

THE CASE

FOR

KOINE

Apologetics

An Introduction

The Case for KOINE
Apologetics: An Introduction

By

IAmKOINE.org



Copyright 2016

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Why KOINE Apologetics?.....	3
Lesson 1: Perfect Tense: Perfect Birth; Salvation	5
Lesson 2: The Article: Jesus is God; Baptism & the Gospel.....	8
Lesson 3: Present Tense: Calvinism and Arminianism.....	10
Lesson 4: Preposition and Adverb: Rapture.....	14
Lesson 5: Adjective: What about a Free or Bound will?	17
Lesson 6: Ignoring KOINE.....	21
Lesson 7: Aorist Tense.....	28
Lesson 8: Participles: Words that Participate	30
Lesson 9: Religious Constructs	32
Lesson 10: A Maze of Minutiae.....	35
Lesson 11: A Purpose of a Different Kind	39
Lesson 12: God’s Omniscience and Living Theism.....	43
Lesson 13: Atonement according to KOINE's Context	47
Lesson 14: Baptismal Regeneration	49
Lesson 15: No Water for Baptismal Regeneration.....	52
Lesson 16: Antitypical Immersion	54
Lesson 17: Constructs in quantitative research.....	58

The Work of an Evangelist

Introduction

Should, in the course of one's life among Baptists, headlines like "*Will New Calvinism Report Calm Tensions among Southern Baptists?*" arise in Theological Articles; especially, in articles appearing in such credible news sources like that of *Christianity Today*? Of only one thing this Baptist can be certain is that the Truth will be set aside for the sake of some greater good. In this matter: "Cooperation." Further, a highlight of the article stated: "After growing tensions over Calvinism within the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) culminated in heresy accusations last year, a 19-member advisory committee has issued a seven-page report on the soteriology struggle. It's primary finding? There's no reason that Calvinist and Arminian Baptists cannot overcome their differences for the sake of the Great Commission." Retrieved from www.christianitytoday.com

There we have it! After thirty years of personal computers, and as many years with the World Wide Web; e-learning, and a new, online, virtual Seminary emerging every other day, the best that the Master can expect from Calvinist and Arminian Baptists is a "cooperative effort." It presents itself as the most commendable of aspirations; for we all know that nothing beyond spreading the words of Calvin or Arminius was intended when Christ commissioned His Churches.

Of course, one is taught by practitioners of Calvinism and Arminianism not to expect something bigger, better, more ancient, more accurate, more powerful, or more truthful than the traditional, systemic theological constructs offered by Calvinistic

and Arminian Baptists today. Who would dare suggest that neither Calvinism nor Arminianism is the curriculum of the

Great Commission? Why cooperate to disciple nations according to a doctrine, a theology, or a tradition that is not even inspired? Whatever one might think of Calvinism or Arminianism, neither are inspired sources of theology. That honor belongs only to the original texts of Scripture. Are we to join a cooperative effort to advance that which was never received according to grace for grace? Are we to move toward a “tradition for tradition” model for the Great Commission? What about the KOINE text? Does it contain the irreconcilable notions found within Calvinism and Arminianism? Do we have no better answer for the Hope that is among us, the Baptists, than Calvinism or Arminianism? Yes, we, the Baptists people do have something to say. Something that neither the world, nor its traditions have to say! It’s called KOINE. The KOINE “Common” *Script* is breathed out by the God and is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness; consequently, then, the man of God is adequately equipped for every good work; even, the Great Commission.

Why KOINE Apologetics?

Craig (2009) asked and answered the question: “What is apologetics? Apologetics (from the Greek *apologia*: a defense) is that branch of Christian theology which seeks to provide a rational justification for the truth claims of the Christian faith” (Kindle Location 144). The Case for KOINE Apologetics is an apologetic approach that is focused solely upon the Bible’s Languages. Koine, wherefore, is a primary core of all that KOINE apologetics asserts. KOINE texts are considered accordingly:

In the fullness of time, God fulfilled His promise to send His Son. What made two thousand years ago the right time? The KOINE Greek Language! God's perfect design was to use KOINE Greek when it was the COMMON language of the world so that every nation could understand the Right-announcement. More than that, KOINE is such a precise language, that when studied, one finds, like knowledge the OT Hebrew, no need to be bound by the endless false dilemmas, empty arguments, and vain philosophies found among those that refuse any exodus from their “Egyptianity” into true Christianity. KOINE facilitates our desire to come out and be separated from them. In a culture dominated by *conversational ecumenism*-It speaks Calvin or Arminius: it’s a virtual language of Ashdod- KOINE stands forever to equip God’s out-called people to remain peculiar, uniquely His, in words and practice: To speak the language spoken by the martyrs throughout all the durations. KOINE will teach you the value of your New Testament in the original language; empower you to meet your responsibility to do your own word studies, in order that you might know exactly what

God intended to communicate to you and others; and finally, demonstrate to you that the True and Living God did not leave you as an orphan, dependent upon the theological traditions, customs, creeds, and confessions of unnatural parentage.

Perfect Tense: Perfect Birth; Salvation

TEXT 1 John 5:1 Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him.

KOINE Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν γεννήσαντα, ἀγαπᾷ καὶ τὸν γεγεννημένον ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

KEV 1 John 5:1a Everyone who is believing that Jesus is the Christ, has been previously generated (and remains generated) out from the God...

The word γεγέννηται is perhaps the most important term in soteriology; for it speaks of the act of God to “generate” one from above. John is writing to provide “divine insight” for those actually born from above, in order that they might “notice” that “they” are having eternal life.

The word is in the perfect tense, which means that as (Davis, 1923) states “[it] expresses the continuance of completed action. It is then a combination of punctiliar action and durative action: This kind of action expressed by the perfect tense is sometimes called *perfective* action” (p. 152). A contemporary English term according to (Lamerson, 2004) is “εὕρηκά (found in Rev. 3:2). This is the famous word for ‘I found it’ that has essentially come across unchanged into our English language as ‘Eureka.’ It means that the person has found the answer to a particular problem and that the finding of this answer will have implications long after the actual finding is over” (p. 75).

The word γεγέννηται as a perfect tense describes for the child of God that the kind of birth experienced out from the God is a “perfect birth,” that is, a birth that is completed in the past with present, continuing results. The New Birth is a perfect birth. Thusly, the child of God is one who is generated out from the God and remains generated out from the God; further, the child of God is one who (because of his birth out from the God) is continuously believing (present tense-more on this later).

TEXT: Ephesians 2:8 For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God:

KOINE τῆ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον

KEV For you are ones who, having previously been delivered, *remain delivered* in the Grace through a trust, and this particular gift from God is not out from you,

The word σεσωσμένοι is also in the perfect tense; however, it is a perfect passive participle (actually it is a periphrastic perfect participle: That’s another lesson). It describes for the child of God a deliverance that has been completed in the past and is continuing in the present. The agency in the passive participle is the Grace (a personification of the Jesus, the Christ). The Jesus, the Christ, delivered the child of God in the past and continues to deliver him presently, continuously...always. The child of God experiences a “perfect” birth, and a “perfect” salvation subsequent to that perfect birth.

Thusly, for the KOINE Christian, understanding the new birth, and subsequent salvation equals understanding elements of KOINE like the perfect tense in 1 John 5:1, and the perfect passive participle in Ephesians 2:8. Both the perfect finite verb and the perfect passive participle convey to the Christian that their birth and salvation, like their Savior, are perfect, that is, completed actions with present continuing results. In neither case: one's birth out from God, or one's deliverance by the Christ will an Arminian tradition accommodate the Common "KOINE" text that dissolves once for all the embarrassing difficulty concerning the truth of a child of God's birth and salvation.

The Article: Jesus is God; Baptism and the Gospel

TEXT: Titus 2:13 Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;

KOINE προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

The ambiguity achieved by the English translations was neither intended, nor the belief of the original translators; nevertheless, the text is often the subject of a superimposed (imported) interpretation; specifically, the assertion that the phrase “the great God” is referring to the Father and the phrase “our Savior” is referring to Jesus Christ.

The KOINE text does not abandon the reader to decide if the phrases are referring to one person or two. Consequently, then, when communicated according to KOINE, the reader clearly reads the text accordingly: “...the great God, that is, our Savior, Jesus Christ.” According to KOINE’s usage of the “Article” the term “and” can be translated according to KOINE as “that is.” It is thusly translated because of a “Common” KOINE formula for nouns joined by “καὶ (and)” (Summers, 1950) simply states: “If the first of the two nouns has the article and the second does not, the two are one person (or thing)” (p. 130). The first noun in Titus 2:13 is “God,” that is, the God. The second noun is “Jesus Christ.” The formula, then, translates the text as “...the God...that is, Jesus Christ. The text refers to one person, according to KOINE, not two.

TEXT: Mark 16:16 He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.

KOINE ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθεὶς σωθήσεται ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας κατακριθήσεται

Applying the KOINE formula for “conjoined nouns” when the first has an article and the second does not to the *verbal* substantives in Mark 16:16 by only changing the word “and” to the phrase “that is” allows the text to read accordingly: “He that believeth, that is, is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” Thusly, one realizes that the writer is speaking of “one thing” not two. The one thing about which KOINE is speaking is “believe.” The term “baptized” further describes “believe.” Thus, KOINE does not support any traditional construct that would impose or extract a “baptismal regeneration doctrine onto or out from this text. KOINE dissolves the embarrassing difficulty associated with this text.

Present Tense: Calvinism and Arminianism

TEXT 1 John 5:1 Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him.

KOINE Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν γεννήσαντα, ἀγαπᾷ καὶ τὸν γεγεννημένον ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

1 John 5:1a Everyone who is believing that Jesus is the Christ, has been previously generated (and remains generated) out from the God...

Returning to this text allows the reader to observe how the “present tense” further dissolves the embarrassing difficulty between Calvinism and Arminianism. KOINE’s incomparable character will so dissolve the embarrassment as to leave the reader with no irreconcilables, paradoxes, or “blind spots.”

As (Davis, 1923) states: “The main idea of tense is the *‘kind of action.’*” Further he observes: “Continued action, or a state of incompleteness, is denoted by the present tense -this kind of action is called *durative or linear*” (p. 25). In the text, 1 John 5:1 KOINE places the birth out from God *prior to* the participle “everyone who is believing.” This participle is a “present” active participle; and, as such its action is continuous, durative: Linear. Linear has as its root the term “line.” For the critical observer, formatting the text according to KOINE will find the “birth out from the God” to be antecedent to the continuous action “believing.”

The entire difficulty between Calvinism and Arminianism-the embarrassing difficulty-lies in this one text; specifically, by ignoring the *present tense* which conveys continuous, durative, that is, linear action, Calvinism imports the idea that one is “born out from the God” *prior to* the Aorist tense (punctiliar) “kind of action.” Second, Arminianism does not attribute to the “birth out from the God” the cause or basis for the continuation or duration of faith.

That is, by Calvinism’s and Arminianism’s oversight of the present tense, the “pre-regeneration faith” and “lose one’s salvation” sects endure until this day; for no Calvinist can find within the KOINE Greek New Testament (any of the Greek New Testament texts), any occurrence in which the “New birth-the birth out from the God” appears *prior to* the punctiliar *kind of action* called Aorist. No Arminian can locate any text which does not attribute to the new birth the continuous kind of action conveyed in the present tense; for in 1 John alone “birth out from the God” precedes numerous “durative, continuous” kinds of actions: All in the present tense; all attributing their continuation to the new birth.

TEXT: John 20:31 But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.

KOINE ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ

KEV On the other hand, these *things* have been scripted *and remain scripted* in order that you all might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the God, and in order that, *while* believing, you all may be having life in His name.

The reader notices that in the KJV, the translators distinguished the Aorist and Present tenses by the terms “believe,” and “believing.” Notice “believe-aorist tense, punctiliar action,” and “believing-present tense, linear action.” John the Apostle carefully indicated in the KOINE text by the use of the two KOINE forms of the verb: πιστεύσητε and πιστεύοντες.

The first form is Aorist tense and translates as “believe.” The second is a Present tense and translates as “believing.” John the Apostle is he who placed “birth out from the God” *prior to* the continuous kind of action and; here in this text of John 20:31, he places the “written things” *prior to* “believe.” The KOINE text places the “written things” *prior to* the aorist kind of action “believe,” and birth out from the God *prior to* the present tense kind of action “believing.”

The KOINE “Common” language does not support Calvinism’s view that birth out from the God precedes the Aorist *kind of action* “believe.” Neither does the KOINE text support Arminianism’s view that the present tense *kind of action* “believing” is not the result of the antecedent act of “birth out from the God.” Neither Calvinism nor Arminianism follows the KOINE formulation, that is, neither systemic mental construct is derived from, nor reflects the KOINE text.

Preposition and Adverb: Rapture

TEXT: 1 Thessalonians 4:17 Then we which are alive *and* remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.

KOINE ἔπειτα ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι ἅμα
σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν
τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ἀέρα καὶ οὕτως πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ
ἔσόμεθα

KEV (Koine English Version) furthermore, we ourselves, the ones who are living, the ones who are being left around, will be seized away simultaneously together with them in clouds into a meeting of the Controller into an atmosphere, and thusly we will always be together with Controller.

With interest in the “**end times**” escalating from duration to duration, one of the most “novel” of ideas ever presented to Christians came in the form of a distinct “rapture.” That is, a “rapture” that existed independently from the Return of Christ and the Resurrection. The idea allowed for an arbitrary assignment of the Rapture, Resurrection, or Return to any text, regardless if the terms even occurred in the texts or not. I resorted to KOINE to initiate a simple study of the “rapture” for a disciple of Christ who sincerely wanted to know about the topic.

The term σὺν is a preposition. Prepositions according to (Davis, 1923) are “adverbs specialized to define more clearly the

meanings of cases, many of which come to be used in composition with verbs” (p. 44). The term $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ translates “together with.” According to (Dana & Mantey, 1927) “It is used almost exclusively with persons, and implies close fellowship or cooperation” (p. 111). The term preposition according to (Braun, 2013) means “‘Place before,’ i.e. prepositions are usually placed before the word which they join to the rest of the sentence” (p. 15). Finally, (Summers, 1950) states: “[The preposition] is so named because its position normally is immediately before the substantive with which it is associated” (p. 32).

Thusly, the preposition ($\sigma\upsilon\nu$ “together with”) is positioned before the pronoun “them.” The antecedent to that pronoun is the “dead who are raised first” when Christ returns. This KOINE text of 1 Thessalonians 4:17 unites in “close fellowship or cooperation” those of us living, that is, the ones left-around “together with” those believers who were first raised from the dead: KOINE does not disconnect the resurrected believers from those of us that are living, being left-around. That is, in the event of Christ’s return they are raised and “together with” them we are simultaneously seized-away. Also, the term $\alpha\mu\alpha$ as a preposition translates as “together,” and as an adverb translates “simultaneously,” or “at the same time.” So, between the preposition “together with,” and the adverb “simultaneously,” KOINE does not abandon this Bible teacher, nor any student wishing to learn about the Return of Christ, the resurrection of the dead saints, or the living saints being left-around; for, KOINE clearly states that we, the living, will be together with them in close fellowship and association; and, when seized-away together with the resurrected saints, it will be occur simultaneously.

Wherefore, of the endless theories that continue to be generated in these last days, no theory that dissociates the dead saints from the living saints, or disconnects the simultaneous nature of the “timing” of the resurrection of the dead in Christ from the seize-away of the living ones being left-around is in accordance to the KOINE formulation.

Adjective: What about a Free or Bound will?

TEXT: John 1:13 Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

KOINE οἱ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν

KEV who are generated, not out from bloods, neither out from a desire of flesh, nor out from a desire of a man, conversely, out from God.

The joy of KOINE is in its precision. (Braun, 2013) defines the adjective as “‘that which is thrown near’ — the noun or pronoun” (p. 1). However, the KOINE language does not find adding to, or taking away from nouns necessary, that is, “throwing words near” the original nouns or pronouns is not necessary to teach all the nations to be observing all things whatever things the Master Teacher commissioned to us.

So, as to the unnecessary grief that is generated around non-KOINE notions like throwing near the noun “will,” the terms “free” or “bound,” practitioners of such “throwing near” advance a false dilemma; namely, that also known as: false dichotomy, the either-or fallacy, either-or reasoning, fallacy of false choice, fallacy of false alternatives, black-and-white thinking, the fallacy of exhaustive hypotheses, bifurcation, excluded middle, no middle ground, polarization, etc., for if the KOINE text did not, and it does not, need phrases like “free will,” or “bound will,” then for what reason are we led to believe

either, and more: Why are we led to believe no better option exists?

Bible students know of another option than those artificially generated; namely, agent-causation. All KOINE Christians know that before English, the KOINE Greek texts existed; also, KOINE Christians know that before KOINE Greek was the Hebrew Old Testament. Within the Hebrew language, and long before KOINE, a text had been scripted, and remains on record that perfectly indicates that thing that existed long before any ideas of a “free or bound” will.

TEXT: 2 Chronicles 20:20 And they rose early in the morning, and went forth into the wilderness of Tekoa: and as they went forth, Jehoshaphat stood and said, Hear me, O Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem; Believe in the LORD your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper.

The term “Believe” in both of its occurrences appear in the Hiphil Imperative form. The Hiphil Imperative form appears 731 times in the Hebrew Old Testament. So, 731 times an agent or agents are commanded to cause or to be causing an agent or agents to do something.

That is, the Hiphil is a causative active stem that appears in both the Perfect (complete) and Imperfect (incomplete) states of the Hebrew verb system. Considering only the sentence in the text “Believe in the LORD your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper” the Hiphil Imperatives “Believe” translates accordingly: “You (all) cause You (all) to believe in the LORD your God, so shall ye be established; You

(all) cause You (all) to believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper” (HEV-Hebrew English Version).

Wherefore, then, the KOINE text needed no such terms as “free or bound” to throw near a noun or pronoun within its text; for, the Hebrew text that antedates KOINE did not abandon the KOINE language to resort to such abstract, unintelligible notions. An observation of John Locke states:

[He] liked the idea of Freedom and Liberty. He thought it was inappropriate to describe the Will itself as Free. The Will is a Determination. It is the Man who is Free: I think the question is not proper whether the Will be free; but whether a man be free. This way of talking, nevertheless, has prevailed, and, as I guess, produced great confusion," he said. It has and still does produce confusion. In chapter XXI, Of Power, in his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Locke calls the question of Freedom of the Will *unintelligible*. But for Locke, it is only because the adjective "free" applies to the agent, not to the will, which is determined by the mind, and determines the action.

Retrieved from

www.informationphilosopher.com

However, logical, and impressive the reasoning of men might be, the Hebrew Scriptures surpass them all. For, the Hebrew text does not teach even “free agency;” although that is an intelligible notion, and does “attach the adjective” free to the agent rather than to a mere attribute of the agent like that of a “will or desire.” KOINE does not impose the assumption upon

its reader that one must possess a desire free from anything; especially, a desire free from “sin.

Nevertheless, because men are causative-agents according to the Hebrew language-the Hebrew Bible-the Old Testament Scriptures, the Bible does convey the urgency for a human agent (person) to cause a human agent (person)-especially himself- to believe the LORD and be established; for any human agent (person) to cause any human agent (person) to believe His prophets, so shall they prosper. It’s called evangelizing the nations: An imperative that it be done.

Although this KOINE Christian is aware that both the philosophies of both Libertarianism and Compatibilism are somewhat reluctant to recognize mankind as causative-agents, the veracity of that reality, like all Scriptural assertions, are not offered as an option, rather scripted as a command for all that listen to mind-after the Gospel and cause themselves to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.

“You cause you” is not only a form of a Hebrew command, but a basis for the statement: “You cause you to believe or disbelieve.” Although not in the imperative form, it is an absolutely true statement that you (the person) cause you (the person) to believe or to disbelieve. The Bible never commands one to disbelieve, but only records the occasions in which men do so. This common observation might fail to contribute to the fields of psychology, or philosophy; but, it does much to advance the work of fulfilling the Great Commission. How many hours, years, even lifetimes have been consumed, *and remain consumed* by ministering to fabulous ideas like those concerning a “free or bound will” which only minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith?

Ignoring KOINE

TEXT: John 20:31 But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.

KOINE ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ

KEV On the other hand, these *things* have been scripted and remain scripted in order that you all might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the God, and in order that, *while* believing, you all may be having life in His name.

The word ἵνα is a conjunction that according to (Dana & Mantey, 1927) “Its most common occurrence is in purpose or final clauses, and it occurs regularly with the subjunctive mood...Its full translation when final is *in order that*” (p. 248). This usage indicates that the purpose for “these things [to] have been scripted, and remain scripted” was *in order that* you all might believe (punctiliar action-the simplest form of action) that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and (it’s a compound purpose) *in order that* by believing (linear action-continuous action), you all may be having (continuous action-linear) life in His name.

Therefore, the lessons, the signs, and all the content of the Gospel of John according to which the *written things, signs* are contextualized are all, each one, scripted for the express purpose that you might believe! Following texts will illustrate

the tragic results of ignoring KOINE, that is, the purpose that KOINE indicates by its use of the conjunction ἵνα.

TEXT: John 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

KOINE Οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχη ζωὴν αἰώνιον

KEV for the God thusly loves the world; consequently, He gives the only generated Son, in order that everyone who is believing into Him might not be destroyed, conversely, may be having durative life,

The most beloved text in the entire Bible, John 3:16 is filled with certainty, hope, commitment, faith, love and joy for all that read it; however, because “ignoring KOINE” has been, and continues to be somewhat prevalent, even John 3:16 has come under the flummox of those that aspire to “defend” it, or “properly interpret” it: Both sides of the fallacious argument tout their good intentions; but, what of the text when it is returned to its original context and taught according to its original purpose?

John 3:16 states that God’s love for the world-the sending of His Son-was in order that everyone who is believing (continuous action-linear) into Him might not be destroyed; conversely, he may be having (continuous action) durative life! So, the term ἵνα identifies the purpose for the manner in which

God loved the world; specifically, *in order that* everyone who is believing might not be destroyed. The reader recalls that one who is continually believing is one that was first born from above, that one born from above had first believed the Gospel (the things written in John's Gospel). So, when reading John 3:16, one sees God's love for the world to provide for those that believe the Gospel, then are born out from God, then, because of the birth out from the God, they are continuously believing into Him. But, when KOINE is ignored, religionists of every stripe suggest that the text speaks only to some, while others tout that it speaks to all; however, the clear purpose indicated by KOINE "*in order that* everyone who is believing might not be destroyed" is also governed by the super-ordinate purpose for the entire Gospel of John; namely, *in order that* you all might believe (punctiliar action-the simplest form of action) that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God! Minding-after the KOINE text finds the reader enjoying John 3:16 precisely because it demonstrates God's gracious provision for everyone who is believing (*continuous action*), *in order that* you all (that read it, or hear it preached) might believe (punctiliar action-the simplest form of action). Therefore, in KOINE English, one rejoices that the text John 3:16 resulted to have been scripted *and remains scripted, in order that* you all might believe! KOINE knows of no reason for the arguments about John 3:16 except for the singular act of "ignoring KOINE."

TEXT John 6:44, 45 No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.

KOINE οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με ἐλκύσῃ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις Καὶ ἔσονται πάντες διδασκατοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πᾶς οὖν ὁ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μαθὼν ἔρχεται πρὸς με

KEV Not even one is able to come toward Me if the Father Who sent Me might not draw him, and I Myself will stand him up in the last day. It is having been scripted and remaining scripted in the prophets: And all will be instructed *ones* of God. Everyone who hears from alongside the Father, that is, who learns is coming toward Me,

The singular act of “ignoring KOINE” will again demonstrate the unnecessary difficulties by which so many KOINE Christians are plagued; specifically, the negation of the proper use of the above text. When using a text-the student of KOINE will find every text, like love, to be useful-like John 6:44, 45, the practitioner of KOINE will not find the assumptions that cognitive, or affective biases generate to diminish the returns in his search of the unsearchable riches: He will be richly rewarded.

The text above is a response by Jesus to religious “grumblers” who presumed to withhold their allegiance from Christ, rather preferring to diminish and ridicule Him and those that followed; however, Jesus startles them with His audacious remark that found their grumbling vain or empty. He clearly stated that not even one man is able to come toward Him if the Father Who sent Him might not draw that person. Recalling the purpose of all the “written things” in John’s Gospel; specifically, that they were written *in order that* you all might believe, the KOINE Christian can quickly dispel any superimposed ideas traditionally imposed upon this text. For, the text is clearly

explained by Jesus Himself concerning those whom the Father refused to “draw” toward Jesus His Son.

Remember, it was written *in order that you all might believe!* So, when that purpose governs the text, then verse 45 becomes very helpful. Jesus said “It is having been scripted and remaining scripted in the prophets: And all will be instructed *ones* of God. Everyone who hears from alongside the Father, that is, who learns is coming toward Me.”

Thusly, Jesus establishes that the Father-God is He Who sent the prophets, the prophets bore witness of the coming Lamb from God-they preached the Gospel to everyone-(all were instructed *to cause themselves to listen and learn the gospel*) and those that listened and learned the gospel from the prophets whom the Father, that is, God sent was “coming toward Jesus!”

Coming toward Jesus was only because the Father sent prophets-forerunners to Christ-and only those that listened (punctiliar action) and *subsequently* learned (punctiliar-the simplest form of action) came to Him. Thus, Jesus indicted the religionists then as He does so today for presuming to “come to Him” apart from that which the Father did; specifically, to “draw” them to Jesus. The religionists wanted to presume that rejecting Jesus had no relationship with their refusal to “listen and learn” from His Father, the True and Living God.

The super-ordinate purpose for the lesson, like all the written things in John’s Gospel, was *in order that you all*, unlike those indicted ones depicted in John’s Gospel, might believe (simplest form of action) that Jesus is the Christ (something the religionists did not do; for they would not believe the prophets whom the Father sent; namely, the message of Jesus that they preached).

TEXT: John 10:11 I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.

KOINE: Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων

KEV: I Myself am the excellent Shepherd. The excellent Shepherd is placing His soul on behalf of the sheep.

A Scripture of great comfort and one of incomparable disclosure of the love of the Good Shepherd, John 10:11 has sustained KOINE Christians throughout the durations, finding them trusting the One that loved them so much as to give his life for them, His sheep. By the singular act of “ignoring KOINE,” this glorious text is impugned by other minds, seeking only to impose their purpose onto the Gospel. Jesus giving of His life for the sheep is a written record of His exclusive work that was incomparable to that of religionists, that is, hirelings.

The purpose for the text “I Myself am the excellent Shepherd. The excellent Shepherd is placing His soul on behalf of the sheep” was not in order that one might “pick a side” among the fallacious arguments generated by the singular act of “ignoring KOINE,” on the other hand, these *things* have been scripted *and remain scripted*, in order that you all might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the God, and in order that, *while* believing, you all may be having life in His name. Ignoring KOINE cannot be over emphasized; for, some of the most powerful texts of all Scripture are reduced to “talking points” or mere fodder for foolish speech.

How does the text of His love for His sheep become subjected to questions like: “For whom did Jesus die?” He died for His sheep! But for the singular act of “ignoring KOINE” the account of Jesus’ death for His sheep was scripted and remains on record *in order that* you all might believe that He is the Christ!

The account would not have been, *nor remain* very efficacious in achieving its purpose for having been written were it to have stated that “The Good Shepherd gives His life for the wolves!” The deliverance provided by the Good Shepherd also includes for His sheep a deliverance from wolves, as well as, from our sins! Amen!

Aorist Tense

TEXT: John 20:31 But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.

KOINE ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ

KEV On the other hand, these *things* have been scripted and remain scripted in order that you all might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the God, and in order that, *while* believing, you all may be having life in His name.

As (Davis, 1923) states: “As has already been learned, the fundamental idea in tense is ‘kind of action’ ... The aorist tense expresses action in its simplest form—undefined... the aorist tense treats the action as a point” (p. 78). One aspect of the Good News about the Gospel is the fact that its purpose is *in order that* you all might believe that Jesus is the Christ! The kind of action expected to be performed by the hearer of the gospel is the “simplest form of action.” While religionists “qualify” the idea of man’s ability or lack thereof, the gospel of His grace actually “quantifies” man’s ability by expecting only from a hearer of the good news, the gospel, the right-announcement the performance of the simplest form of action; namely, “believe!”

The Gospel of John is written for the purpose that one might perform the simplest form of action “believe.” Calvinism states that this simplest form of action cannot be performed prior

to the birth out from the God; however, KOINE does not concur. KOINE places the Gospel “prior to” the simplest form of action “believe.” Further, KOINE records the “birth out from the God” as that which is antecedent to the continuous form of action “believing.” Understanding the aorist, like understanding the present tense forever dissolves the embarrassing difficulty that has unnecessarily plagued Missionary Baptists for centuries. But, praise be to God, KOINE removes the plague once for all!

Participles: Words that Participate

TEXT: Matthew 28:18-20 And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, *even* unto the end of the world. Amen.

KOINE καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος Ἀμήν

KEV And after He approached, Jesus spoke to them saying: Every authority in heaven and upon the earth is given to Me.

28:19 Therefore, when you transport yourselves, initiate all the nations, *by* merging them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,

28:20 *by* instructing them to be observing all things, as many things as, I commission to you. Indeed notice: I Myself am with you all the days until the consummation of the duration.

(Dana & Mantey, 1927) state: “The participle, like the infinitive, is not a mood but a verbal substantive” (p. 220). Also,

(Dana & Mantey, 1927) state: “The instrumental participle may indicate the means by which the action of the main verb is accomplished” (p. 228). (Braun, 2013) observes participles to be: “words that ‘participate’ in the formation of a sentence” (p. 13).

KOINE’s use of present active participles in the great commission indicates the means by which the action of the main verb is accomplished; specifically, the term μαθητεύσατε is an aorist active imperative 2nd person plural. The imperative is the main verb, the instrumental participles “merging” and “instructing” indicate the means by which the action “to initiate all the nations” according to the Great Commission is accomplished. The work required to learn KOINE is much less arduous, and much more productive than the futile labor of seeking to ascertain abstract philosophical concepts that are foreign to Bible languages: Its words, syntax, etymology, grammar, and context.

Religious Constructs

All religious constructs are influenced by numerous biases. Both the Constructor and the construct are skewed accordingly:

“**Construct**” as a verb (transitive) means to compose or to frame mentally an argument, assertion, or even a sentence; as a noun the term refers to anything formulated or systematically constructed. A construct can be a very complex idea or thought that is the product of a synthesis of multiple simpler ideas. Further, a construct can be a model constructed for the purpose of correlating observable realities with theoretical ones.

The finitude of mankind assures that it is inevitable that all religious constructs will have some kind of flawed element, making all of them fallible. As far as divine conceptual constructs go, then, a finite man lacks any corresponding reality for his concepts. The finitude of a religious man betrays him, leading him to persist in his construction process, persuading himself that he is right. When a religious, finite constructor proceeds according to known fallacies, he might overly concern himself with fields outside the Bible, caring more that his religious, fallible construct not contradict finite philosophy or logic.

As a result, when one constructs a religious construct, one tends to co-depend upon certain rules of thumb, or heuristics, that help him to make sense out of the complex and uncertain field of religion. However, sometimes these heuristics lead to skewed and systematic errors in the constructing process.

These Systematic errors (like errors of omission, and omission biases) are those that appear time and time again. They seem to arise from a series of cognitive biases in the way that religious constructors process Biblical texts and reach judgments.

Because of cognitive biases, many religious constructors are certain to make poor hermeneutical judgments. They are religious, fallible constructs, because they depend for their existence and character on the ingredients of which they are constructed and the pattern or structure the biases that they inherit in the process. On the other hand, the texts are infallible, spiritual constructs, because their construction occurs according to the process of Divine inspiration.

Divinely inspired Scripts: Infallible Constructs unlike human-made constructs (which are similarly constructs of religious, and traditional elements: they are not teleologically determined to fulfill some divine purpose) are Divinely inspired infallible constructs teleologically constructed to fulfill the divine purpose; specifically, as scripted:

πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν πρὸς ἔλεγχον, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ

Each Script is a God-breathed Script and is a profitable Script toward doctrine, toward reproof, toward fully-upright orthodoxy, toward training in the righteousness.

Scripts are Divine constructs. Religious constructs, on the other hand, are constituted by skewed ingredients-biases-

and, because such biases are not genuinely infinite; and, of course not infallible.

These religious constructs are oral, flawed mixtures with no autonomous inspired status: They are not constructs-that-are inspired, that is, God-breathed. A number of biases have been verified repeatedly among religious studies, so one can be reasonably sure that these biases exist and that all religious constructors are prone to them.

The prior hypothesis bias refers to the fact that religious constructors who have strong prior beliefs about the relationship between two or more concepts tend to construct according to these beliefs, even when presented with evidence that their beliefs are incorrect, that is, unscripted.

Moreover, they tend to seek and use information that is consistent with their prior beliefs (source bias) while ignoring information (source avoidance) that contradicts those beliefs.

A Maze of Minutiae

But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep.

—Jesus, the Good Shepherd

As one who came to appreciate Christian counseling, (currently a student of the field of Christian counseling) I was particularly struck by the adverse effects, the negative externalities, of the continual production of seemingly endless Philo-religious constructs.

The question I asked myself: Are they becoming a source of despicable dissonance, even among Christians?

Just how are people-God's people- faring who are caused to navigate through an increasingly complex Maze of Philo-religious Constructs doing, that is, are they growing to the full measure of Christ, becoming conformed to His image, realizing the benefits of participating in the New Covenant, while enjoying the benefits of the harmonious –arrangement afforded in strategically localized assemblies throughout the communities where they live?

A very popular example of despicable dissonance is that ever-growing dissonance over the *Philo-religious* constructs concerning the terms Freewill, and Free Will:

A *Philo-religious* construct: Libertarianism is one of the main philosophical positions related to the problems of free will

and determinism, which are part of the larger domain of metaphysics.

A note: The phrase “*problems of free will*” does not exist in the Bible: Neither the phrase nor the problems. The “problems” of the undefined phrase “free will” exist outside the Bible.

Another *Philo-religious* construct: Compatibilism is the belief that free will and determinism are compatible ideas, and that it is possible to believe both without being logically inconsistent. Compatibilists believe freedom can be present or absent in situations for reasons that have nothing to do with metaphysics.

A note: Neither of these *Philo-religious* constructs exist within Scripture; however, the dissonance generated, the despicable dissonance has permeated the fellowship of numerous Christian communities, even His called-out bodies of baptized believers who have covenanted together in order to carry-out the Great Commission.

Where’s the compassion when even preachers, so-called, join in the false argument of “picking” which free will/freewill *Philo-religious* construct to believe? Or worse, to not teach what the Bible actually states about the relationship of a subject to her or his actions; especially, when it comes to the action of believing?

Counselors, students of the Scriptures, mentally-position counselees: Mentally-position them according to the Scriptures. They do NOT generate further dissonance by ignoring its despicable nature, neither by contributing to increased

dissonance by coercing a counselee to make a false choice between two Philo-religious constructs!

A demonstration of Compassionate Consonance:

The response below is an actual response that was prescribed by a Biblical Counselor as the antidote for an ailing patient, a child of God, a sheep hungering for green grass and thirsting for still waters:

In the Bible; initially, in the sentence of Genesis 15:6 “And he believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness,” one can observe this text carefully and notice from the context that Abraham is the subject, and; in the full sense, he (Abraham) is described as the one who causes the subject, “he” to believe in the LORD.

Note: This notion of causing a (grammatical object) to participate as a subject in the action is represented in the Hiphil stem: An easily learned and infallibly reliable material source for the cure that ails so many. This is what the Bible actually teaches, and is not a source of further dissonance, rather the cure for despicable dissonance. As to the amount of work it would take for a trained Koine-counselor to extract this cure from the Bible: Approximately 5 minutes!

The Bible’s description of Abraham’s action is sufficient for anyone to know the truth about anyone’s relationship to the act to believe. One can then cause one’s self to believe the Bible, or reject the Bible and prefer a Philo-religious construct and its corresponding flummoxes.

Christians, and their neighbors are not being honestly dealt-with when they are invited into a *Philo-religious flummox*, more rather, they are being toyed-with by Philo-religious practitioners whose sheep are no their own; for, such practitioners are hirelings who care for themselves, not the sheep, so that when they see the Philo-religious practitioner coming, they flee, allowing the sheep to be scattered by the practitioners Philo-religious flummoxes. Therefore, the Biblical Counselor can express genuine compassion toward a sheep, or a lost individual, by informing them of the Truth of Scriptures; namely, that to no *Philo-religious* practitioner must she or he resort, rather to a God-called pastor, a counselor that will rightly handle the Word of God, and not offer conjecture rather than Scripture.

A Purpose of a Different Kind

From a sermon by Charles Spurgeon-

"But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth: Whereunto he called you by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ." —2 Thessalonians 2:13-14.

There is nothing in Scripture which may not, under the influence of God's Spirit, be turned into a practical discourse: for "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable" for some purpose of spiritual usefulness. It is true, it may not be turned into a free-will discourse—that we know right well—but it can be turned into a practical free-grace discourse: and free-grace practice is the best practice, when the true doctrines of God's immutable love are brought to bear upon the hearts of saints and sinners. Retrieved from <http://www.spurgeon.org/sermons/0041.htm>

Brother Charles H. Spurgeon well states that "there is nothing in Scripture that may not...be turned into a practical discourse;" however, he qualified it (although, very subjectively) with the phrase "under the influence of God's Spirit. The phrase "turned into" is exactly where the other purpose can become; namely, a purpose for a discussion super-imposed, [through eisegesis], rather than, explicated through exegesis!

Dr. Charles H. Spurgeon did not bother to note that the term "chosen" was actually the term "aireomai" from which the term

“preferred” is derived, or the transliteral term, noun-form, “heresy” comes. Nevertheless, he proceeded with that blind-spot, knowingly, or unknowingly-let the reader adjudicate him. It’s only an expression of bias: Something against which all interpreters must contend.

However, noteworthy, is the fact of “turning” some Scripture “into” a practical discourse, allowing for one, while disallowing the other; particularly, the imported discussion about freewill or free-grace.

Considering an excerpt of “Exploring the Attributes” of God by Robert Morey, the reader can further contemplate the realities of constructors and their construction process: It can often be for a different purpose than that for which the text was written.

Dr. Robert Morey stated:

Over the years we have observed a process of apostasy that begins with the rejection of the mystery of God’s sovereignty and then proceeds to the rejecting of the mystery of the inerrancy of Scripture, the authority of Scripture, the incomprehensibility of God, the infinite nature of God, the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit, the sinful nature of man, the historicity of Biblical miracles, the accuracy of the Gospel narratives, and the eternal punishment of the wicked.

The driving force that pushes people down this path of apostasy is their refusal to bow in humility before the Word of God. They will not accept the many seemingly

conflicting statements of Scripture. They cannot abide mystery in any form. Whatever cannot be rationally explained, they will eventually throw out. They always assume the Greek 'either-or' dichotomy in every issue and refuse to acknowledge the 'both-and' solution of Scripture because it would throw the issue back into mystery.

We grow weary of hearing that we must choose either God's sovereignty or man's responsibility. Why is it always assumed that we can't accept both? Why do processians assume that if man is free, God must be bound? Why is it assumed that divine election and evangelism cannot both be true? So what if we can't resolve all the questions that humanistic philosophers raise? Ought we not to please God rather than man?"

Retrieved from

http://www.faithdefenders.com/articles/theology/idolatry_t.html

Is not his description of the "processians," a descriptor, a construct, that conveys in *metonymy* the entirety of those that presume the need to "process" Scripture into an array of "dead constructs?"

Living Theism does *NOT* find such processing (categorizing: katēgoreō) "*accusing* in the English Bible) necessary: *Accusing* is simply what religionists do...If they did not preoccupy with the process of accusing others, then with what else would they be occupied? The Great Commission, perhaps?

If one states that a particular construct is preferred over another, the reasons for such a preference do not always include biases, pre-primed memes, nor any other reality associated with one's traditions; for, a constructor finds himself unwilling to recognize the fallibility of the construct of his own processing.

One constructor, a "*processian*," once elaborated at great length about his preferred construct, stating; however, that "*he might be wrong*." Nevertheless, when one of the constructor's adherents was later overheard praising the constructor's humility to acknowledge "*I might be wrong*," the adherent became very angered, when asked by the hearer: "*What might be wrong with it?*" The source of the adherent's anger: Source bias, source avoidance...the preference for consonance; for, the adherent expressly stated that he had thought that he had "*all of this worked-out (processed into a construct)*."

The desire to have all of this *worked-out* had temporarily relieved the adherent from any further need of Scripture, any further need to process (construct) eschatological elements into a construct any further...he assumed that he could move forward and simply impose his construct onto others, while preferring to ally himself with those that agreed with it/him, providing himself with the highly coveted *social currency* necessary for sectarianism and the belittling (like the "certain ones" which trusted in themselves that they were right, and despised others) of others that don't process Scriptures accordingly.

God's Omniscience and Living Theism

Succinctly stated, Living Theism is asserted according to the reified elements more often overlooked within the constructs of Open, Closed or Relational and Classical Theism.

Within the Scriptures, are influences, along with living realities that, when included, present a theism unique to the Holy Bible.

Dual Causal Agents within Scripture

God, the Divine Causal Agent:

And **the LORD God caused** a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof;

-Genesis 2:21

Abram, a Human Causal Agent:

And he [**caused himself to believe**] believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness.

-Genesis 15:6

Evidently, in the Scriptures, one finds no material suitable to frame a better construct, than that one which the Scriptures themselves are: God has given us His divine Construct, His Scripted Scriptures. To accurately depict the attributes of God, therefore, one need only be faithful to the texts.

The novel categories called “Open and Closed” theisms both begin with a constructed end and work/process their hearer accordingly; however, beginning with the divinely inspired construct: “Living God,” one admittedly, finds a “Living theism,” that results in a much more developed construct, that is, a construct that does not need to exclude the absolute truth concerning man’s causal agency; that does not find God’s causal agency problematic; rather very informative in teaching a disciple the Truth concerning God’s divine Construct, the Scriptures.

When speaking of God’s Omniscience, quite an inconsistency emerges from both the Arminian and Calvinistic Constructs; namely, the seemingly complete subjectivity in rationalizing the texts that defy categorization; specifically, consider when a religionist defends Jesus’s omniscience by arbitrarily asserting “limitations” upon Jesus because He, God’s Mono-gene, became a human being. Religionists state that since Jesus “grew in wisdom” (Luke 2:52) or because in Matthew 21:19, Jesus failed to know that a fig tree was barren before he got to it (Matt. 21:19), then; subjectively, He is pronounced “omniscient” precisely because of His ignorance, or more surprisingly, when Jesus is portrayed as NOT knowing the time of His own second coming in Matthew 24:36, then religionists who rally to rationalize His omniscience, adamantly affirm that this is because of the “limitations” due to the Eternal Mono-gene becoming human.

Regrettably, however, if a reader of the Bible finds the Father of Jesus the Eternal Mono-gene asking questions, or expressing “real-time” experiences between Himself and His

creatures, God is said to no longer be “omniscient” if these things were actually so.

Perhaps here one usually inserts anthropopathisms; for, everyone knows that the best way to understand God is to view Him, the Wholly Other One, through an anthropomorphic lens:

The height of constructors’ conflict in their irrational, inconsistent apologetic; for, it is replete with biases. How could one assert that God, the Father of the Eternal Mono-gene, is unable to “limit” Himself in relation to time and space? How is it so easy to “explain and defend: give a rationale” for the omniscience of Jesus, but seemingly impossible to do so in relation to the Father?

Although Omniscience is defended to be God’s attribute of “having all knowledge, as well as, being the source of all knowledge,” it seems to be troublesome for those that find Jesus’s demonstration of Omniscience to be insufficient for understanding God’s Omniscience: Were it not for the forging of previous constructs concerning “omniscience,” then Jesus’s demonstration of “*omniscience of God among men*” would be the textbook explanation of God’s omniscience.

A reader could then enjoy reading the Bible narratives that convey a “Living God” communicating in “time” with His “living souls.” But, the doctrine called “Living Theism” needs no constructor, or a “processian” to “process” it; for, that “construct” was, is and forever shall remain divinely scripted, that is, constructed. God’s omniscience needs no qualification

according to any particular person in the divine Godhead—
Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are all by *hypo-stasis* omniscient.

The Bible reader can recognize that both God and man
are causal agents in time and space, correctly depicted within no
other book than that one called the Holy Bible: The Wholly Holy
Bible, the unique, divinely inspired Bible, written like no other.

Atonement According to KOINE's Context

I John

1:9 If we are similarly-speaking our particular negative-testimonies, then He is a Faithful One, and a Just One, in order that He might release the negative-testimonies; for us and might purify us away from all injustice,

1:10 If we might say that we have not negatively-testified, then we are making Him a liar, and His particular Word is not in us.

I JOHN CHAPTER TWO

2:1 My children, I am scripting these things to you all, in order that you all might not negatively-testify: Indeed, if a certain one might negatively-testify, then we are having a Pleader toward the Father of Jesus Christ, the Just One.

2:2 Indeed, He Himself is the conciliation concerning our particular negative-testimonies, but not concerning our particular negative-testimonies only; conversely, concerning also the entire order.

In the above texts the reader observes that a "Pleader" is graciously afforded those whom John called "My children."

The basis for "My children" to have confidence that their sins are forgiven while confessing (continual, sustained action that follows being generated out from the God) them is the Pleader!

The basis for their need of a “Pleader” is their sins. Sin demands conciliation: The children of God are culpable for the blood of Christ, their culpability is their need for a Pleader; likewise, the entire order is culpable of the blood of Christ; yet the entire order-the order composed of those outside of Christ-has NO PLEADER!

Christ’s death with reference to redemption is Kinsman; with reference to conciliation of the Father, it is the basis of both the culpability of the entire order, and the continuous confession of children of God. Christ’s blood alone conciliated the Father.

His conciliatory blood is a demonstration for the culpability of the entire order: However, the entire order has *NO Pleader!* The text contrasts those with a Pleader with those without one!

Baptismal Regeneration

The phrase “Baptismal Regeneration” is the name of a “construct” that conveys to the reader or hearer, that some type of water baptism [The types and modes vary and are as numerous as the religions, religionists, traditions, and denominations that advocate the name: “Baptismal Regeneration”] is required, imposed, or administered, in order that generation [Birth, or New Birth], in part, might be achieved, initiated, or sustained.

The “**complexity**” of the construct known by the name: Baptismal Regeneration has generated so much chaos that even its advocates are wary to fully embrace it, as in the case of a very prolific author within Christendom, Max Lucado, who so de-emphasizes the name, Baptismal Regeneration, that many of his ardent fans and followers would have to be told that he is a practitioner of the art, and former advocate of the doctrine called: **Baptismal Regeneration**.

Also, the complexity of the construct and the conjoined realities of the chaos that has ensued for centuries are seldom evaluated according to the KOINE texts. First, the phrase, the name: “Baptismal Regeneration” does not appear anywhere in any KOINE text. Second, no text appears in any KOINE New Testament that contains the term Baptize and Regenerate, neither any text that includes Generate and Baptize.

Mark 16:16

TEXT: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.

KOINE ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθεὶς σωθήσεται ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας κατακριθήσεται

Applying the KOINE formula for “**conjoined nouns**” when the first has an article and the second does not to the verbal substantives in Mark 16:16 by only changing the word “**and**” to the phrase “that is” allows the text to read accordingly:

“He that believeth, that is, is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” (KEV)

Thusly, one realizes that the writer is speaking of “**one thing**” not two. The one thing about which KOINE is speaking is “**believe.**” The term “**baptized**” further describes “**believe.**” Thus, KOINE does not support any traditional construct that would impose or extract a “**baptismal regenerative**” doctrine onto or out from this text. KOINE dissolves the embarrassing difficulty associated with this text.

Further, one can observe that in Mark 16:16, the appearance of the terms “**water, or regenerate**” does not occur.

For the advocate of any form of the multi-variate doctrines called by the same name: “**Baptismal Regeneration,**” a KOINE text would need to exist that would translate into something like this:

He that believeth and is baptized into water by someone that also has been so baptized, for the purpose of being regenerated, that is, for the purpose of having one's sins remitted, then she or he shall be saved, that is, born from above; but he that believeth not, as demonstrated by her or his refusal to be baptized into water accordingly, then she or he shall be damned.

After these numerous additions to the text, then Mark 16:16 begins to transform into that form otherwise omitted in all the KOINE New Testaments.

No Water for Baptismal Regeneration

As an apologist, one must clarify for the pre-primed advocates of Baptismal regeneration, as well as, those pre-primed against Missionary Baptists Apologists. That is, as a Missionary Baptist disallows for water in any particular text, and likewise demonstrates its impossibility, certain ones might present symptoms of pre-priming, that is, negative radicalizing that find such a person so primed as to be willing to accuse the Missionary Baptist apologist of advocating something called: **“Spirit baptism.”**

The accusation stems from a willingness to ignore the context in which a Missionary Baptist Apologist disallows water in any particular text; specifically, the contextually reality called: **“No water for Baptismal Regeneration.”**

The Missionary Baptist Apologist will not find water in any text for the purpose of advocating **“Baptismal Regeneration,”** nor will he find **“Baptismal Regeneration”** in texts that do mention water baptism.

Regrettably, even this faithful Apologetics and Outreach Ministry of the Landmark Missionary Baptist Church in Jacksonville, Arkansas has incurred the accusations by pre-primed, radicalized religionists who adamantly condemn our work stating: **“If not water baptism, then you are advocating a spiritualized kind of baptism.”** To which we at IAmKOINE.org, and Landmark Missionary Baptist Church graciously reply: **“No water”** refers only to **“water for the purpose of Baptismal Regeneration;”** however regrettable that extreme and completely unfounded accusation might be, a Missionary Baptist

Apologist will not find “**water for baptismal regeneration**” in even one KOINE New Testament; nor will any religionist find a Missionary Baptist permitting any water baptism for the completely alien purpose called: “**Baptismal Regeneration.**”

Antitypical Immersion

The water baptism that one will receive from Missionary Baptists is called: “**Antitypical.**” The term “**antitypical**” is the KOINE term found in 1 Peter 3:21 that states:

“The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ:” (KJV).

“which now an antitypical merger is also delivering us, not by a stand-away from filth of flesh; conversely, by a stipulation of a good conscience into God through resurrection of Jesus Christ” (KEV).

Thus, one can easily notice that the name: “**Antitypical**” is not the name “**Baptismal Regeneration;**” for it is a name for the kind of baptism that directly corresponds (anti) in type with the Flood of Noah. Through this kind of baptism, the “**Antitypical**” kind, not the imagined “**regenerative kind**” is one so baptized delivered “**in corresponding type**” just as Noah was delivered in actuality by the Flood.

Noah was delivered through the Flood waters from the compromised as well as the tyrannical hordes with which the compromised had conjoined themselves. Without the water, Noah’s divinely designed Ark would have been destroyed just as Noah and his family. Likewise, when one is baptized with water today, that is, baptized with water by those who have likewise received “antitypical” water baptism, then that one is

united into the localized Assembly which administered the **“antitypical”** immersion.

Thus, for those extremists that deny the Bible doctrine of **“antitypical”** immersion, or advocate a **“spirit kind of baptism,”** do so while ignoring the unique (one) kind of baptism that finds those who administer it and those who receive it to be delivered **“in exact type”** through it as Noah was **“actually”** delivered through the Flood waters from the tyrannical hordes that sought only to harm him and his family.

Accordingly, then, those who receive antitypical immersion, are in exact-type as delivered from all that the Blood of Christ previously purchased them as Noah was completely delivered through the Flood waters from those that rejected God or compromised with those who had.

This **“stigma”** of baptism, antitypical baptism with water, administered by New Testament Assemblies stems from their enemies’ recognition of their deliverance (exodus) out from among them, the severance of ties with all that Christ has purchased, that is, redeemed them. Antitypical immersion is a believer’s **“way out”** from the world’s religions, theistic traditions, and worldly orders that, prior to redemption had once held them.

Consequently, then, through Scriptural, antitypical immersion, all who believe the Gospel exit, that is, are delivered from the world’s **“Egyptianity”** into one of the Lord’s strategically localized Assemblies: Assemblies localized throughout all the world: The historically unprecedented exodus, deliverance

achieved through “**antitypical**” immersion has left a legacy of love for God known as the Trail of Blood!

Were antitypical-immersion by water not available for those who have believed the Gospel, been regenerated through it, then how else could worldly ties be severed? How else could one “**come out**” from among them and be delivered? How could believers be delivered from their state-religious persecutors?

Martyrs Mirror stated:

From the time of Christ to the end of the world, God, through Christ, has taken away the ceremonies of the Mosaic law as well as the signs by which it is sealed; and, to the acknowledgment of the grace of Christ, commended the observance of other ceremonies and signs, as baptism, supper, etc. These external commandments, together with faith, and true penitence of life, which is the spiritual and moral virtue, the Lord has very strictly enjoined upon all members of the church of Christ. See Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15, 16, compared with I Cor. 11:2-28; also the entire epistles of the apostles, which treat of the fulfillment of the Mosaic ceremonial law, as Rom. 10:4; Gal. 4:10, 11 and 5:1-4; Col. 2:16.

We arrive now at the point we had in view from the beginning, and which we shall now present more plainly and fully. It is certain that the Lord has spoken here of the preaching of the holy Gospel, of faith, of baptism, and of the manner of establishing and building up His church, as it was His will that the same should be

built up and maintained through all ages. After saying this, He gave the before mentioned promise.

It is settled, therefore, that the visible church of Jesus Christ (for this is the one in whom the preaching of the holy Gospel, faith, baptism, and whatever there is more besides, have place) shall exist through all time, even unto the consummation of the ages; for, otherwise, the promise: "Lo, I am with you all the days," etc., cannot be fulfilled in her.

Even as, besides preaching and faith, baptism shall continue in the church to the end of time, so also the holy supper: This appears from the words of Paul, I Cor. 11:2'6, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth the Lord's death till he come."

Thus, if mention is made here of the eating of the bread, the drinking of the cup, and the showing forth of the Lord's death, with the additional clause that this shall be observed, and continue, till the Lord come (that is, the end of time, to judge the world), it follows that there will be, throughout all ages to the end of the world, a church which will observe the external ordinances of Christ not only in respect to holy baptism, but also to the holy supper, and the shewing forth of the Lord's death; unless it can be shown that the words, "till he come," have another signification, such as we have never yet met with in any commentator, since the text is not only too clear, but also too conclusive.* Compare this with Matt. 25:31; John 14:3; Acts 1:11; I Thess. 4:16; Jude 14;

Rev. 1:7; 22:12, 20. Retrieved from:

<http://www.homecomers.org/mirror/martyrs003.htm>

Constructs in Quantitative Research

Laerd Dissertation stated: “Constructs are mental abstractions that we used to express the ideas, people, organizations, events and/or objects/things that we are interested in. Constructs are a way of bringing theory down to earth, helping to explain the different components of theories, as well as measure/observe their behavior” (p. 1).

For the Missionary Baptist apologist, therefore, innovative constructs can be complex abstractions. That is, the innovative nature of certain constructs might be so abstract as to find the elements according to which they are composed the result of a biased selection process.

That is, if one starts with an innovative construct that by its design is a complex abstraction, then the complexities will prevent rational assertions; for, if one fails to begin with an observable construct, then its understanding will remain untenable. Consequently, if one begins with an observable construct like that expressed accordingly: **“Living God,”** then the elements assignable to that construct would be selectable from the texts that actually reference the construct: **“Living God.”**

If, however, one begins with a complex abstraction like that expressed by the construct **“Open Theism,”** then the

assignment of elements to this type of complex abstraction will be according to no known Biblical rationale. Likewise, also, can no assignable elements be contextually extracted from the Biblical texts, in order to develop a rationale for the complex abstraction called, **“Closed Theism:”** Beginning with a pre-understood construct is difficult enough to avoid, yet when that construct is both complex and abstract, then the bias of the practitioner of eisegesis is multiplied, and leads to completely divergent conclusions when such a complex and abstract construct confronts its anti-construct. Consequently, then, the ability to reconcile **“Open or Closed”** theistic constructs is impossible precisely because of the complex and abstract nature of their design.

Nevertheless, when the Missionary Baptist apologist engages in exegesis, she or he starts with **“Living God”** and proceeds to locate all references and contextualized narratives associated with the observable construct, producing a common, observable construct called: **“Living Theism.”**

Starting with the Divine Constructs like **“Living God”** encourages the apologist to retrieve the inspired elements of which this observable construct is composed. Also, considering the numerous points of contention, an apologist can generate a rationale for her or his faith by introducing the original construct, that is, the construct provided within the text itself:

Total Depravity: A complex and abstract construct that a Missionary Baptist Apologist can easily reintroduce according to the term **“depravity”** itself, by noticing the original term in the Hebrew and Greek texts, while also noticing the singular or

plural forms of the term within each of the contextualized narratives in which they occur. In so doing, the complexities and abstractions will be minimized, in order that a common understanding might emerge. What is the Bible term for Depravity, is it H5771? An apologist can actually become that precise in her or his understanding of the Bible.

Unconditional Election: As previously illustrated, the Missionary Baptist Apologist need only acknowledge that “unconditional” as an “adjective” does not exist within any KOINE text; likewise, the apologist can notice that the term “elect” within numerous texts is an “adjective” itself, calling for the supply of the “noun” which it is modifying. That is, when the apologist identifies the “noun” that “elect” actually modifies, then much of the complexity and abstraction is immediately dispelled. One need only be reminded of the following texts, in order to remove much of the complexity and abstraction typically associated with the doctrine of election:

Reference	Text	Construct
Luke 5:32	I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.	Righteous Judaizers Versus Sinful non-Judaizers
Matthew 24:24c	...if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect (what is the	Elect Sinners

	noun?).	
Matthew 20:16b	...and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen.	Many called sinners; few elect sinners.
Romans 5:15	But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.	...through the offence of one the many (sinners) be dead...by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto the many (sinners).

The apologist can diminish the amount of complexity and abstraction by supplying contextually provided parts of speech, and particles like Nouns, Verbs, Adjectives, Pronouns, Adverbs, Prepositions, Conjunctions, and Interjections, as well as Definite articles, etc. With only a few parts of speech the apologist can express the doctrine of election according to the contextualized narratives; especially, those particular statements made by Christ Himself. For, the tension with which Jesus is recorded to have endured was that tension between the righteous Judaizers and those classified as Sinners (non-Judaizers).

Thus, abstract concepts like a “general or effectual” call, when evaluated within the texts disclose a call only for the sinners, the non-Judaizers, and that out from those many sinners called, few called sinners would be chosen. This tension abides unto this day: *The non-righteous, non-religious, are categorized as the*

*sinner*s by those that have adopted a system according to which they might establish their own righteousness, that is, establish their own by ignoring His as mentioned in Romans 10:3. Ignoring the Righteousness from God finds the one so doing exempt from any call by Jesus to come out from among others that are likewise ignoring Him: Neither will such a person, a person ignoring the Righteousness of God, be drawn by the Father of Jesus, the Son of God. The doctrine of election, when so evaluated, is much less mysterious, complex or abstract, rather it becomes Gospel-centered, and leads out from the actual account, the Biblical account called the Gospel, of Jesus calling sinners to come: “Come toward Me, all the sinners who are toiling, that is, the sinners who, having been burdened, remain burdened and I Myself will permit you all to cease [from ever toiling and being burdened by the futility of Judaism];” thus, the notion of “election” when explicated from the Scriptures conveys essential contextual elements that allows for a very observable and realizable understanding of a topic that would otherwise remain elusive as a complex abstraction.

Limited Atonement, Irresistible Grace, Perseverance are good “elemental examples” that might not have begun as very complex and abstract constructs, but have become useful illustrations when one develops a rationale for the Faith once delivered. As this is only an introduction, however, full deconstruction of the complexities associated with these types of abstract constructs is beyond the scope of this booklet.

References

- Braun, Frank X., Ph.D *English Grammar for Language Students*.
Resource Publications Eugene, Oregon. 2013
- Craig, William Lane (2008-06-09). Reasonable Faith (3rd edition):
Christian Truth and Apologetics (p. 15). Crossway.
Kindle Edition.
- Dana & Mantey *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New
Testament* Macmillian Publishing Company., Inc. New
York 1927
- Davis, William Hersey., M.A., Th.D *Beginner's Grammar of the
Greek New Testament* Harper & Row, Publishers New
York, Hagerstown, San Francisco, London 1923
- Lamerson, Samuel., *English Grammar to ACE New Testament
Greek* Zondevan Grand Rapids, Michigan USA 2004
- Summers, Ray., *Essentials of New Testament Greek* Broadman
Press, Nashville, Tennessee 1950