

# ROMANS 3:20—THE FULL KNOWLEDGE OF SIN

by Avram Yehoshua

## [The Seed of Abraham](#)

The Apostle Paul had Two Streams of thought on Mosaic Law. Romans 3:20 is the only Scripture in the New Testament that speaks of both Streams in the same verse, and so it's extremely significant. The First Stream deals with a Jew trying to add the deeds or works, also known as the commandments, ordinances, statutes and judgments of Mosaic Law to faith in Yeshua the Messiah for salvation or justification (eternal life).

The Second Stream pertains to the biblical Christian lifestyle. Romans 3:20b reveals that without Mosaic Law it's impossible to know how God wants Christians to walk out their faith in Yeshua. The first part of the verse is rightly understood by all theologians to mean that no amount of good works or deeds of Mosaic Law, or any religious pagan law, can justify or save a person. No amount of "being moral" can overcome human nature, which falls far, far short of the Glory that is the God of Israel and His Son. This is found in actuality, with no one able to love God with their whole heart all the time, as well as their neighbor as themselves, and in human nature, with its penchant for rebellion against God and His Ways. Both Jew and Gentile stand condemned before the holy and righteous God of Israel. Romans 3:20 should read in your English translation, something like this:

"Therefore, by the deeds (or works) of Law, no flesh will be justified in His sight, for by Law is the *full knowledge* of sin." (Romans 3:20)

Most English translations will not have "full knowledge," which I'll speak on in a moment, and most English Bibles will have "the law," in both phrases, but the Greek doesn't have the article (the) in front of "law" in either case. It's not wrong to have the article in front of both.

The first part of the verse is Paul's understanding that keeping or doing the laws of Moses, or any laws, usually termed "moral laws," cannot save or justify a person because no law can transform a person into the Image of Yeshua, or "give life" as the Apostle says in Galatians 3:21.<sup>1</sup> No amount of man's morality will be able to justify him on Judgement Day because man not only has sinned, but has a carnal, sinful, rebellious nature that Man cannot transform no matter how many good deeds he does.

The second phrase, for by the Law is the full knowledge of sin," reveals that Mosaic Law is God's understanding of what is sin for the Apostle Paul. This should be a simple, black and white point that Mosaic Law, and only Mosaic Law, reveals what sin is, but due to the Great Deception, the Church is anti-Mosaic Law, both for justification, which is correct, and for Christian lifestyle, which is heretical.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "Is the Law then against the promises of God? *Certainly not! For if there had been a law given which could have given life, truly righteousness would have been by the Law.*" (Galatians 3:21)

<sup>2</sup> The Great Deception of Satan, worked through the Roman Catholic Church, which bled over into Protestantism, is found in Daniel 7:25, written about 570 BC. Daniel writes, "He (Pope Sixtus in 120 AD) shall speak blasphemous words against the Most High God! He shall persecute the saints (i.e. Christians) of the Most High God, and he shall intend to change times (i.e. Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel) and (Mosaic) Law (as Christian lifestyle; cf. Romans 3:31; 7:12, 14, 16). Then the saints (i.e. Christians) shall be given into his hand for a time and times and half a time." For almost two thousand years, Christians have been led astray by Catholicism and here heretical Days and Ways, instead of walking out their faith in the Messiah of Israel through all the rules of Mosaic Law that apply to any one Christian. For more on this see my short, two page articles, [Illicit SEX and the Church](#), [The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#), [The Two Triangles of the NT](#), and my longer article, [Law 102](#), as well as my "test" article, which is also two pages: [Take the Quiz! Five Quick Questions about the New](#)

This understanding, that Mosaic Law is God's New Testament lifestyle for all Christians, is emphasized by Paul when he writes in Greek, that "by the Law is the *full knowledge*" of sin." The Greek word for knowledge is *gnosis*, but Paul adds a prefix to it to make it *epignosis*, which means *full knowledge*. This is recognized not only by distinguished scholar Joseph Thayer, but also by James Denney,<sup>3</sup> David Stern<sup>4</sup> and James Strong.<sup>5</sup>

In other words, without Mosaic Law Christians are handicapped in their knowledge of what is sin in God's eyes. Without Mosaic Law saying to keep the Sabbath day holy and to celebrate Passover, and to not eat unclean animals such as the pig (cf. Lev. 11:7), one is left without that *divine knowledge* of what is sin in God's eyes.

God is the One who determines what is moral or not; what is ethical or not; which only only means what is right and what is wrong. Is it right or wrong for Christians to keep Passover? God says to keep it, but the Church says either it's wrong to keep it, as Jesus did away with those Jewish things, or it's not necessary. The Apostle Paul though, said to the Corinthians to keep it:

"Your glorying *is* not good. Do you not know that a little leaven leavens the whole loaf? Therefore, purge out the old leaven that you may be a new loaf, since you truly are unleavened. For indeed Messiah, our Passover, was sacrificed for us. Therefore, *let us keep the Feast*, not with old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened *bread* of sincerity and Truth." (1st Corinthians 5:6-8)

Some pastors get around this by saying that Paul was only speaking metaphorically or figuratively speaking. It's hard though, to say that Paul is speaking figuratively when he says, "*let us keep the Feast*." According to the Apostle Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles (Rom. 11:13), without Mosaic Law's rules, ordinances and commandments, etc., Christians are walking in less than the *full knowledge* of what God considers sin and consequently, they are continually sinning against Jesus.

Christians know not to steal or murder, and to love God and neighbor with all their heart, but without Mosaic Law they transgress the Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel, and they eat foods that were sin for Jesus, and according to Paul, are also sin for us (cf. 1st Cor. 4:16-17; 11:1). Paul confirms this Second Stream on Mosaic Law in the same Letter to the Romans by saying that the Law is holy and spiritual:

"Therefore, the Law is *holy*, and the commandment holy and just and good...For we *know* that the Law is *spiritual*, but I am carnal, sold under sin" (Romans 7:12, 14).

"If, then, I do what I will not to do, I agree with the Law that *it is* good." (Romans 7:16)

These are very strange statements if indeed, Mosaic Law is not for Christians. Why is Paul even talking about the Law, if it doesn't effect Christians? And Paul is certainly elevating the Law for the Roman Christians, more than 20 years after the Resurrection. This too is important to understand because the Church teaches that Jesus did away with the Law (for Christians) at His death in 30 AD, but Paul is writ-

---

#### [Testament.](#)

<sup>3</sup> James Denney, M.A., Author; W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor, M. A., LL. D., *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. two: *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), p. 608.

<sup>4</sup> David Stern, *Jewish New Testament Commentary* (Clarksville, MD: Jewish New Testament Publications, 1992), p. 346; 20c.

<sup>5</sup> ἐπίγνωσις Joseph Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Accordance Bible Software, 2017), paragraph 4,069.

*Strong's Greek Dictionary of the New Testament* (Accordance Bible Software, 2017), paragraph 1,933: "full discernment."

ing to Rome about 53 AD.

That Paul is speaking about Mosaic Law is realized when we understand that Yeshua was judged sinless according to Mosaic Law, not just the Ten Commandments. In other words, if Yeshua failed to keep Passover or taught that it was alright to eat just one slice of bacon, as most pastors heretically teach, basing it on Mark 7:19,<sup>6</sup> He would have been a sinner and His sacrifice of no consequence for us. Mosaic Law was God's Standard for ancient Israel and His Son, and it's also His Standard for Christians too, despite Church teaching against Mosaic Law as God's holy lifestyle, the second part of Romans 3:20.

## *Christian Commentaries on Romans 3:20b*

There is no commentary that understands the second phrase of Romans 3:20 the way the Apostle Paul intended it to be understood. *The Pulpit Commentary* in relation to Romans 3:20, states,

“In this concluding verse the apostle briefly intimates the reason of law's inefficacy for justification... The reason is that law in itself only defines sin and makes it sinful, but does not emancipate from it.”<sup>7</sup>

As true as it is, that the Law defines sin and cannot free the Jew from his sin nature, *The Pulpit Commentary* fails to recognize that it's Mosaic Law that *still* defines what sin is for the Christian. Paul didn't write, “for by the Law *was* the full knowledge of sin for ancient Israel,” but “by the Law *is* the full knowledge of sin.”

The *Expositor's Bible Commentary* relates that,

“For the first time in Romans we encounter the expression “by works of law,” which has such prominence in Galatians (2:16; 3:2, 5, 10). Part of the verse—“no one will be declared righteous in his sight”—is a quotation from Psalm 143:2, in which a change in the Greek text is made from “no one living” to “no flesh” (which) is an alteration designed to bring out the frailty and inability of man with respect to meeting God's requirements (cf. 8:3). The practical result of working seriously with the law is to “become conscious of sin” (cf. 5:20; 7:7-11). How startling it is to contemplate the fact that the best revelation man has apart from Christ only deepens his awareness of failure. The law loudly proclaims his need for the gospel.”<sup>8</sup>

Again, there is truth in what *EBC* says, but it too fails to understand the importance of the second phrase for Christian lifestyle. It's sin to break the Law; whether for ancient Jew or modern Gentile Christian. If Jesus is the Head of the Church (Col. 1:15-18), and He is the *same today* as He was *back* there in ancient Israel, with His Apostles (Heb. 13:8), and the Apostle John, more than 60 years *after* the Resurrection writes that Christians should walk out their faith in Jesus *the same way the Jesus did* (1st John 2:6), how is it that Christians are told not to keep the Feasts of Israel, and that they can eat pig and shrimp, all of which would have been, and still is, sin for Jesus, their Head and Savior?

---

<sup>6</sup> See my article, [Law 102](#), which deals with that issue, as well as a number of places which Christians use to justify the eating of unclean animals, such as Peter's Vision in Acts Ten.

<sup>7</sup> J. Barmby, author; Henry D. M. Spence-Jones and Joseph S. Excell, Editors; *The Pulpit Commentary Series: Romans* (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 1890; Accordance Bible Software, 2017), paragraph 50,239.

<sup>8</sup> Everett F. Harrison, Author; Frank E. Gaebelein, General Editor; J. D. Douglas, associate ed., *The Expositor's Bible Commentary—Romans*, vol. 10 (Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Zondervan, 1990; Accordance Bible Software), paragraph 52,848.

Once justified by faith in Messiah Yeshua, does it matter if a Christian sins? How then, can Mosaic Law not be pertinent to them, when Paul specifically states that it's by Mosaic Law that we know, fully know, what sin is?

R.C.H. Lenski, one of the most noted and respected Lutheran theologians and scholars of the 20th century, in his book, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans 1–7*, writes of what far too many churches teach as “the Way to Heaven,” saying,

“The moralistic teaching and following are prominent today; entire denominations are swept away by them, to say nothing of the pale moralism of the secret orders of worldly ethical preachments. None of it avails in the court of God and of his Word, “because out of (ἐκ, as a result of) works of law no flesh will be declared righteous before him.” These are almost the words of Ps. 143:2.”<sup>9</sup>

Psalm 143:2 states, “Do not enter into judgment with Your servant, for in Your sight *no one living is righteous.*” Lenski continues saying,

“Bring all the works of law in the whole world now or at any time before God, the Judge—not a single mortal...will ever win acquittal by means of them...or become righteous.”<sup>10</sup>

The righteousness Lenski speaks of is that of eternal righteousness, for there is also a righteousness of Mosaic Law, but it's not for eternal life. Paul speaks of the righteousness of the Law, saying,

“But what things were gain to me, these I have counted loss for Messiah. Yet indeed I also count all things loss for the excellence of the *full knowledge* (again, epignosis), of Messiah Yeshua my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and count them as rubbish, that I may gain Messiah and be found in Him, *not having my own righteousness, which is from the Law*, but that which *is through faith in Messiah, the righteousness which is from God by faith*. That I may know Him and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being conformed to His death.” (Philippians 3:7-10)

“For we ourselves were also once foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving various lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another. But when the kindness and the love of God our Savior toward Man appeared, *not by works of righteousness which we have done*, but according to His mercy He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, whom He poured out on us abundantly through Yeshua the Messiah our Savior, that having been justified by His Grace *we should become heirs according to the hope of eternal life.*” (Titus 3:3-7)

Lenski goes on, but he too, no surprise, doesn't understand the place of Torah (i.e. Mosaic Law) in the life of every Christian:

““for through law (there comes only) sin's realization,” the very opposite of justification. This opposite is intensive: not only does *God not* justify because of works of law, law itself brings *us* realization of sin. “Law,” anything in the nature of law, including that of Moses, but likewise including any and every other ethical code. The fact that the law of Moses is clearer than any other is true, but that truth makes no difference (2:12-16) regarding what Paul here states. “Sin's realization,” like “works of law” has no articles, the

---

<sup>9</sup> R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans 1–7*, Lenski's Commentary on the New Testament (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961; Accordance Bible Software), p. 242.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 243.

nouns being stressed as to the quality expressed by each. “Sin,” the abstract, means anything in the nature of sin (ἁμαρτία [*hamartia*] missing the mark); and ἐπίγνωσις (γνώσις + ἐπί) [gnosis + epi]...*is more than* “knowledge” (our versions), which may be merely intellectual; it is “*full realization*” borne in upon us, personal inner conviction...Paul’s statement is axiomatic:<sup>11</sup> sin misses the mark set by law, hence law reveals what sin does and so makes us realize what sin is.”<sup>12</sup>

How close and yet how far away Lenski was. Yes, Mosaic Law convicts us of sin, but Lenski fails to realize that it still does. That it’s still God’s holy Standard to live our lives by, just as it was ancient Israel’s and Messiah Yeshua. Lenski, as well as many others, brings out that Romans 3:20b, can of any law or moral code, other than Mosaic, for the Gentile world to hang their hope of their false Heaven on. Yet, that cannot be what the Apostle means, even pagan religious systems that used animal sacrifice, as did the Mosaic, to deal with sins, because Paul distinctly states that “by the Law (i.e. Mosaic), is the full knowledge of sin.” No ancient pagan religion, although having it’s “moral laws,” knew that to break the Sabbath, or to not keep Passover, or to eat pig, were sin. And so, as right as Lenski is in stating that no moral and/or religious code could be kept by Gentiles who didn’t have Mosaic Law, as a means to enter the God of Israel’s Heaven, because none of them kept Mosaic Law. For it’s only by Mosaic Law that one can fully know what sin is.

Also, to break a law in ancient Rome was a crime, but never a sin. It might even be a moral crime, like stealing, but it wasn’t a sin in Rome. Pagan mythological religions had their sins, which needed to be forgiven, either by animal sacrifice or ransom money, but Romans 3:20b cannot be speaking of these “laws” because Paul is saying that “by law is the *full knowledge of sin*.” No pagan religion has ever kept the Sabbath, let alone counted it a sin, etc. So it’s only by Mosaic Law that one has *the full knowledge of sin*, and therefore, it’s truly primarily Mosaic Law that the Apostle to the Gentiles is speaking about when he writes of “law,” even without the article in front of it.

James Edwards, another Christian theologian and scholar, in his commentary on Romans, speaks of Paul emphasizing “the doing of Torah, fulfilling its moral requirements.”<sup>13</sup> As true as that is, it’s *all* Torah that Paul sees as “moral.” Every rule of Torah. The keeping of the Sabbath is just as moral as not stealing, no, it’s more moral.

The punishment for breaking the Sabbath is death (Ex. 35:1-2). The punishment for stealing sheep or oxen is repayment of four sheep to one stolen, while five oxen is required for one ox stolen (Ex. 22:1). Edwards states that the Law produces “a consciousness of sin,” and that this is an insight that is “unique to Paul and unknown to rabbinic Judaism,” which is special. He also says that the “justice demanded by the law’s demands cannot be provided by the law.”

Again, as true as that is, he fails to realize that the Law obviously still reveals what sin is. Also, it’s not accurate to say that the Law didn’t provide for sin. God, though Mosaic Law, provided animal sacrifice to forgive ancient Israel for their sins (cf. Lev. 4–6). What Paul is speaking of in Rom. 3:20a, is justification for eternal life. Animal sacrifice didn’t provide for that. Eternal life or justification by faith in Yeshua had to wait for Yeshua’s sacrifice and His divine blood to be given for not only forgiveness of sins, but also for the transformation of Israel’s carnal, Adamic, rebellion nature into His nature.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Axiomatic means self evident or unquestionable.

<sup>12</sup> Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans 1–7*, p. 244.

<sup>13</sup> James R. Edwards, *New International Biblical Commentary: Romans* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2002), p. 93.

<sup>14</sup> See my article, [Salvation—The Promise!](#)

James Denney, as mentioned previously speaks of *epignosis* and translates the phrase, “By the law comes the *full* knowledge of sin.”<sup>15</sup> He says it’s “a favorite Pauline word” that the Apostle uses “fifteen times” in his Letters.<sup>16</sup> He comments on Romans 3:20, saying,

“the full knowledge of sin...is its” (the Law’s) “proper, and indeed, its *exclusive* function ...The law *has served its purpose* when it has made men feel to the full how sinful they are; it brings them down to this point, but it is not for it to lift them up...As Lipsius remarks, no distinction is drawn by the Apostle between the ritual and the moral elements of it” (Mosaic Law). “Under no system of statutes, the Mosaic or any other, will flesh ever succeed in finding acceptance with God. Let mortal man present himself before the Most High, and His verdict must always be: Unrighteous.”<sup>17</sup>

The Law’s function isn’t confined to revealing sin, but also revealing righteousness, or what is right living in God’s eyes. It’s right to keep the Feasts of Israel and it’s right to not eat pig, etc. Also, there is no distinction in Torah, or anywhere else in Scripture, where anyone distinguishes between the Mosaic Law’s so called moral laws and its so called ritual laws. This is an artificial “Christian” distinction that allows them to seamlessly move over into the New Testament, what they think is moral. Truly though, all the rules of Moses are moral or “right rules” in God’s eyes.

## The Use of *Epignosis* in the New Testament

There are 20 times where *epignosis*, or a grammatical variation, occur in the New Testament. Fifteen are by the Apostle Paul, one in Hebrews, and the Apostle Peter uses it four times in his Second Letter. In most of them, “full knowledge” is the preferable translation to just “knowledge.” This further supports its usage in Romans 3:20. We’ll see all the cites in a moment, but first, the Greek text for Romans 3:20:

“διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἀμαρτίας.” (Romans 3:20 GNT-T)

There isn’t a variation between the Textus Receptus and the Majority Text when it comes to Romans 3:20, and of course, they both have *epignosis* (full knowledge). The following are nine different Bibles and how they translate *epignosis*; not of which use full knowledge. The tenth cite is a Greek lexicon’s translation, and it does speak of “full knowledge” as “full recognition.”

1. American Standard Version (1901): “because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for <sup>14</sup>through the law *cometh* the knowledge of sin.” (Romans 3:20)
2. English Standard Version: “For by works of the law no human being will be justified in his sight, since through the law comes knowledge of sin.” (Romans 3:20)
3. Holman Christian Standard Bible: “For no one will be justified in His sight by the works of the law, because the knowledge of sin comes through the law.” (Romans 3:20)

---

<sup>15</sup> Denney, *St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Romans*, p. 608.

<sup>16</sup> *Epignosis*, or a grammatical variation thereof, is used 15 times by Paul: Romans 1:28; 3:20; 10:2; Eph. 1:17; 4:13; Phil. 1:9; Col. 1:9-10; 2:2; 3:10; 1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Tim. 2:25; 3:7; Titus 1:1; Philemon 1:6.  
Once in Hebrews: 10:26, and  
Four times by Peter in 2nd Peter 1:2-3, 8, 2:20.

<sup>17</sup> Denney, *St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Romans*, p. 608.

4. New American Standard Bible: “because by the works of the Law no flesh will be justified in His sight; for through the Law *comes* the knowledge of sin.” (Romans 3:20)
5. New English Translation: “For *no one is declared righteous before him* by the works of the law, for through the law comes the knowledge of sin.” (Romans 3:20)
6. New International Version: “Therefore no one will be declared righteous in his sight by observing the law; rather, through the law we become *conscious* of sin.” (Romans 3:20 NIV) This distorts Paul’s meaning.
7. New King James Version: “Therefore by the deeds of the law no flesh will be justified in His sight, for by the law is the *knowledge* of sin.” (Romans 3:20 NKJV)
8. New Revised Standard Version: “For “no human being will be justified in his sight” by deeds prescribed by the law, for through the law comes the knowledge of sin.” (Romans 3:20)
9. World English Bible: “Because by the works of the law, no flesh will be justified in his sight. For through the law comes the knowledge of sin.” (Romans 3:20)
10. Robert K. Brown and Philip W. Comfort, translators; J. D. Douglas, Editor, *The New Greek-English Interlinear New Testament* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1990), p. 539:
  - “Because by works of Law not will be justified all flesh before Him, for through Law (is) *full recognition* of sin.”<sup>18</sup> (Romans 3:20)

Only in their *Greek-English Interlinear* do Brown and Comfort have “full” in their translation of *epignosis*, as “full recognition.” Even though this isn’t the meaning that Paul desired, for he was adamant that it was “full knowledge,” not “full recognition,” which leans toward the phrase meaning that one is conscious of sin, as opposed to what the verse actually says, that it’s only by Torah that one *knows* or has the “full knowledge” of just what sin is.

All the other English Bible translations fail miserably to do justice to the Greek word because knowledge is just a general word, and so they use it to speak of how the Law effected one’s conscience, not that the Law revealed the extent of God’s understanding of just what sin entailed. “Full knowledge” emphasizes that Mosaic Law is God’s Standard for what is sin and alternately, what the Lord God of Israel desires of His people Israel; both Jew and Gentile.

## *The 15 Places Where Paul Uses Epignosis*

Of the 15 places where Paul uses ἐπίγνωσις (*epignosis*), every time, except for Romans 1:28, and possibly Col. 3:10, it can be said that *full knowledge* is the more appropriate translation than just *knowledge*.<sup>19</sup> Interestingly enough, it’s the very first time that the Apostle uses it, in Romans, that *shouldn’t* be translated as “full knowledge,” but just “knowledge.”

1. Romans 1:28 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσει .....Dative<sup>20</sup>
  - “And even as they did not like to retain God in their *knowledge*, God gave them over to a debased

<sup>18</sup> Robert K. Brown and Philip W. Comfort, translators; J. D. Douglas, Editor, *The New Greek-English Interlinear New Testament* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1990), p. 539.

<sup>19</sup> Romans 1:28; 3:20; 10:2; Eph. 1:17; 4:13; Phil. 1:9; Col. 1:9, 10; 2:2; 3:10; 1st Tim. 2:4; 2nd Tim. 2:25; 3:7; Titus 1:1; Philemon 1:6.

<sup>20</sup> **Dative** represents the *indirect object* (to). John throws the ball *to* Paul.

mind, to do those things which are not fitting.”

2. Romans 3:20 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσις .....Nominative<sup>21</sup>
  - “Therefore by the deeds of the Law no flesh will be justified in His sight, for by the Law is the *full knowledge* of sin.”
3. Romans 10:2 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσιν .....Accusative<sup>22</sup>
  - “For I bear them witness that they have a zeal for God, but not according to *full knowledge*.”
4. Ephesians 1:17 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπιγνώσει .....Dative
  - “that the God of our Lord Yeshua the Messiah, the Father of Glory, may give to you the Spirit of Wisdom and Revelation in the *full knowledge* of Him.”
5. Ephesians 4:13 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπιγνώσεως .....Genitive<sup>23</sup>
  - “until we all come to the unity of the faith and of the *full knowledge* of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Messiah.”
6. Philippians 1:9 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπιγνώσει .....Dative
  - “And this I pray, that your love may abound still more and more in *full knowledge* and all discernment.”
7. Colossian 1:9 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσιν .....Accusative
  - “For this reason we also, since the day we heard it, do not cease to pray for you, and to ask that you may be filled with the *full knowledge* of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding,”
8. Colossians 1:10 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσιν .....Dative
  - “that you may walk worthy of the Lord, fully pleasing Him, being fruitful in every good work and increasing in the *full knowledge* of God.”
9. Colossians 2:2 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσιν .....Accusative
  - “that their hearts may be encouraged, being knit together in love, and attaining to all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the *full knowledge* of the Mystery of God, both of the Father and of Messiah.”
10. Colossian 3:10 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσιν .....Accusative
  - “and have put on the New Man who is renewed in *full knowledge* according to the Image of Him who created him.”
  - This verse could be translated either way, as “knowledge” or “full knowledge.”
11. 1st Timothy 2:4 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσιν .....Accusative
  - “who desires all men to be saved and to come to the *full knowledge* of the Truth.”
12. 2nd Timothy 2:25 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσιν .....Accusative
  - “in humility correcting those who are in opposition, if God perhaps will grant them repentance, so

---

<sup>21</sup> **Nominative** is the *subject* of the sentence. Subjects can think and act.

<sup>22</sup> **Accusative** points to the *direct object*, “completing” the meaning of the sentence with the direct object. A brother loses a man.

<sup>23</sup> **Genitive** is the case of *possession* (of) or of definition. A brother of a man loses: A man’s brother loses.



that they may *fully know* the Truth.”

13. 2nd Timothy 3:7.....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσιν .....Accusative
  - “always learning and never able to come to the *full knowledge* of the Truth.”
14. Titus 1:1 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσιν .....Accusative
  - “Paul, a slave of God and an Apostle of Yeshua the Messiah, according to the faith of God’s elect and the *full knowledge* of the Truth which accords with godliness.”
15. Philemon 1:6 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπιγνώσει .....Dative
  - “that the sharing of your faith may become effective by the *full knowledge* of every good thing which is in you in Messiah Yeshua.”

### ***Five Other Places Where Epignosis Used***

1. Hebrews 10:26 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσιν .....Accusative
  - “For if we sin willfully after we have received the *full knowledge* of the Truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins.”
2. 2nd Peter 1:2 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπιγνώσει .....Dative
  - “Grace and peace be multiplied to you in the *full knowledge* of God and of Yeshua our Lord.”
3. 2nd Peter 1:3 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπιγνώσεως .....Genitive
  - “as His divine power has given to us all things that pertain to life and godliness, through the *full knowledge* of Him who called us by Glory and Virtue.”
4. 2nd Peter 1:8 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπίγνωσιν .....Accusative
  - “For if these things are yours and abound, you will be neither barren nor unfruitful in the *full knowledge* of our Lord Yeshua the Messiah.”
5. 2nd Peter 2:20 .....Noun, Feminine, Singular ἐπιγνώσει .....Dative
  - “For if, after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the *full knowledge* of the Lord and Savior, Yeshua the Messiah, they are again entangled in them and overcome, the latter end is worse for them than the beginning.”

The English translation of Romans 3:20 should read:

“Therefore, by the Deeds or Works of Mosaic Law no flesh will be justified in His sight,  
*for by Mosaic Law is the full knowledge of sin.*”

With this dynamic translation (giving the meaning of the verse instead of just a literal or not so literal a translation, it’s seen that *Mosaic Law is still God’s holy Standard for judging sin*. Paul wrote Romans around 53 AD, or more than 30 years *after* the Resurrection. The Church teaches that Mosaic Law was done away with at the death of Jesus, but Paul declares that it is still valid for Christians as God’s holy lifestyle for what is sin, and consequently, what is the right way to walk out one’s faith in His Son, the Lord Yeshua.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Finished on Sunday, August 27, 2023.