolary agrist. While νῦν can have a purely temporal sense, "now," it can also mark a return to real circumstances, whether present or not, after a consideration of a contrary-to-fact or hypothetical scenario (cf. BDAG vũv 2a, which is where 1 Cor. 5:11 is listed). Here we think the latter applies, and so we recommended putting the current HCSB translation into the footnote and printing "But as it is I wrote" in the text. The problem with the HCSB translation is that it implies a contrast between what Paul said in his earlier letter and what he is saying in the present epistle, but it is hard to see that kind of contrast in the sentence introduced by νῦν δὲ. The essential thought in verse 11 is the same as what Paul said or clearly enough implied in the previous letter according to his own explanation of it, and the new details in verse 11 are more easily viewed as further explicitation of the earlier message, a process Paul began in verse 10. The main contrast that emerges with regard to the previous letter is

between the faulty understanding Paul disavows in verse 10 and the proper understanding he lays out in verse 11.

Paul talks about someone who claims to be or is called an ἀδελφός. Our preference is to translate "brother" here, as the HCSB does in many other places. If for some reason that is felt to be an inadequate translation, we would point out that ἀδελφός calls attention to a horizontal connection among members of the church, not just a vertical relationship with God, and that it is worth bringing that out in a context that stresses responsibilities and influences of a horizontal nature. Instead of "believer" we would recommend "fellow believer."

Changing the second "who" in verse 11 to "and" eliminates a grammatical ambiguity in HCSB.

Finally, the second footnote gives an alternative translation and not just a literal translation. It understands the verb ὀνομαζόμενος as a passive, as opposed to the middle understanding in the HCSB text.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 6:4

Original text:

βιωτικά μεν οὖν κριτήρια ἐὰν ἔχητε, τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῆ ἐκκλησία, τούτους καθίζετε;

HCSB rendering:

So if you have cases pertaining to this life, do you <u>select those</u> who have no standing in the church <u>to judge</u>?

^a Or *life*, *appoint those* (as a command)

Suggestion:

So if you have cases pertaining to this life, do you <u>select^a as your judges those</u> who have no standing in the church?

^a Or *life*, *appoint* (as a command)

Rationale:

The phrase "to judge" is grammatically ambiguous in HCSB. A reader might wonder whether the basic thought here is *do you select them to judge* or *they have no standing to judge*. Our suggestion revises both the text and the footnote to eliminate that ambiguity in a manner consistent with the meaning of $\kappa\alpha\theta$ ($\xi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$).

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 6:9-10

Original text:

"Η οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἄδικοι θεοῦ βασιλείαν οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν; μὴ πλανᾶσθε· οὕτε πόρνοι οὕτε εἰδωλολάτραι οὕτε μοιχοὶ οὕτε μαλακοὶ οὕτε ἀρσενοκοῖται ¹⁰ οὕτε κλέπται οὕτε πλεονέκται, οὐ μέθυσοι, οὐ λοίδοροι, οὐχ ἄρπαγες βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν.

HCSB rendering:

Don't you know that the unrighteous will not inherit God's kingdom? Do not be deceived: No sexually immoral people, idolaters, adulterers, or <u>anyone practicing homosexuality</u>, ^{a 10} no thieves, greedy people, drunkards, verbally abusive people, or swindlers will inherit God's kingdom.

^a Lit adulterers, passive homosexual partners, active homosexual partners

Suggestion:

Don't you know that the unrighteous will not inherit God's kingdom? Do not be deceived: No sexually immoral people, idolaters, adulterers, or <u>males who have sex with males</u>, ¹⁰ no thieves, greedy people, drunkards, verbally abusive people, or swindlers will inherit God's kingdom.

^a Lit adulterers, passive male homosexual partners, active male homosexual partners

Rationale:

Differing cultural practices and terms and stylistic preferences conspire to make this part of Paul's list a translator's nightmare. We think we can understand why the HCSB translators may have decided on the rendering we find here. English doesn't have concise standard terms corresponding closely to the two Greek terms Paul uses, so the use of the phrase "anyone practicing homosexuality" can be seen as a way of covering both categories at once, and the result is a translation that lends itself to application against all sorts of homosexual practices. But there are two problems:

- 1) However well intentioned it may have been, the use of the word "anyone" in just this one place in the list will probably provoke some criticism along these lines: *Paul mentions these offenders without any special emphasis, but HCSB conveys a subtle implication that homosexuality is uniquely heinous by reserving the word "anyone" for this one phrase.* We are after all living in times of particular sensitivity about these matters.
- 2) HCSB aims to be accurate in preserving distinctions made in the original languages about males and females. That means there is more use of the words "men," "he," etc. than in translations that aim for a more gender neutral Bible. But here we have a term that unmistakably refers to *males* who take the active role in sex with *males*, ἀρσενοκοῖται, which in turn helps to establish the sense of the preceding term, μαλακοὶ, as males who take the passive role in homosexual practices. Consistency requires that those elements of meaning be reflected in translation. If the objection is raised that then lesbian practices are not criticized, the answer is that 1) Paul is not trying to produce an exhaustive list of vices and 2) translators

need to respect the choices he made as he illustrated the point that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God.

We suspect that "anyone practicing homosexuality" appears in the HCSB text instead of some version of the footnote explanation because a phrase specifying active and passive roles is likely to become unwieldy and may strike some readers and listeners as uncomfortably vivid. What would be better?

NIV 2011 translates οὕτε μαλακοὶ οὕτε ἀρσενοκοῖται with the words, "nor men who have sex with men." A point in favor of that translation is that one can hear in it an echo of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13, passages that probably sparked through their Greek form in the LXX the creation of the word ἀρσενοκοίτης (as noted by David Wright). In its use of "men," however, NIV is imprecise since some of the homosexuals Paul is talking about were boys. Accordingly we have replaced "men" with "males" in the translation we are recommending.

We notice that the HCSB uses the terms "males" and "females" in Romans 1:26-27, where Paul is also talking about homosexuality. Using "males" here would dovetail with the language in Romans 1.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 6:12-14

Original text:

Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν· ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα συμφέρει. πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπό τινος. ¹³ τὰ βρώματα τῆ κοιλία, καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῖς βρώμασιν· ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ ταύτην καὶ ταῦτα καταργήσει. τὸ δὲ σῶμα οὐ τῆ πορνεία ἀλλὰ τῷ κυρίω, καὶ ὁ κύριος τῷ σώματι·

HCSB rendering:

"Everything is permissible for me," but not everything is helpful. "Everything is permissible for me," but I will not be brought under the control of anything. ¹³ "Food for the stomach and the stomach for <u>food,"</u> but God will do away with both of <u>them. ^b The</u> body is not for sexual immorality but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. ¹⁴ God raised up the Lord and will also raise us up by His power.

^a The words in quotation marks are most likely slogans used by some Corinthian Christians and corrected by Paul.

^b Lit *both it and them*

Suggestion:

"Everything is permissible for me," but not everything is helpful. "Everything is permissible for me," but I will not be brought under the control of anything. ¹³ "Food for the stomach and the stomach for <u>food</u>, <u>and</u> God will do away with both of <u>them</u>." However, the body is not for sexual immorality but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. ¹⁴ God raised up the Lord and will also raise us up by His power.

^a The words in quotation marks are most likely slogans used by some Corinthian Christians and corrected by Paul.

^b Lit *both it and them*

Rationale:

While a very good case can be made for the use of quotation marks to indicate that Paul is first quoting and then correcting the thinking of some of the Corinthians, it would be better to include "God will do away with both of them" as part of the argument used by some of the Corinthians and to adjust the conjunctions accordingly. That results in a consistent, point-by-point correction by Paul:

Corinthian thinking	Pauline correction
"Everything is permissible for me,"	but not everything is helpful.
"Everything is permissible for me,"	but I will not be brought under the control of anything.
"Food for the stomach and the stomach for food, and God will do away with both of them."	However, the body is not for sexual immorality but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. God raised up the Lord and will also raise us up by His power.

Paul has no reason to assert that the resurrection body will have no stomach or that the resurrection body will have a stomach incapable of digestion. Paul may well be aware of a fact that his friend Luke reports, namely, that on Easter evening the risen Lord ate some broiled fish in the presence of his disciples in order to demonstrate the reality of his bodily resurrection (Lk 24:42,43).

It makes much better sense for the *Corinthians* to assert that God will do away with the stomach as part of their argument-by-analogy: Christians can satisfy the bodily appetite for food and it doesn't matter what food one eats, for God will show his lack of concern with these matters by ultimately doing away with the stomach, and therefore Christians can also satisfy the bodily appetite for sex and it doesn't matter what kind of sexual activity one engages in, for God will show his lack of concern with those matters too by ultimately doing away with sexuality or even with the body as a whole (cf. 1 Cor 15:12). If that is the way they argue, it makes excellent sense for Paul to assert the resurrection as a counter-argument (6:14) to *their* assertion, "God will do away with both of them."

As it stands in HCSB, Paul's argument seems undeveloped at best and self-contradictory at worst. If Paul is in part agreeing with the Corinthians by saying, "Yes, you are free to eat any food, and this can be based on the fact that God will do away with the digestive function of the stomach," it makes little sense for Paul to continue, "but no, you can't go to prostitutes, because God will raise up your bodies." The Corinthians could reply, "What's the difference, Paul? Surely you are not arguing for a continuation of the sexual function in eternal life? [Cf. Lk 20:34-36] If you say that a loss of digestive function in the world to come shows the indifference of types of food in the present world, must you not also say that the loss of sexual function in the world to come shows the indifference of types of sexual activity in the present world?" To avoid those conclusions, Paul would need to make some distinctions and explanations that he does not make.

All of the above problems go away when the passage is properly punctuated.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 6:15

Original text:

οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ ἐστιν; ἄρας οὖν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποιήσω πόρνης μέλη; μὴ γένοιτο.

HCSB rendering:

Don't you know that your bodies are a part of Christ's body? So should I <u>take</u> a part of Christ's body and make it part of a prostitute? Absolutely not!

Suggestion:

Don't you know that your bodies are a part of Christ's body? So should I <u>remove</u> a part of Christ's body and make it part of a prostitute? Absolutely not!

Rationale:

English has a virtually empty use of "take" that merely focuses attention on the object: "You can take your fancy education and jump in a lake!" That is probably how readers will understand "take" in this verse in HCSB since Paul is talking about his own body, not an external object that he could take to himself. Greek has a somewhat similar, watered-down use of $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} v \omega$, but to the best of our knowledge $\alpha \ddot{\imath} \rho \omega$ is not used that way. One of the established meanings of $\alpha \ddot{\imath} \rho \omega$ is "remove," and that fits this context well. Paul is not simply hoping his readers will see the use of prostitutes as unworthy of Christ's people and shocking; he is declaring union with Christ and union with a prostitute mutually exclusive (cf. 6:9).

Others, such as Meyer and Schrage, give $\alpha i p \omega$ a slightly different nuance here, i.e., to take unlawfully what belongs to another, to misappropriate. One could convey that sense adequately by saying, "So should I take charge of a part of Christ's body...?" That would be more meaningful than the simple "take" used by HCSB, but we would not find it as easy to demonstrate the meaning "misappropriate" or "take charge of" from Greek usage, and so we suggest "remove."

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 7:6

Original text:

⁶ τοῦτο δὲ λέγω κατὰ συγγνώμην, οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγήν.

HCSB rendering:

⁶ I say the following^a as a concession, not as a command.

^a Lit say this; some interpret the word as referring to v. 2, vv. 2-5, v. 5 (wholly or in part), or v. 6

Suggestion:

⁶ I say <u>this</u> as a concession, not as a command. [no footnote]

Rationale:

In this passage the literal translation "this" is decidedly better than the interpretive rendering "the following," and the change to "this" eliminates the need for the footnote.

While τοῦτο can point ahead ("the following"), it very often points back. The literal "this" covers both possibilities.

Most of the commentators we have consulted understand τοῦτο here as referring to the preceding material, though with deep disagreement as to which of the preceding thoughts is being referred to. Some (e.g., Barrett) do not even bring up the possibility that τοῦτο here points ahead, and some who do mention that interpretation rightly reject it (e.g., Fee, Fitzmyer, Schrage, Zeller). As Fitzmyer points out, the linguistic features that would indicate a forward-looking τοῦτο are lacking here. If we examine the content, nothing in verses 7, 8, or 9 simultaneously meets the qualifications of a) actually conceding something and b) sounding like it could be a command without being intended as such. As to the latter point, verse 7a in Greek might, if ripped out of context, be taken as a command, but no one who has read verses 2-5 and goes on to read the rest of verse 7 could understand it that way. In any case, HCSB has chosen to word verse 7a as a contrary-to-fact wish, and it would be hard for an unprejudiced reader to see either a command or an actual concession in that contrary-to-fact wish.

Paul's readers in Greek needed to do some thinking to determine what τοῦτο refers to, and it is no bad thing if Paul's readers in English see "this" and have to do some similar thinking.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 7:9

Original text:

εί δὲ οὐκ ἐγκρατεύονται, γαμησάτωσαν, κρεῖττον γάρ ἐστιν γαμῆσαι ἢ πυροῦσθαι.

HCSB rendering:

But if they do not have self-control, they should marry, for it is better to marry than to burn with desire.

Suggestion:

But if they <u>are not exercising</u> self-control, they should marry, for it is better to marry than to burn with desire.

Rationale:

A person might claim to have the ability to control himself even if he repeatedly fails to control himself. But judging by Paul's language, his implied pastoral question is not, "Do you have self-control in a hypothetical sense, an ability you could make use of in the future?" but rather, "Are you in fact exercising self-control?" The definition of ἐγκρατεύομαι in BDAG is not "to have self-control" or "to be able to control oneself" but "to keep one's emotions, impulses, or desires under control, *control oneself*, *abstain*."

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 7:14

Original text:

ήγίασται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἡγίασται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ $^{[a]}$ ἀδελφῷ· ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστιν, νῦν δὲ ἄγιά ἐστιν.

HCSB rendering:

For the unbelieving husband <u>is set apart for God by</u> the wife, and the unbelieving wife <u>is set apart for God by</u> the husband. Otherwise your children would be <u>corrupt</u>, but <u>now</u> they are <u>set apart for God</u>.

^a Lit the brother

Suggestion:

For the unbelieving husband <u>has been rendered holy for</u> the wife, and the unbelieving wife <u>has been rendered holy for</u> the husband.^a Otherwise your children would be <u>unclean</u>, but <u>as it is</u> they are <u>holy</u>.

^a Lit *the brother*

Rationale:

In context the point about the unbelieving spouse is not his or her present relationship with God ("is set apart for God") but rather his or her suitability as a marital partner for the Christian ("has been rendered holy for the wife/husband"). A Christian need not divorce an unbelieving spouse out of fear of being defiled; as Paul says in Titus 1:15, "to the pure all things are pure." By the same token, the literal translation of ἀκάθαρτα as "unclean" with its implication of a potential for defiling others fits the context, whereas "corrupt" misses the point, whether we think of moral corruption or physical corruption. One of the most powerful indicators we have for determining the meaning of a word in a particular context is the use of the word in contrast to some other word. Here ἀκάθαρτα and ἅγια are contrasted. That tells us what kind of holiness is in view: what is unclean defiles, but what is here called holy does not. That in turn confirms for us what the related word ἡγίασται is talking about: not a relationship with God, but a status relevant to the believing spouse. To bring that out clearly we are suggesting "for" as the translation of ev. Sometimes $\dot{\epsilon}v + dative$ is equivalent to a bare dative. Alternatively, one could argue that here $\dot{\epsilon}v$ means "in the case of," and one could see that as covering both "by" (agent) and "for" (reference), but unfortunately "has been rendered holy in the case of" is obscure, unidiomatic English. The only other change to account for is our preference for "but as it is" to bring out the sense of νῦν δέ, which here signals a switch from a hypothetical case ("unclean") to a real one ("holy"), not a switch from past to present ("but now").

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 7:24

Original text:

ἔκαστος ἐν ὧ ἐκλήθη, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τούτω μενέτω παρὰ θεῶ.

HCSB rendering:

Brothers, each person should remain with God in whatever situation he was called.

Suggestion:

Brothers, each person should remain with God in the situation in which he was called.

Rationale:

The insertion of "whatever" in HCSB perhaps disguises for some readers a grammatical problem: a key part of Paul's thought is not being expressed. In HCSB, the sense seems to be equivalent to the following rearrangement: "Brothers, in whatever situation each person was called, he should remain with God. That sounds like saying, No matter what the person's situation was when he became a Christian, the important thing is that the Christian should remain with God (even if the Christian changes his situation). But Paul doesn't just want the Christian to remain with God; he wants him or her to remain with God in the situation in which he or she was called. The Christian was called by the gospel to salvation in Christ and membership in the community of the saved, and that call to salvation spills over onto the state in which the person was already situated, as far as major identity markers are concerned (i.e., Jew or Gentile, slave or free, married or single; Paul does not say that one's situation includes his place of residence, occupation, educational status, style of apparel, etc.). The gospel saves us where we are and empowers us to serve God where we are; there is no need to change one's identity in ethnic or social terms so as to become a true child of God. It would give a false impression of the gospel if a new convert acted as though salvation were contingent upon his or her changing any of these major identity markers, and that is why Paul lays down the command in this verse as a rule of thumb. Granted, it is a rule that admits of purposeful exceptions, as when Paul circumcises Timothy, or an unmarried Christian decides to get married (1 Cor 7:28). But the exceptions do not overturn the usefulness of the rule in most circumstances: Stay in the situation you were in when you were called to salvation.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 7:36

Original text:

Εί δέ τις ἀσχημονεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον αὐτοῦ νομίζει ἐὰν ἦ ὑπέρακμος, καὶ οὕτως ὀφείλει γίνεσθαι, ὁ θέλει ποιείτω· οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει· γαμείτωσαν.

HCSB rendering:

But if any man thinks he is acting improperly toward his virgin, a if she is past marriageable age, and so it must be, he can do what he wants. He is not sinning; they can get married.

^a = a man's fiancée, or his daughter, or his Levirate wife, or a celibate companion

Suggestion:

But if any man thinks he is acting improperly toward his virgin, if she is past her prime and so it ought to be done, he should do what he wants. He is not sinning; they should get married.

^a = a man's fiancée, or his daughter, or his Levirate wife, or a celibate companion

Rationale:

HCSB is not bad here, but in a section teeming with difficulties under the best of circumstances, even small improvements are desirable.

HCSB unnecessarily gives an odd impression when it portrays Paul as recommending marriage for a woman who is "past marriageable age." "Past her prime" avoids the appearance of inconsistency.

When Paul says ὀφείλει γίνεσθαι, he is pointing to a need for a change in the situation. HCSB's "and so it must be" can be understood that way, but it could also be read as indicating the inevitability of some feature of the status quo, or perhaps the certainty of a logical inference (it must be so—nothing else makes sense). It seems to us that "it ought to be done" more clearly indicates that under the hypothetical circumstances, propriety requires that something be done to change the status quo, i.e., it requires marriage.

Since ὀφείλει points to the obligations of (moral or social) propriety and Paul considers those obligations relevant here, the permissive understanding of Paul's imperatives ("can") seems a bit weak. While we do not think of "should" as our favorite option for translating an imperative, here it seems to fit better than other possibilities.

^bOr virgin, if his passions are strong,

^bOr virgin, if his passions are strong,

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 8:3

Original text:

εί δέ τις άγαπᾶ τὸν θεόν, οὖτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

HCSB rendering:

But if anyone loves God, he is known by Him.

Suggestion:

But if anyone loves God, he has been known by Him.

Rationale:

HCSB can be understood correctly, but a clearer translation of the perfect tense of the verb ἔγνωσται seems desirable here. Barrett translates, "but if anyone loves God, he has been known by God," and he comments *ad loc*.: "The sentence does not mean (for this would be contrary to Paul's clearly expressed thought elsewhere), If a man loves God, God rewards him by recognizing him. The sense rather is, If a man loves God, *this is a sign that* God *has taken the initiative*." Fitzmyer spells out the nature of that divine initiative: A Christian's love "springs from the fact that such a lover has already been known by no one other than God. Implied is the love that God has for such a known one and the way that it has been manifested by divine election." Occasionally in biblical Greek γινώσκω has strong overtones of election (cf. LXX Amos 3:2), and this is such a passage.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 8:7

Original text:

Αλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνῶσις· τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνηθείᾳ ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενὴς οὖσα μολύνεται.

HCSB rendering:

However, not everyone has this knowledge. In fact, some have been so used to idolatry up until now that when they eat <u>food offered to an idol</u>, their conscience, being weak, is defiled.

Suggestion:

However, not everyone has this knowledge. In fact, some have been so used to idolatry up until now that when they eat <u>the food</u>, they eat it as something offered to an idol, and their conscience, being weak, is defiled.

Rationale:

Paul takes care to indicate the *thought process* that results in a defiled conscience when a weak Christian eats εἰδωλόθυτον. The weak Christian eats the food "as" (ώς) something offered to an idol, i.e., thinks of what he is eating as being improper for him for that reason. The point is worth bringing out in translation.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 9:16-18

Original text:

¹⁶ ἐὰν γὰρ εὐαγγελίζωμαι, οὐκ ἔστιν μοι καύχημα, ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι ἐπίκειται· οὐαὶ γάρ μοί ἐστιν ἐὰν μὴ εὐαγγελίσωμαι. ¹⁷ εἰ γὰρ ἑκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω, μισθὸν ἔχω· εἰ δὲ ἄκων, οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι. ¹⁸ τίς οὖν μού ἐστιν ὁ μισθός; ἵνα εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀδάπανον θήσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, εἰς τὸ μὴ καταχρήσασθαι τῆ ἐξουσία μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.

HCSB rendering:

¹⁶ For if I preach the gospel, I have no reason to boast, because an obligation is placed on me. And woe to me if I do not preach the gospel! ¹⁷ For if I do this <u>willingly</u>, I have a reward, but if <u>unwillingly</u>, I am entrusted with a <u>stewardship</u>. ¹⁸ What then is my reward? To <u>preach</u> the gospel <u>and offer it</u> free of charge <u>and not make full use of my authority in</u> the gospel.

Suggestion:

¹⁶ For if I preach the gospel, I have no reason to boast, because an obligation is placed on me. And woe to me if I do not preach the gospel! ¹⁷ For if I do this as a <u>volunteer</u>, I have a reward, but if <u>not</u>, I am entrusted with a <u>responsibility</u>. ^a ¹⁸ What then is my reward? To <u>present</u> the gospel free of charge <u>when I</u> preach it instead of making use of the right I have when I preach the gospel.

^a Lit with management; cp. 1Co 4:1 "managers of God's mysteries"

Rationale:

The point of $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\dot{\omega}v$ / $\ddot{\alpha}\kappa\omega v$ here is not Paul's present willingness or unwillingness. That he is currently willing to preach the gospel is beyond question and doesn't need to be articulated. If he were describing himself as willing and for that reason entitled to a reward, the following words $\dot{\epsilon}i$ δ $\dot{\epsilon}$ $\ddot{\alpha}\kappa\omega v$, οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι would be a pointless digression, and his earlier assertion that there is no boast for him simply in preaching the gospel would become baffling. (It would be like saying that merely preaching the gospel brings him no reward or boast, but if he adds willingness to preaching, now he has a reward and a boast—and that quite apart from preaching the gospel free of charge, the very thing he is intent on discussing here.) In actuality Paul is using $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\dot{\omega}v$ in a sense found already in Homer (*Iliad* 3.66) to describe a person making a choice on his own initiative—hence our translation "as a volunteer." This understanding enables us to see that $\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\dot{\omega}v$ here does *not* describe Paul's actual situation; rather, the fact that he was entrusted with a ministry without volunteering ($\ddot{\alpha}\kappa\omega v$) accounts for his sense that literal pay (a material "reward" in the form of compensation from the congregants he is serving) is inappropriate in his case, and thus he is happy with his paradoxical "pay" of receiving no literal pay but having the boast of preaching the gospel free of charge.

It seems to us "a stewardship" is not a very idiomatic or communicative translation for οἰκονομίαν. If readers are not completely puzzled by "a stewardship," they may understand it as a general Christian duty to handle one's resources in a God-pleasing manner, not as Paul's assigned task of being a "manager of God's mysteries" (4:1). We think "a responsibility" is a clearer translation. It conveys two ideas connected

with an ancient οἰκονόμος: he has work to do, and he is accountable for doing it. If necessary, that translation can be supplemented with the sort of footnote we have provided.

When Paul asks $\tau i \zeta$ oỗ ν μού ἐστιν ὁ μισθός; (verse 18), he answers with a twofold expression that presents the same answer twice, once positively (to present the gospel free of charge when preaching it) and once negatively (not to make use of his right to receive pay for gospel ministry). The way HCSB paraphrases Paul, it seems there is an additional reward, i.e., the very fact that Paul preaches the gospel. No doubt Paul derived satisfaction from preaching the gospel regardless of the circumstances, but he doesn't actually make that point here. He wants to focus attention on why he doesn't take conventional compensation. He wants the Corinthians both to understand why he operates as he does and to see in him an example of not insisting on using one's rights. Our revision keeps the focus where Paul wants it.

We recommend changing HCSB's "make full use of" to "making use of." BDAG says that while Greeks usually make a distinction between καταχράομαι and χράομαι, in the two NT occurrences of the compound verb it is used with little or no distinction from the simple verb. Saying that Paul does not "make *full* use" of his right to receive pay would only obscure Paul's point. He is not seeking half-pay from the Corinthians. He doesn't want any material compensation from them at all.

HCSB has Paul not making full use of "my authority (ἐξουσία) in the gospel." That phrase in English sounds like a reference to Paul's apostolic authority to define what the gospel message is, but that is not the point here. The point has to do with receiving pay, and therefore "right" is a more natural word than "authority"—a worker demanding his pay would say he has a *right* to the pay he has earned, not the *authority* to claim his pay. The word "right" also provides a link to 8:9, where HCSB translates, "But be careful that this *right* (ἐξουσία) of yours…" Paul wants his readers to see that having a right doesn't necessarily mean using it; this is one of the ways they are to imitate him (11:1). The literal translation "in the gospel" is also likely to obscure Paul's point. He is not saying that the saving gospel contains within itself a right to receive material compensation (if it did, every believer would have "in the gospel" a right to receive pay). Paul is not even saying that the "gospel" in a broader sense (= the whole NT message) includes Jesus' authorization that the worker is worthy of his compensation. Rather, Paul is using εὐαγγελίφ here as a *nomen actionis* equivalent to "the preaching of the gospel" (cf. Php 4:15). A minister who has been entrusted with the gospel to preach but fails to preach it has no right to receive pay; the right of which Paul is speaking is contingent upon actually preaching the gospel. Our revision attempts to bring that out with a paraphrase.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 9:22

Original text:

έγενόμην τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν ἀσθενής, ἵνα τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς κερδήσω· τοῖς πᾶσιν γέγονα πάντα, ἵνα πάντως τινὰς σώσω.

HCSB rendering:

To the weak I became weak, in order to win the weak. I have become all things to all people, so that I may by every possible means save some.

Suggestion:

To the weak I became weak, in order to win the weak. I have become all things to all people, so that I may <u>in every way</u> save <u>some</u>.^a

^a Or may save at least some.

Rationale:

HCSB has three weaknesses here. One is that it ignores a perfectly viable alternative interpretation and translation. The word πάντως can mean "certainly," and the most idiomatic way of saying "certainly some" is "at least some." (Some may wish to categorize "certainly" and "at least" as distinct meanings, as BDAG s.v. πάντως does by giving "certainly" as a gloss under meaning 1 and offering "at least" under meaning 4 as one of the possibilities for 1 Cor. 9:22.) We are suggesting a footnote to that effect, though some of us would prefer putting the translation "may save at least some" in the text, which seems also to be the BDAG preference.

Second, HCSB's use of "means" ("by every possible means") is imprecise. There is only one *means* of bringing people to faith and salvation, and that is the gospel. Paul of course knows that perfectly well, and yet in this verse in HCSB he sounds like a clueless experimenter who will try every conceivable means to win people for Christ. If one is going to offer an interpretation along these lines as opposed to "certainly" or "at least," it will be more accurate to convey the adverbial force of $\pi \acute{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \varsigma$ with "way" rather than "means."

Third, the distortion introduced by the word "means" is exacerbated by an over-emphatic rendering of the stem of $\pi \acute{\alpha} v \tau \omega \varsigma$ as "every possible." It is sufficient to say "every."

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 10:13

Original text:

πειρασμός ύμας οὐκ εἴληφεν εἰ μὴ ἀνθρώπινος· πιστὸς δὲ ὁ θεός, ὃς οὐκ ἐάσει ὑμας πειρασθῆναι ὑπὲρ ὃ δύνασθε, ἀλλὰ ποιήσει σὺν τῷ πειρασμῷ καὶ τὴν ἔκβασιν τοῦ δύνασθαι ὑπενεγκεῖν.

HCSB rendering:

No temptation has overtaken you except what is common to humanity. <u>God</u> is <u>faithful</u>, <u>and He</u> will not allow you to be tempted beyond what you are able, but with the temptation He will also provide <u>a way of escape so that you are able</u> to bear it.

Suggestion:

No temptation has overtaken you except what is common to humanity. <u>But God</u> is <u>faithful. He</u> will not allow you to be tempted beyond what you are able, but with the temptation He will also provide <u>the outcome of being able</u> to bear it.

Rationale:

Paul gave a warning in verse 12: those who think they are standing had better be careful not to fall. At some point there is a change in tone, since verse 13 ends with a reassurance. There is no Greek conjunction at the beginning of verse 13 to signal a change, but there is an adversative δὲ (unfortunately omitted in HCSB) marking the change when we get to πιστὸς δὲ ὁ θεός. In other words, "No temptation has overtaken you except what is common to humanity" continues the warning from verse 12: Corinthians, you haven't faced any extraordinary tests, just the ordinary kind; the tests could become more severe, so don't become cocky. BUT God is faithful... Since the conjunction is important for tracking the line of thought, we think it should not be omitted in translation. Then, if "but" is added ("But God is faithful"), we think it would be best for what follows to be a new sentence ("He will not allow..."). Otherwise there would be a sentence with two "but's."

Many English translators and commentators take τὴν ἔκβασιν as an "escape" or a "way out," but it is hard to see why. The evidence is decidedly against that interpretation, as Johannes Weiss showed a century ago. For that matter, the Vulgate had *proventum*, "the successful outcome," and the recent philological commentary by Dieter Zeller has "den (guten) Ausgang." The case for our translation is as follows:

- 1) "Outcome" or "result" is an established meaning of $\xi\kappa\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\zeta$, and it shows up also in Hebrews 13:7 (HCSB: "As you carefully observe the <u>outcome</u> of their lives, imitate their faith."). In fact, some grammarians refer to result clauses as ecbatic clauses.
- 2) Paul uses an article, $\underline{\tau \dot{\eta} \nu}$ $\xi \kappa \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$. It is inadequate simply to ignore it (as in HCSB) or to explain it lamely as "'the necessary way of escape,' the one suitable for such a difficulty" (Robertson & Plummer's ICC). A generous God could provide a number of ways of escape, so there would be no reason for Paul to assume there will be just one and call it $\underline{\tau \dot{\eta} \nu}$ $\xi \kappa \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$, "the escape."

- 3) If we take τὴν ἔκβασιν as "the outcome," the expression is too vague to stand alone. It requires explanation, and that is exactly what Paul provides with the following words, τοῦ δύνασθαι ὑπενεγκεῖν. It hardly matters whether we take the genitive articular infinitive as having the force of an epexegetical genitive ("the outcome of being able…") or we treat the genitive articular infinitive as equivalent to a bare infinitive of result used epexegetically with τὴν ἔκβασιν. Either way, we get the same meaning.
- 4) But if we take τὴν ἔκβασιν as "(the) escape," then τοῦ δύνασθαι has to be a purpose infinitive or a result infinitive independent of τὴν ἔκβασιν. Either way it is grammatically difficult; since God is the subject of the main clause, the change to the subject "you" ("so that *you* are able to bear it") would have to be made explicit with the pronoun ὑμᾶς, which is lacking in the authentic text (ὑμᾶς is a weakly attested variant).
- 5) It hardly makes sense for Paul to talk about an escape or way out if the point of it all is "so that you are able to bear it." If one takes advantage of an escape from temptation or testing, there is nothing left to bear.
- 6) If a translator makes it seem as if God has promised that an escape will accompany every temptation or test, he thereby creates difficulties especially for Christians who suffer from chronic conditions that tempt/test them. A Christian who has been suffering from ill health or a handicap for decades may well ask, "Where is my escape?" and then what are we to say? One is compelled to say, "Unfortunately that is an inaccurate translation. What God actually guarantees here is that he will provide the ability to bear the test; he is not out to get you with a burden so severe that you are doomed to fail. So, take advantage of his promises, pay attention to the guidance he gives in his Word, seek his help in prayer, make use of the people and resources he provides, and you will be able to bear it."

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 10:16

Original text:

τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστιν;

HCSB rendering:

The cup of blessing that we give thanks for, is it not a sharing in the blood of Christ? The bread that we break, is it not a sharing in the body of Christ?

Suggestion:

The cup of blessing that we <u>bless</u>, is it not a sharing in the blood of Christ? The bread that we break, is it not a sharing in the body of Christ?

Rationale:

One and the same prayer can simultaneously thank God for a gift and bless (praise) him as a good and kind God for giving the gift, but even then *thanking* and *blessing* are not identical concepts. Some might say they are close enough to be used interchangeably when God is the object, but it is not indicated here that God is the object. On the contrary, the obvious and natural way of reading the grammar is that we have an explicit object for the transitive verb εὐλογοῦμεν, and that explicit object is the neuter pronoun ô referring to the cup, not "God." HCSB seems to be paraphrasing an attempt to read the Greek as saying, "The cup of blessing in respect to which we bless [God]." But although ô occurs frequently, we can find no parallels for what HCSB implies here—certainly none in which ô would serve as an accusative of respect in a clause featuring a transitive verb that has no explicit object.

We Lutherans do not think of Calvin as a reliable guide in Eucharistic passages, but we do find it interesting that Calvin rejected as forced and unnatural the kind of grammatical analysis and translation HCSB offers here.

One can approach the phrase "cup of blessing" from the perspective of a Jewish background in which "cup of blessing" implies "we bless God" rather than "we bless the cup," but that only shows why Paul would add the phrase ὁ εὐλογοῦμεν to bring out the additional idea that yes, we Christians do indeed bless this cup. When that thought is rejected in favor of "in respect to which we bless [God]," the words ὁ εὐλογοῦμεν become otiose, a mere restatement of the ordinary Jewish understanding of "cup of blessing." (It is not as though Paul is first introducing the phrase "cup of blessing" to the Corinthians and feels the need to add a relative clause so as to explain a potentially obscure Jewish phrase to Gentile readers. In this whole section he is taking advantage of their familiarity with the sacrament so that they can judge for themselves [10:15] how inevitably it requires them to stay away from the cup and table of demons. Paul is not going to distract them from that point by introducing at the outset a novel designation of the cup as a cup of blessing.)

The biblical background provides us not just with examples of blessing God in connection with food but also with examples of blessing the food itself. That is what we find in Luke 9:16, literally, "And having taken the five loaves and the two fish, having looked up to the sky/heaven, he blessed them (εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς) and broke and was giving to the disciples to serve to the crowd." The grammatically obvious object of "blessed" is "them," the (masculine) loaves and (masculine) fish (though that doesn't stop some commentators and translators who find the idea uncongenial from resorting to forced grammatical alternatives or translations that obscure the point). Similarly, in 1 Samuel 9:13 we hear of Samuel, "The people won't eat until he comes because he must bless the sacrifice" (HCSB; LXX εὐλογεῖ τὴν θυσίαν).

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 10:18-20

Original text:

βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα· οὐχ οἱ ἐσθίοντες τὰς θυσίας κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου εἰσίν; 19 τί οὖν φημι; ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστιν, ἢ ὅτι εἴδωλόν τί ἐστιν; 20 ἀλλ' ὅτι ἃ θύουσιν, δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ θύουσιν, οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι.

HCSB rendering:

Look at the people of Israel. <u>Do</u> not those who eat the sacrifices <u>participate in what is offered on</u> the altar? ¹⁹ What am I saying then? That food offered to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything? ²⁰ No, but I do say that what they sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God. I do not want you to <u>participate with demons!</u>

Suggestion:

Look at the people of Israel. <u>Are not those who eat the sacrifices partners of the altar?</u> ¹⁹ What am I saying then? That food offered to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything? ²⁰ No, but I do say that what they sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God. I do not want you to <u>become partners of the</u> demons!

Rationale:

The way to avoid a tautological statement based on a strained application of a familiar metonymy is to recognize that κ o ν o ν o ν o ν can be used substantively in the sense "partner," and the attached genitive can indicate the person or persons with whom one is a partner. Here such an understanding involves a kind of personification of the altar, but that is not difficult if we agree with those scholars who infer that in the OT worship arrangements, the altar of burnt offering was a kind of symbol of God, a religious object marking the place at which God received his share and allowed the worshipers to receive their share in his

presence. Note that at the inauguration of the covenant of Sinai, the sacrificial blood of the covenant was partly sprinkled on the people and partly put on the altar, thus marking the two parties joined together in the covenant. The blood on the altar marked God as a party to the covenant, evidently because the altar in a certain respect represented God. Paul finds it advantageous to refer to the Israelites as "partners of the altar" instead of calling them "partners of God" because Paul doesn't want it to seem as though the Israelites had a more direct connection to God through their sacrificial meals than Christians do through the Lord's Supper.

Some scholars reject the idea that the altar symbolized or represented God, but even they should be able to understand "partners of the altar" in an acceptable sense by taking "of the altar" as a genitive of description (partners of the altar = altar partners, people who have a religious bond with one another by their use of the same altar).

The use of a similar phrase in verse 20, "partners of the demons," preserves in English the complete formal parallelism in Greek between κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου and κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων. The pagan worshipers got their portions from the sacrificial animal, and the demons received the worship intended for the non-existent gods, and thus the worshipers and the demons were partners of each other at these worship events.

If it felt that "partners of" is too clumsy in modern English, then we suggest "partners with" in both cases as the next best alternative, still supporting the point of our recommendation.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 10:28

Original text:

έὰν δέ τις ὑμῖν εἴπη· Τοῦτο ἱερόθυτόνα ἐστιν, μὴ ἐσθίετε α ἰερόθυτόν WH Treg NIV] εἰδωλόθυτόν RP

HCSB rendering:

But if someone says to you, "This is food offered to an idol," do not eat it,

Suggestion:

But if someone says to you, "This is food from a sacrifice," do not eat it,

Rationale:

HCSB seems to translate the majority text, είδωλόθυτον. We think the evidence favors ἱερόθυτον. It has good early support, and transcriptional probabilities favor it strongly. As Fee says, εἰδωλόθυτον "cannot be original since there is no way to account for ἱερόθυτον if it were" (476, n. 4).

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 11:6

Original text:

εὶ γὰρ οὐ κατακαλύπτεται γυνή, καὶ κειράσθω· εἰ δὲ αἰσχρὸν γυναικὶ τὸ κείρασθαι ἢ ξυρᾶσθαι, κατακαλυπτέσθω.

HCSB rendering:

So if a <u>woman's head</u> is not covered, her hair should be cut off. But if it is disgraceful for a woman to have her hair cut off or her head shaved, she should be covered.

^a Lit a woman

Suggestion:

So if a <u>woman doesn't wear a covering</u>, she should cut off her hair. But if it is disgraceful for a woman to <u>cut off her hair or shave her head</u>, she should <u>wear a covering</u>.

Rationale:

The issue here is the voice(s) of the Greek verb forms and how to convey the voice(s) in translation. Some of Paul's verbs here are clearly middle (κειράσθω, κείρασθαι), and the rest can be taken as middle. None of them is unambiguously passive, but HCSB uses passive constructions or ones that can be understood in a passive sense. Paul aims for persuasion, not enforcement by others. When he says that a woman who doesn't cover herself should cut off her hair, he is in effect using shock treatment: *If she takes a step toward being unwomanly by abandoning the womanly headcovering, she may as well take a bigger step and cut or shave off all the hair on her head!* (Epictetus uses a similar but even more drastic argument to dissuade men from getting their bodies depilated—if you are getting rid of things that mark you as a man, why stop with body hair?) Paul counts on it that she will recoil from the thought of making herself as bald as a man and thus will see the point of not even taking a small step toward erasing conventional distinctions in appearance between men and women. But where Paul aims to persuade, HCSB seems to invite the congregation to enforce, and one shudders to think what some Christians might feel emboldened to say or do to women members as a result.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 11:16

Original text:

εί δέ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνεικος εἶναι, ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν, οὐδὲ αί ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ θεοῦ.

HCSB rendering:

But if anyone wants to argue about this, we have no <u>other</u>^a custom, nor do the churches of God. a Or no such

Suggestion:

But if anyone wants to argue about this, we have no <u>such</u> custom, a nor do the churches of God.

<u>a No such custom as the innovators were promoting</u>

Rationale:

HCSB has some company here among Evangelicals; for example, NASB (various revisions) and NIV (1984 and 2011) print "other" in the text as their translation of τοιαύτην. We assume that this is not a reader-oriented recasting of Paul's thought when we see it even in the NASB, but we cannot defend it from Greek usage. Fee used NIV 1984 in his NICNT commentary except in a handful of places where he felt compelled to correct the NIV, and this was one of them: he replaces NIV's "other" with "such" and adds in a footnote, "the Greek is τοιαύτην, which means 'such a kind'; there is no evidence that it ever means 'other'" (524, n. 3). More recent philologically informed commentaries that we have checked do not suggest that Fee's comment needs to be qualified in any way. Often they do not even mention "other" as a proposal to be refuted, much less as a viable option. Even Schrage's gigantic commentary says nothing.

This is not surprising since one can make good sense of the passage using the well-established meaning "such": *If anyone is minded to be contentious (by advocating a new practice), we have no such custom (as the contentious people would advocate), nor do the churches of God.* Around AD 55, when Paul wrote this letter, the majority of Christians were in the Holy Land, where the womanly headcovering was a firmly established practice, and the rest were in Diaspora congregations founded by people like Paul, who transmitted the Jewish practice to his churches (11:2).

We have noticed that the HCSB quite often includes explanatory footnotes. Since it may not be immediately clear to the reader what is meant by "no such custom," we suggest a footnote to clarify the meaning.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 11:20

Original text:

συνερχομένων οὖν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν.

HCSB rendering:

Therefore, when you come together, it is not really to eat the Lord's Supper.

Suggestion:

Therefore, when you come together, it is not <u>possible</u> to eat the Lord's Supper.

Rationale:

There is a long established grammatical construction in which ἔστιν (or ἔξεστιν) used with a subject infinitive means "it is possible to…" (for classical Greek, cf. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, para. 1985; for NT Greek, BDAG s.v. εἰμί 7: "οὐκ ἔστιν φαγεῖν *it is impossible to eat* 1 Cor 11:20…"). It would take powerful reasons to depart from that construction here, and we do not see sufficient reason to do so. Paul is of course not denying the physical possibility of eating the sacramental bread and wine when they come together; he means that it is impossible under the circumstances to eat the meal in the manner the Lord intended, so that it truly would be a meal worthy of the name κυριακὸν δεῖπνον. (Compare 10:21, where "you cannot…" does not deny the physical possibility of receiving the Lord's Supper on one day and eating a pagan sacrificial meal on another; rather it asserts that they cannot do so in a God-pleasing manner.)

HCSB takes φαγεῖν as an adverbial infinitive expressing the purpose of their coming together. That is grammatically implausible here. Paul is not likely to put the thought serving as the subject of his sentence (i.e., the antecedent of "it") into a genitive absolute. If he were to do something so irregular, he would need to provide an explicit pronoun such as τοῦτο to refocus attention on that thought as the subject of ἔστιν and thus remove any possibility of treating the infinitive as the subject. HCSB is also improbable in content. Undoubtedly the Corinthians did come together with the purpose of observing the Lord's Supper even if it was not their highest priority and even if they had grotesque ideas about how the Supper could be observed. A translator might well feel uneasy about flatly denying that they were coming together with the purpose of eating the Lord's Supper, and so HCSB says "it is not really to eat the Lord's Supper." The word "really" suggests that some other purpose or purposes mattered more to them than the purpose of eating the Supper. But "really" is without foundation in the Greek. The problems with HCSB's translation make it advisable to adopt the translation we are suggesting.

Bible References:

1 Corinthians 11:21,33

Original text:

1 Cor 11:21 – ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν, καὶ ὃς μὲν πεινᾳ, ὃς δὲ μεθύει. 1 Cor 11:33 – Ὠστε, ἀδελφοί μου, συνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε.

HCSB rendering:

1 Cor 11:21 – For at the meal, each one eats his own <u>supper ahead of others</u>. So one person is hungry while another gets drunk!

1 Cor 11:33 – Therefore, my brothers, when you come together to eat, wait for one another.

Suggestion:

1 Cor 11:21 – For at the meal, each one eats his own <u>supper</u>. So one person is hungry while another gets drunk!

1 Cor 11:33 – Therefore, my brothers, when you come together to eat, <u>receive</u> one another <u>hospitably</u>.

Rationale:

A common reconstruction of the congregational meals in Corinth makes timing a crucial factor: wealthier members were free to come early and chose to get a head start on the meal. Thus they kept their ample provisions to themselves instead of waiting for all to show up and then sharing their food with poorer members, some of whom had little or no food of their own to bring and thus went hungry. But that reconstruction has its problems, and a different interpretation is preferable and is reflected in our recommendation. At the very least the other way of translating deserves a place in the footnotes.

We understand that it would be foolish to insist that when Paul says "each," he means every last member. But it seems unrealistic to suppose that he wants "each" to be tacitly limited to "each wealthy member." If timing is a significant factor and some come early to get a head start *and others don't*, it seems odd to say that "each" member "eats his own supper ahead of others." The problem is exacerbated when we notice a pattern in Pauline usage: when "each" is promptly followed by pronouns strung together with μ èv and δ è, the normal implication is that the pronouns all represent subsets of the group implied by "each." But here $\delta \zeta \mu$ èv π ev \tilde{q} , "one person is hungry," hardly makes sense as representing a subset of the group who come early and get a head start.

It would be better to give up the whole notion of a problem in timing, i.e., the notion that the rich arrive early and get a head start. Paul repeatedly talks about meetings at which the Corinthians "come together" and yet have divisions. They seem to be there at the same time, but the rich are nonetheless keeping their food to themselves instead of sharing, and so each person ends up eating his or her own food, and as a result the poor who brought little or nothing are put to shame and go hungry.

The other piece of evidence often cited for the head start scenario is the imperative in verse 33, ἐκδέχεσθε. The verb occurs six times in the NT (twice in Paul: here and 1 Cor 16:11), and in the other five times it means "wait for." For some scholars that by itself is decisive. But it seems better to recognize that NT Greek has rich connections to the Greek of the non-Christian world in which the church was situated. Then it becomes significant that the *primary* meaning of ἐκδέχομαι, as Moulton and Milligan point out, is "receive." In the context of a group meal that meaning easily takes on a nuance, such as "receive as a guest, receive to one's table, receive hospitably, welcome." It should be noted that such a meaning is more relevant than the meaning "wait for" as the solution to the problem of divisions at the congregational meals in Corinth. If the rich were arriving early and getting a head start, waiting for the rest to show up is not in itself a solution, for if they go on keeping their food to themselves, they will still be shaming the poor and letting them go hungry. The actual solution is for the members to "receive one another hospitably" and in particular for the wealthier Christians to receive the other members at their tables and share food with them.

But if we recognize that here ἐκδέχεσθε means "receive hospitably," there is no reason to suppose that timing had anything to do with the problem in the first place. As far as we can see, the members showed up at about the same time and the meal took place, but the rich refused to share, and no doubt some of the shamed and hungry poor responded with hostility; but now Paul is telling them all to receive one another as brothers and truly celebrate the Lord's Supper together.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 12:13-14

Original text:

καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς εν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες, εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ πάντες εν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν. ¹⁴ καὶ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα οὐκ ἔστιν εν μέλος ἀλλὰ πολλά. ^a πάντες WH Treg NIV] + εἰς RP

HCSB rendering:

For we were all baptized by one Spirit into one body—whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free—and we were all made to drink of one Spirit. 14 So the body is not one part but many.

^a Or with, or in

Suggestion

For we were all baptized by one Spirit into one body—whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free—and we were all made to drink one Spirit. ¹⁴ Furthermore, the body is not one part but many.

^a Or with, or in

Rationale:

In verse 13, HCSB's "of" in "of one Spirit" has no foundation in the original text. The Greek does not indicate either a partitive idea or a source idea. A few texts have "into one Spirit," but the better attested text simply has "one Spirit" as the object of the verb.

Verse 14 begins with $\kappa\alpha$ ì γ áp. Only rarely does γ áp have an inferential sense (HCSB: "So"). Normally the combination $\kappa\alpha$ ì γ áp indicates that an additional reason or explanation is being given: "Futhermore." That fits here. Verse 12 ("For as the body is one and has many parts, and all the parts of that body, though many, are one body—so also is Christ") is supported first by verse 13 (unity through one Spirit) and then by verses 14ff (the diversity of the many members).

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 12:19-20

Original text:

εί δὲ ἦν τὰ πάντα ἕν μέλος, ποῦ τὸ σῶμα; 20 νῦν δὲ πολλὰ μὲν μέλη, ἕν δὲ σῶμα.

HCSB rendering:

And if they were all the same part, where would the body be? 20 Now there are many parts, yet one body.

Suggestion

And if they were all the same part, where would the body be? ²⁰ <u>But as it is</u>, there are many parts, yet one body.

Rationale:

In verse 20 vũv $\delta \epsilon$ signals a shift from a hypothetical scenario to the actual situation, "But as it is," not a shift from past to present, "Now."

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 14:1

Original text:

Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην, ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε.

HCSB rendering:

Pursue love and desire spiritual gifts, and above all that you may prophesy.

Suggestion

Pursue love and desire spiritual gifts, and especially that you may prophesy.

Rationale:

The translation "and above all" is too strong for $\mu \tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta \hat{\epsilon}$. A reader could get the impression that here the gift of prophecy is being valued more than love, a perspective that would be contrary to Paul's teaching in chapter 13. Since prophecy is one particular gift among the spiritual gifts, "and especially" works well as a translation here.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 14:33b-34

Original text:

ώς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἁγίων, ³⁴ αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν, οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν· ἀλλὰ ὑποτασσέσθωσαν, καθὸς καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει.

HCSB rendering:

As in all the <u>churches</u> of the saints, ³⁴ the women should be silent in the <u>churches</u>, for they are not permitted to speak, but should be submissive, as the law also says.

Suggestion

As in all the <u>church meetings</u> of the saints, ³⁴ the women should be silent in the <u>church meetings</u>, for they are not permitted to speak, but should be submissive, as the law also says.

Rationale:

In verse 35, HCSB translates ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ with the words, "in the church meeting." "Church meeting" is a sound translation there, and its plural fits as a translation in verses 33 and 34. Unfortunately HCSB has "churches" in 33 and 34, and that is likely to result in confusion or faulty understandings. If a reader takes "churches" in 34 as meaning "congregations" (= local groups to which Christians belong even when they are not gathered for worship), the verse implies that Christian women are to be silent 24/7 since they are members in their congregations 24/7. If a reader tries to avoid that understanding by taking the verse to mean, "the women are to be silent in the church buildings," he distorts Paul's meaning by resorting to an anachronistic meaning of "church." Both problems are avoided in our recommendation for verse 34.

The same translation should be used also in verse 33b, which HCSB correctly connects with 34 (rather than 33a). Normally when Paul wants to speak of what happens or ought to happen in church meetings, he uses the phrase ἐν ἐκκλησία (singular noun, no article). But in verse 34 he uses ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις instead, and the only good way of accounting for that is this: In 33b his addition of "all" (πάσαις) accounts for the shift to the plural ἐκκλησίαις, and the attached articular genitive "of the saints" (τῶν ἀγίων) accounts for the use of an article also with ἐκκλησίαις (an application of the canon of Apollonius); thus, having begun the sentence with this departure from his normal idiom, it is natural for him to continue using the altered phrase in verse 34 if he is still using the noun in the same sense. Accordingly ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ought to be translated the same way in both verses.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 15:1-2

Original text:

Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε, ἐν ῷ καὶ ἑστήκατε, 2 δι' οὖ καὶ σώζεσθε, τίνι λόγω εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, εἰ κατέχετε, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰκῇ ἐπιστεύσατε.

HCSB rendering:

Now brothers, I want to <u>clarify</u> for you the gospel I proclaimed to <u>you</u>; <u>you received it and</u> have taken your <u>stand on it. ² You are also</u> saved by it, if you <u>hold</u> to the message I proclaimed to you—unless you believed <u>for no purpose</u>. ^b

^a Or I make known

Suggestion

Now brothers, I <u>bring to your attention</u> the gospel I proclaimed to <u>you, which you received, on which you</u> have taken your <u>stand</u>, ² and <u>by which you are being</u> saved, if you <u>are holding</u> to the message I proclaimed to you—unless you believed <u>in vain</u>.

[No footnotes]

Rationale:

Paul's use of Γνωρίζω (normally= "I make known") seems to create a tension here for which there is no obvious and completely satisfactory resolution. But HCSB's "I want to clarify" is free to an unnecessary degree. "Clarify" is not attested as a meaning for $\gamma \nu \omega \rho i \zeta \omega$, and "want" is not expressed by the Greek either. Our suggestion, "I bring to your attention," is closer to the established meaning "make known"—close enough that we would be willing to dispense with the first footnote.

HCSB breaks up Paul's string of relative clauses and thus creates a number of independent clauses punctuated as two sentences. Here that gives the unfortunate impression that the clarification HCSB speaks of comes already in verse 2, with verses 3ff providing support for that clarification. Needless to say, such a reading of the line of thought would miss Paul's point. We have restored Paul's series of relative clauses so that readers will look beyond verse 2 for the main point he wishes to focus on first, i.e., the resurrection of Christ.

The use of verb tenses in conditional sentences in English is sometimes ambiguous. *If you win, you get a prize* could be present general or future particular. Paul's εἰ κατέχετε (present indicative) is unambiguous, and its meaning is conveyed most clearly with an unambiguous reference to present time, "if you are holding..." The same applies to σώζεσθε, "you are being saved."

It seems to us that "in vain" is the sense required here for $\varepsilon i \kappa \tilde{\eta}$, as in Galatians 3:4 and 4:11, and so we would be happy to see that translation and no footnote. Paul assumes that the Corinthians believed the

^bOr believed without careful thought, or believed in vain

gospel in the past, but their past faith would prove to be in vain if they subsequently threw it away by rejecting the gospel of the risen Savior and embracing instead a radical denial of the resurrection. Since faith is such a pivotal matter for Paul, it is hard to imagine him calling their past response to the gospel *faith* if they paid no attention to one of the most fundamental parts of the gospel or merely went through the motions of joining the church outwardly. Paul would hardly refer to that kind of behavior as *believing* "for no purpose" or as *believing* "without careful thought"; he would call it hypocrisy or more simply not believing at all. Paul has just held before them the thought that they are being saved by the gospel—"unless..." With that "unless" he is not pointing to the possibility of a minor deficiency in their faith. They are being saved (are on the path to heaven) if they are by faith holding fast to the gospel; but they are not being saved if their past faith is gone and they are no longer holding fast to the gospel. In that case they believed "in vain."

(After writing the preceding paragraph we find that Dieter Zeller in the most recent First Corinthians commentary in the Meyer series has essentially the same view. He translates $\varepsilon i \kappa \tilde{\eta}$ as "vergeblich." He rejects the translation "ins Blaue hinein (ohne Ueberlegung)," i.e., "without due consideration, without careful thought," because it does not do justice to the connection with $\sigma \phi \zeta \varepsilon \sigma \theta \varepsilon$. He doesn't even mention "for no purpose"; evidently he does not consider it a serious option here at all.)

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 15:3-9 (formatting only)

Original text:

³ Παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὂ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, ⁴ καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη, καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, ⁵ καὶ ὅτι ἄφθη Κηφᾳ, εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα· ⁶ ἔπειτα ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ, ἐξ ὧν οἱ πλείονες μένουσιν ἕως ἄρτι, τινὲς δὲ ἐκοιμήθησαν· ⁷ ἔπειτα ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ, εἶτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν· ⁸ ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὤφθη κἀμοί. ⁹ ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὃς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος, διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ·

HCSB rendering:

³ For I passed on to you as most important what I also received:

that Christ died for our sins

according to the Scriptures,

⁴ that He was buried,

that He was raised on the third day

according to the Scriptures,

⁵ and that He appeared to Cephas,

then to the Twelve.

⁶ Then He appeared to over 500 brothers at one time;

most of them are still alive,

but some have fallen asleep.

⁷ Then He appeared to James,

then to all the apostles.

⁸Last of all, as to one abnormally born,

He also appeared to me.

⁹ For I am the least of the apostles, unworthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God....

Suggested format

³ For I passed on to you as most important what I also received:

that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures,

⁴ that He was buried,

that He was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures,

⁵ and that He appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve.

⁶ Then He appeared to over 500 brothers at one time; most of them are still alive, but some have fallen asleep. ⁷ Then He appeared to James, then to all the apostles. ⁸ Last of all, as to one abnormally born, He also appeared to me. ⁹ For I am the least of the apostles, unworthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God....

Rationale:

If there is to be special formatting here, it would be good to use it to highlight just verses 3b-5 as the four clauses of the creed Paul received from earlier Christians and passed on to the Corinthians. That is preferable to HCSB's formatting, which lumps together all the evidence cited here (3b-8) for the resurrection of Christ. HCSB gives the impression that all of 3b-8 is the tradition that Paul received from others (3a). That is very improbable. Others are not likely to have formulated a tradition enumerating Paul himself as the final eyewitness, and since Paul could give his own testimony about Christ's appearance to him, he had no reason to insert his testimony into the creed he received. If for some strange reason he were to do that, he would not expect the Corinthians to refer to himself in a creedal affirmation as "me" or as $\tau \tilde{\phi}$ eκτρώματι.

The Corinthians knew from prior teaching where the creed ended, and so they could easily see the exact spot where Paul stops quoting the creed and starts adding supplementary material. For us the matter is made clear by Paul's use of $\delta\tau\iota$ four times. The first instance (middle of verse 3) is needed in any case to indicate that indirect discourse follows, but the other three instances (verses 4 and 5) are purposeful only insofar as they mark successive clauses of similarly quoted material. Once we get to the beginning of verse 6 we have seen the last $\delta\tau\iota$, and the quoted creed is over.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 15:18

Original text:

εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγήγερται, ματαία ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν, ἔτι ἐστὲ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν. 18 ἄρα καὶ οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ ἀπώλοντο.

HCSB rendering:

And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is worthless; you are still in your sins. ¹⁸ Therefore, those who have fallen asleep in Christ <u>have also perished</u>.

Suggestion:

And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is worthless; you are still in your sins. ¹⁸ Then it also follows that those who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished.

Rationale:

"Therefore..." sounds too much like an independent assertion coming from Paul himself. In the source text Paul is simply drawing out the further implications of a denial of the resurrection. HCSB's "those...have also perished" seems to take καὶ closely with οἱ κοιμηθέντες rather than with the inferential process signaled by ἄρα. The latter makes good sense and is reflected in our suggestion, whereas the former (HCSB) seems to say, You Corinthian Christians would still be in your sins and as a result you would have already perished; those who have fallen asleep in Christ would have also perished. That is more than Paul wants to say. If, for the sake of argument, Paul grants the hypothesis that Christ has not risen, the Corinthian Christians can be said to be still in their sins, but they cannot be said to have perished in the same sense that dead Christians are here said (hypothetically) to have perished.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 15:22

Original text:

 20 Νυνὶ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων. 21 ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι' ἀνθρώπου θάνατος, καὶ δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν· 22 ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζῳοποιηθήσονται.

HCSB rendering:

²⁰ But now Christ has been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep. ²¹ For since death came through a man, the resurrection of the dead also comes through a man. ²² For as in Adam <u>all</u> die, so also in Christ <u>all</u> will be made alive.

Suggestion:

²⁰ But now Christ has been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep. ²¹ For since death came through a man, the resurrection of the dead also comes through a man. ²² For as in Adam they all die, so also in Christ they all will be made alive.

Rationale:

Verse 20 announces the dual focus of Paul's thinking in this section: Christ (the firstfruits) and those who have fallen asleep (believers who have already died or will have done so before the last day—for convenience let's call them the Christian Sleepers). It would be good for a translation to keep that dual focus in view or at least make it possible for alert readers to do so. Our suggestion does that in verse 22: "For as in Adam they (the Christian Sleepers) all die, so also in Christ they (the Christian Sleepers) all will be made alive." Not all Christians will die; some will be alive at Christ's return. But those who do die, i.e., the Christian Sleepers, die their death because of their connection to Adam. Similarly, the Christians who are alive at Christ's return will not need to be made alive (all they will need is the transformation Paul speaks of later in the chapter), but the Christian Sleepers will be made alive because of their connection to Christ. Thus they will be made alive in the full sense—not raised up to face condemnation and eternal death, but raised up in glorified bodies to experience life with Christ forever. It is perhaps worthwhile to add the following:

- 1) The nominative form $\pi \acute{\alpha} v \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ routinely requires translators to choose between "all" (in the sense of "all people") and a contextually limited "they all" (all those about whom the writer is talking). More often than not, the latter is the case; cf. 1 Cor. 10:1ff, where repeatedly $\pi \acute{\alpha} v \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ refers to all the forefathers who left Egypt under Moses, not all people of all time. In our verse (15:22) Paul has already indicated his limited focus, the Christian Sleepers (15:20). Respecting that focus gives consistent results, whereas departing from it produces contradictions (unless the exegete resorts to arbitrary "solutions" that ignore the actual wording and grammar).
- 2) The Adam-Christ contrast in context does not overturn that focus. The fact that Adam's sin has consequences for all people conceived in the natural way doesn't mean that Paul has to talk about all

people; he may be interested in talking only about a subset. Likewise, the fact that Christ's atonement embraced all people doesn't mean that Paul always has to talk about all people when he is discussing the benefits that are found in Christ.

- 3) As a matter of fact, nowhere in this large chapter does Paul show any interest in the resurrection of unbelievers to face judgment and punishment. He neither affirms it nor denies it. He keeps his focus entirely on the risen Christ and his believers and the benefits the latter derive from the former; those are the points he expounds and defends.
- 4) Our proposal keeps the referent of πάντες consistent in both halves of verse 22. Nothing in the wording points to a change in the content of πάντες. The phrases "in Adam" and "in Christ" are adverbial; they are not adjectival modifiers limiting either occurrence of πάντες.
- 5) There are those, like Schrage, who correctly see that ζ φοποιηθήσονται is speaking of a salvific resurrection but wrongly insist that πάντες in an Adam-Christ context would have to refer to the whole human race. These exegetical decisions lead Schrage to speak of an unresolvable tension in this text, a finding which many will take as evidence that Paul is an incoherent, inconsistent thinker, or that the NT teaches the final salvation of all people, or both. Our suggestion preserves Paul's theological consistency without resorting to exegetical violence.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 15:24

Original text:

εἶτα τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδιδῷ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί, ὅταν καταργήση πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν,

^a παραδιδῷ WH NIV] παραδιδοῖ Treg; παραδῷ RP

HCSB rendering:

Then comes the end, when He hands over the kingdom to God the Father, when He <u>abolishes</u> all rule and all authority and power.

Suggestion:

Then comes the end, when He hands over the kingdom to God the Father, when He <u>has abolished</u> all rule and all authority and power.

Rationale:

Our suggestion is supported by both grammar and content.

Grammar: The verb in question, καταργήση, is an aorist subjunctive. The choice of an aorist views the action as accomplished rather than as being in progress. Accordingly, BDAG s.v. ὅταν 1aβ says that ὅταν is used with the aorist subjunctive "when the action of the subordinate clause precedes that of the main clause." Our suggestion indicates that time relationship, though one could mark it even more clearly by saying "after He has abolished."

Content: The abolishing of all (hostile) rule and all authority and power takes places when Christ's enemies can no longer assert themselves or maintain power against him. In context Paul identifies death as the final enemy. The final enemy is done away with on the last day at the moment when Christ's people are released from death's grip by their resurrection to glory. *Subsequent* to that act (and to the ensuing judgment), Christ hands over his reign to God the Father by presenting his resurrected, glorified, and vindicated people to his Father. In this way the reign of Christ in its current form (the embattled reign of a man we do not see) is transformed into the manifest and consummated reign of the triune God, whom we shall see face to face.

(NB: We assume that $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\iota\delta\tilde{\varphi}$, <u>present</u> subjunctive, is the correct text in the earlier part of the verse. HCSB has translated that present subjunctive correctly, and the implications are consistent with the sequence of events on the last day as we just sketched them.)

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 15:31

Original text:

τί καὶ ἡμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν πᾶσαν ὥραν; ³¹ καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω, νὴ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν, ῆν ἔχω ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.

HCSB rendering:

Why are we in danger every hour? 31 I affirm by the pride in you that I have in Christ Jesus our Lord: I <u>die</u> every day!

Suggestion:

Why are we in danger every hour? ³¹ I affirm by the pride in you that I have in Christ Jesus our Lord: I face death every day!

Rationale:

We wonder what the typical reader will make of HCSB in verse 31. Paul seems to be starting out with a warm and powerful assurance that he is about to make a true statement, and then comes a statement which, according to current English usage, sounds like a strange exaggeration or a riddle of some sort. Nowadays to convey a strong sense of embarrassment we may say, "I just *died* when that happened!" But Paul is not talking about embarrassment. To convey a sense of extreme fear we may say, "I *almost died* from fright!"—but here there is no "almost." It won't do to say that Paul means no more than that every day he gets a little older and is one day closer to death—that is true of all people.

The translation we are recommending is the one offered by BDAG s.v. ἀποθνήσκω 2 with specific reference to this verse. It fits the context and is readily intelligible.

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 15:41

Original text:

ἄλλη δόξα ήλίου, καὶ ἄλλη δόξα σελήνης, καὶ ἄλλη δόξα ἀστέρων, ἀστήρ γὰρ ἀστέρος διαφέρει ἐν δόξη.

HCSB rendering:

There is a splendor of the sun, another of the moon, and another of the stars; <u>for</u> one star differs from another star in splendor.

Suggestion:

There is a splendor of the sun, another of the moon, and another of the stars; <u>in fact</u>, one star differs from another star in splendor.

Rationale:

It is hard for us to track the logic implied by HCSB's use of "for" in this verse. We think "in fact" fits very well. Our translation is very similar to some of the glosses included in BDAG s.v. $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ 2, such as "moreover" and "indeed."

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 16:10

Original text:

Έὰν δὲ ἔλθη Τιμόθεος, βλέπετε ἵνα ἀφόβως γένηται πρὸς ὑμᾶς, τὸ γὰρ ἔργον κυρίου ἐργάζεται ὡς κἀγώ·

HCSB rendering:

If Timothy comes, see that he has nothing to fear <u>from you</u>, because he is doing the Lord's work, just as I am.

Suggestion:

If Timothy comes, see that he has nothing to fear <u>during his visit with you</u>, because he is doing the Lord's work, just as I am.

Rationale:

While commentators over the years have explained the Greek of this verse in somewhat discordant ways, our understanding is that here $\pi\rho\delta\zeta$ $\dot{\nu}\mu\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$ is to be construed directly with $\gamma\dot{\epsilon}\nu\eta\tau\alpha$. In this context it means "with you." Literally, "see that he may be with you fearlessly." (Since it is uncommon for an adverb to be used instead of an adjective as the complement for $\gamma\dot{\nu}\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$, it is unlikely that Paul wants to be understood as saying literally, "see that he may be fearless with reference to you," much less "from you.")

While HCSB does not translate the ἵvα clause literally, we are not intent on literal translation here, and one could say that HCSB makes explicit the concerns we can infer from Paul's words. Nonetheless, we regret that HCSB's paraphrase replaces some tact on Paul's part with words that are more brusque, "see that he has nothing to fear *from you*."

Bible Reference:

1 Corinthians 16:13

Original text:

Γρηγορεῖτε, στήκετε ἐν τῆ πίστει, ἀνδρίζεσθε, κραταιοῦσθε.

HCSB rendering:

Be alert, stand firm in the faith, act like a man, be strong.

Suggestion:

Be alert, stand firm in the faith, act like men, be strong.

Rationale:

HCSB's use of "like a man" (singular) raises questions. Is Paul talking to an unnamed individual? No. Does he mean that the congregation as a whole is to work together in such unity that they act like one person? That would be more clearly communicated by saying "act like one man"; but in any case, no such thought is implied in the Greek. Our suggestion forestalls those questions.

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 2:12-13

Original text:

 12 Έλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν Τρφάδα εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θύρας μοι ἀνεφγμένης ἐν κυρίφ, 13 οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν με Τίτον τὸν ἀδελφόν μου, ἀλλὰ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς ἑξῆλθον εἰς Μακεδονίαν.

HCSB rendering:

¹² When I came to Troas to preach the gospel of <u>Christ, the</u> Lord opened a door for <u>me</u>. ¹³ <u>I</u> had no rest in my spirit because I did not find my brother <u>Titus</u>, <u>but</u> I said good-bye to them and left for Macedonia.

Suggestion:

¹² When I came to Troas to preach the gospel of <u>Christ and</u> the Lord opened a door for <u>me</u>, ¹³ I had no rest in my spirit because I did not find my brother <u>Titus</u>. <u>Instead</u>, I said good-bye to them and left for Macedonia.

Rationale:

This passage sets up Paul's grand digression on the glory of the ministry of the new covenant. By breaking vv 12-13 into two sentences, however, the HCSB appears to have obscured his point here. The apostle's main assertion is not that the Lord opened a door for him at Troas but that he was compelled to abandon that ministry opportunity and instead leave for Macedonia.

We suggest rendering this passage in a more straightforward manner, recognizing $\dot{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\varphi\gamma\mu\dot{\epsilon}\nu\eta\zeta$ as part of genitive absolute construction rather than treating it as if it were a finite verb. We see a temporal shading to this participle.

With the last clause in verse 13 Paul is responding to the implied question that precedes it. When he could not find Titus in Troas, could the restless apostle stay there and preach the gospel? No, instead $(\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\dot{\alpha})$ he had to leave and move on to Macedonia. (BDAG gives several examples of this conjunction $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\dot{\alpha}$ "introducing the main point after a question expressed or implied, which has been answered in the negative.")

We notice that the HCSB has rendered similar argumentation in this manner later on in this epistle:

2 Corinthians 7:5 – In fact, when we came into Macedonia, we had no rest. Instead ($\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda$ '), we were troubled in every way: conflicts on the outside, fears inside.

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 3:3

Original text:

φανερούμενοι ὅτι ἐστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, ἐγγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι ἀλλὰ πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίναις ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίαις σαρκίναις.

HCSB rendering:

It is clear that you are Christ's letter, <u>produced</u> by us, not written with ink but with the Spirit of the living God—not on stone tablets but on tablets that are hearts of flesh.

^a Lit *ministered to*

Suggestion:

It is clear that you are Christ's letter, the result of our ministry, not written with ink but with the Spirit of the living God—not on stone tablets but on tablets that are hearts of flesh.

Rationale:

The verb διακονέω (and its cognates) plays a crucial role in this third chapter of Second Corinthians. We fear that its force has been diminished, however, in the HCSB translation of διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν. Our suggestion retains the force of the verb within the context of this chapter (that of "ministering," "serving," "providing spiritual care").

If the word "ministry" is included in the text, we see no need for the footnote. This footnote struck us as a bit odd—speaking about a "letter" that was "ministered to."

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 3:13-14

Original text:

¹³ καὶ οὐ καθάπερ Μωϋσῆς ἐτίθει κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου. ¹⁴ ἀλλὰ ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν. ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τῆ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης μένει, μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον ὅτι ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται·

HCSB rendering:

¹³ We are not like Moses, who used to put a veil over his face so that the Israelites could not stare at the end of what was fading <u>away</u>, ¹⁴ <u>but</u> their minds were closed. For to this day, at the reading of the old covenant, the same veil remains; it is not lifted, because it is set aside only in Christ.

^aLit their thoughts were hardened

Suggestion:

¹³ We are not like Moses, who used to put a veil over his face so that the Israelites could not stare at the end of what was fading <u>away</u>. ¹⁴ <u>But</u> their minds were closed. ^a <u>Indeed</u> to this day, at the reading of the old covenant, the same veil remains; it is not lifted, because it is set aside only in Christ.

^aLit their thoughts were hardened

Rationale:

Our suggested translation of this passage has two components:

- a) Verse 14 does not complete the thought of verse 13. The author rather turns the discussion in a new direction as he shares his first observation about the spiritual condition of the Israelites. To make this transition more apparent, we suggest starting a new sentence at the start of verse 14, as most translations do.
- b) As for the γάρ that follows, Paul is not explaining the previous ("for"). Rather he appears to be confirming the Israelites' dire situation with fresh imagery. Hence our suggestion that γάρ be rendered "indeed."

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 3:18

Original text:

ήμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένω προσώπω τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος.

HCSB rendering:

We all, with unveiled faces, are looking as in a mirror at the glory of the Lord and are being transformed into <u>the same</u> image from glory to glory; this is from the Lord who is the Spirit.

Suggestion:

We all, with unveiled faces, are looking as in a mirror at the glory of the Lord and are being transformed into <u>his very</u> image from glory to glory; this is from the Lord who is the Spirit.

Rationale:

The HCSB's rendering of τὴν αὐτὴν could leave the impression that "we all ... are being transformed" into the same image as one another, as if this were primarily a mutually shared image. Our suggestion recognizes the function of αὐτός as an intensive marker while also helping readers more easily see that this εἰκών is the image of Christ.

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 5:7-8

Original text:

 7 διὰ πίστεως γὰρ περιπατοῦμεν, οὐ διὰ εἴδους· 8 θαρροῦμεν δὲ καὶ εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον.

HCSB rendering:

⁷ For we walk by faith, not by <u>sight</u>, ⁸ and we are <u>confident and satisfied</u> to be out of the body and at home with the Lord.

Suggestion:

⁷ For we walk by faith, not by <u>sight</u>. ⁸ Yes, we are confident, and we think it would be better to be out of the body and at home with the Lord.

Rationale:

With $\theta\alpha\rho\rho\sigma\tilde{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu$ at the start of verse 8 Paul is repeating an assertion he made just two verses earlier. We think this emphatic device is more apparent as well as easier on the ear when verse 8 is presented as a new sentence, with the particle $\delta\dot{\epsilon}$ rendered "Yes." (See ESV, NRSV, and NKJV.)

Attempting to coordinate εὐδοκοῦμεν with θαρροῦμεν ("we are confident and satisfied") strikes us as rather clumsy. Instead, we suggest separating it with a comma and repeating the subject "we." This might make it more apparent that Paul is concluding the comparison between this "temporary earthly dwelling" and our "eternal dwelling in the heavens" which began at the start of this chapter.

What we are suggesting for $\varepsilon \dot{\upsilon} \delta o \kappa o \tilde{\upsilon} \mu \epsilon v$ is similar to the way the HCSB handles this verb on one other occasion:

1 Thessalonians 3:1 – Therefore, when we could no longer stand it, we thought it was better (εὐδοκήσαμεν) to be left alone in Athens.

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 6:9

Original text:

ώς ἀγνοούμενοι καὶ ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι, ὡς ἀποθνήσκοντες καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶμεν, ὡς παιδευόμενοι καὶ μὴ θανατούμενοι,

HCSB rendering:

as unknown yet recognized; as dying and look—we live; as being disciplined yet not killed;

Suggestion:

as unknown yet recognized; as dying yet look—we live; as being disciplined yet not killed;

Rationale:

Starting with the last clause of verse 8, the apostle is presenting a series of seven antitheses. (We see the same sort of rhetorical device at 4:8-9.) Each antithesis is introduced by $\dot{\omega}\zeta$ ("as"), with the second element prefaced by the adversative $\kappa\alpha i$ (five times) or by the adversative δi (two times).

On six of these occasions the HCSB brings out the adversative with the conjunction "yet." For consistency's sake and to make Paul's rhetorical device more readily apparent, we suggest that the third καί in this sequence also be rendered with the conjunction "yet."

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 7:2

Original text:

Χωρήσατε ήμας· οὐδένα ἠδικήσαμεν, οὐδένα ἐφθείραμεν, οὐδένα ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν.

HCSB rendering:

Accept us. We have wronged no one, corrupted no one, defrauded no one.

a Lit Make room for us

Suggestion:

Make room for us in your hearts. We have wronged no one, corrupted no one, defrauded no one.

Rationale:

Here at the start of chapter seven the apostle is picking up on the point he made so colorfully just seven verses earlier:

2 Cor 6:11-13 – We have spoken openly to you, Corinthians; our heart has been opened wide (ή καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτυνται). ¹² You are not limited by us, but you are limited by your own affections. ¹³ I speak as to my children. As a proper response, you should also be open to us.

We think a straightforward rendering of $X\omega\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$ is more vivid than the HCSB's current translation. In addition, it brings out this connection to 6:11-13. We suggest adding "in your hearts" to make this even more apparent and to help the reader recognize that "make room" is to be understood figuratively.

Our translation is similar to that which is found in a number of popular translations, including ESV, NASB, NIV, and NRSV. In addition, BDAG suggests this rendering here at 2 Corinthians 7:2.

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 8:6

Original text:

είς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ήμᾶς Τίτον, ἵνα καθὼς προενήρξατο οὕτως καὶ ἐπιτελέσῃ εἰς ὑμᾶς καὶ τὴν χάριν ταύτην.

HCSB rendering:

So we urged Titus that just as he had begun, so he should also complete this grace to you.

Suggestion:

So we urged Titus that just as he had begun, so he should also complete this grace on your part as well.

Rationale:

We find the expression "grace to you" to be clumsy and potentially misleading. For instance, this translation may call to mind Paul's favorite greeting ("Grace to you and peace") when, in fact, no such connection is intended.

As far as the offering for the saints in Jerusalem was concerned, Paul hoped that the Corinthians would follow the example of those eager and generous Macedonians. The phrase $\varepsilon i \zeta$ $\psi \mu \alpha \zeta$ here in verse 6 appears to have the sense of "with reference to you." There are several viable options for putting this into readable English, including "as for you," "among you," and "on your part." We recommend the last option, since it steers clear of giving the impression that Titus would be doing all the work by himself. Clearly the believers in Corinth would themselves be completely invested in this offering.

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 8:14

Original text:

έν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ τὸ ὑμῶν περίσσευμα εἰς τὸ ἐκείνων ὑστέρημα, ἵνα καὶ τὸ ἐκείνων περίσσευμα γένηται εἰς τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα, ὅπως γένηται ἰσότης,

HCSB rendering:

at the present time your surplus is available for their need, so their abundance may also become available for <u>our</u> need, so there may be equality.

Suggestion:

at the present time your surplus is available for their need, so their abundance may also become available for <u>your</u> need, so there may be equality.

Rationale:

The pronoun $\dot{\nu}\mu\tilde{\omega}\nu$ ("your") is widely attested. In fact, we found no reference to a variant reading of any sort.

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 9:13

Original text:

διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τῆς διακονίας ταύτης δοξάζοντες τὸν θεὸν ἐπὶ τῆ ὑποταγῆ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰς πάντας,

HCSB rendering:

They will glorify God for your <u>obedience to the</u> confession of the gospel of Christ, and for your generosity in sharing with them and with <u>others through the proof provided by this service</u>.

Suggestion:

<u>In view of the proof provided by this ministry</u>, they will glorify God for <u>the fact that your actions line up with your</u> confession of the gospel of Christ, and for your generosity in sharing with them and with everyone.

Rationale:

Finding the HCSB translation of this passage difficult to track, we have a number of suggestions:

- 1. The phrase διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τῆς διακονίας ταύτης modifies δοξάζοντες. This becomes more apparent (and reads more smoothly) when the translation of these words remains at the start of the verse.
- 2. The preposition διά appears not to be introducing the instrumental agent ("through") of δοξάζοντες but rather the circumstance that would attend this activity. So we suggest διά be rendered "in view of." Doing so with διά is not unusual for the HCSB. Cf. also Phil 3:8 and 2 Thess 1:11.
- 3. In 9:12 the noun διακονία was rendered "ministry." We suggest that that translation be retained in this verse that immediately follows it.
- 4. The phrase ἐπὶ τῆ ὑποταγῆ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is complex. Rendering it in English is a challenge. Nevertheless we believe that, while the HCSB's "for your obedience to the confession of the gospel" may appear to be word-for-word, it's rather difficult to decipher. Our solution is two-fold:
 - a. Since ὑμῶν can modify both τῆ ὑποταγῆ and τῆς ὁμολογίας together, we think the translation can repeat the word "your."
 - b. "Your obedience to your confession" is still clumsy, however. So we also suggest that ἐπὶ τῆ ὑποταγῆ ... ὑμῶν be rendered with a verbal phrase that expresses the noun ὑποταγή

somewhat literally. Rendering $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\upsilon\tau\alpha\gamma\dot{\eta}$ as a "lining up under" corresponds well with BDAG's gloss: "the state of submissiveness, subjection, subordination."

Paul's is announcing that the saints in Jerusalem would be prompted to glorify God when they saw that the Corinthians' participation in this offering lined up perfectly with the good news they professed. We see no reason why the translation couldn't express this in a more understandable manner.

At the end of the verse we also recommend "with everyone" as a better English equivalent for $\varepsilon i \zeta \pi \acute{a} v \tau \alpha \zeta$ than "with others."

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 11:12

Original text:

Ό δὲ ποιῶ, καὶ ποιήσω, ἵνα ἐκκόψω τὴν ἀφορμὴν τῶν θελόντων ἀφορμήν, ἵνα ἐν ῷ καυχῶνται εύρεθῶσιν καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς.

HCSB rendering:

But I will continue to do what I am doing, in order to deny <u>the</u> opportunity <u>of</u> those who want <u>an</u> <u>opportunity to be</u> regarded <u>just as</u> our equals in what they boast about.

Suggestion:

But I will continue to do what I am doing, in order to deny <u>an</u> opportunity <u>to</u> those who want <u>to be</u> regarded <u>as</u> our equals in what they boast about.

Rationale:

While the noun ἀφορμὴν appears twice in the original, first as the direct object of ἐκκόψω and then as the direct object of τῶν θελόντων, repeating the word in translation makes for clumsy English. Here the second ἴνα clause provides both the intended result as well as the content of the ἀφορμὴν to which Paul is referring. Given that, we've found that deleting the second mention of the word "opportunity" takes nothing away from the message of this passage.

We also think an improvement could be made with "deny the opportunity of." As the HCSB stands, one could get the idea that the opponents claim they have the opportunity and Paul denies the claim, whereas Paul's way of putting it makes it clear that they want an opportunity and therefore are not claiming to have it already. We think it would be clearer to make a slight change to "deny an opportunity to."

Finally, $\kappa\alpha\theta\dot{\omega}\varsigma$ can often be rendered "just as." In this setting, however, the word "just" may suggest the idea of "merely" or "only." We think the word "just" can be dropped.

Bible Reference:

2 Corinthians 13:12-14

Original text:

- 12 ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν ἁγίφ φιλήματι. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἅγιοι πάντες.
- 13 Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.

HCSB rendering:

- ¹² Greet one another with a holy kiss. All the saints greet you.
- ¹³ The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with all of you.^a
- ^a Some translations divide these 2 vv. into 3 vv. so that v. 13 begins with *All the saints*...and v. 14 begins with *The grace of*...

Suggestion:

- ¹² Greet one another with a holy kiss. ¹³ All the saints greet you.
- ¹⁴ The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with all of you.

Rationale:

The Greek text has only two verses here, but most English translations have three. The HCSB has chosen to follow the Greek verses, but we are concerned about confusion coming from changing the verse number of a verse that is as widely used in liturgical contexts as 2 Corinthians 13:14 is. We recommend following the traditional English versification here.