The Hebraic-Roots Version

Scriptures

Containing

The Tanak

and

Ketuvim Netzarim

Translated out of the original Hebrew and Aramaic.

By

James Scott Trimm

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Hebraic Roots Version Bible
Table of Contents

PREFACE

Translating the Word of Elohim into English, or any other language, is an awesome responsibility, and not one that the translator has taken lightly. The volume before you is the result of many years of research and study. It has been my intent to render the original Hebrew and Aramaic of the Scriptures to produce the best possible English translation. The Tanak (Old Testament) portion of the HRV is a revision of the JPS 1917 version which is in the public domain. There are many key revisions, however, that make the HRV Tanak quite distinct from the JPS 1917 text. The HRV "New Testament" is an original translation taken directly from the Hebrew and Aramaic sources[1]. While one cannot help but be influenced by the translations one has known and used in the past, I have nonetheless sought to give an original translation directly from the Hebrew and Aramaic. This translation is as literal as possible and follows the original word order as closely as possible whenever possible.

Finally, I must touch on the concept of the inerrancy of the Scriptures. This is a concept, which I the translator hold near and dear. It must be emphasized that the concept of inerrancy applies only to the autograph (the original from the pen of the original author) and not to the many manuscript witnesses which are copies. As a matter of fact not two manuscripts agree exactly even in dealing with the Greek New Testament, and so one would be hard pressed to say exactly which manuscript we have today is the "inerrant" one. The purpose of the HRV is to provide the best possible translation from the Hebrew and Aramaic copies which bear witness to the inerrant original. Like those men in the parable of talents it is our responsibility to do the best we can with what Elohim has given us.

James Trimm
PO Box 471
Hurst, TX 76053
U.S.A.
jstrimm@nazarene.net
http://www.nazarene.net

---

[1] However is should be noted that the Book of Matthew in the HRV is a revision of my own translation of DuTillet Hebrew Matthew (revised in many places to agree with the Aramaic or other Hebrew witnesses). My translation of DuTillet Matthew was itself noted on the title page as a "revision" of previous translations. Among the versions, which most strongly influenced that translation, was a 1927 English translation of the DuTillet text published by Hugh Schonfield, having passed into the public domain. Also it should be noted that no reliable Hebrew or Aramaic witnesses are yet available for 2Kefa (Peter), 2 & 3 Yochanan (John) or Y'huda (Jude) and so these books were translated from Greek with the understanding that the translator was reaching toward an underlying Aramaic text.

INTRODUCTION

WHY THE HEBRAIC ROOTS VERSION?

The Hebraic Roots Version (which began as the Semitic New Testament Project) has been a ten year project to produce a new and accurate translation of the New Testament taken primarily from old Hebrew and Aramaic sources. Unlike most translations this edition will not be rooted in a Greek Hellenistic text. Instead this translation will seek to understand the text of the New Testament from the languages in which it was originally written. This is important because there are some passages in the NT which do not make sense at all in Greek, but only begin to make sense when we look at them in Hebrew and Aramaic.

Acts 11:27-30

> And in these days prophets came from Jerusalem to Antioch. Then one of
> them, named Agabus, stood up and showed by the Spirit that there was going
> to be a great famine throughout all THE WORLD, which also happened in the
> days of Claudius Caesar. Then the talmidim, each according to his ability,
> determined to send relief to the brothers dwelling IN JUDEA. This they also
> did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.

Now this doesn't make sense at all, why would those in Antioch send relief to those dwelling IN JUDEA if the famine was to strike all THE WORLD. They would be facing famine themselves. The solution lies in the fact that the word for "WORLD" in the Aramaic manuscripts is ארע (Strong's #772) the Aramaic form of the Hebrew word ארץ (Strong's 776). This word can mean "world" (as in Prov. 19:4) "earth" (as in Dan. 2:35) or "land" (as in Dan. 9:15) and is often used as a euphemism for "The Land of Israel" (as in Dan. 9:6). Certainly the word here is not meant to mean "world" but "land of Israel."

Mt. 26:9 = Mk. 14:3

> And when Y'shua was in Bethany at the house of Simon the leper,

As any Bible student knows, lepers were not permitted to live in the city (see Lev. 13:46). Since ancient Hebrew and Aramaic were written without vowels, there was no distinction between the Aramaic words GAR'BA (leper) and GARABA (jar maker or jar merchant). Since in this story a woman pours oil from a jar it is apparent that Simon was a jar merchant or jar maker and not a leper.

Mt. 19:12 & Acts 8:26f

....there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the
Kingdom of Heaven's sake....
--Mt. 19:12 NKJV

So he [Phillip] arose and went. And behold, a man of Ethiopia, a
eunuch of great authority under Candace the queen of the Ethiopians,
who had charge of all her treasury, and had come to Jerusalem to
worship.
--Acts 8:27 NKJV

The man in Acts 8:27 appears to be a proselyte to Judaism since he seems to be making the Torah-required pilgrimage to Jerusalem (Dt. 16:16). The Torah, however, forbids a eunuch both from becoming a proselyte Jew, and from worshiping at the Temple (Dt. 23:1f). This also raises the question of why one would become a eunuch (be castrated) for the sake of the Kingdom of Heaven. After all eunuchs are excluded from the assembly of Israel. The word for "eunuch" in the Aramaic manuscripts of both of theses passages is מהימנא which can mean "eunuch" but can also mean "believer" or "faithful one" as it clearly means here.

Mt. 19:24 = Mk. 10:25 = Lk. 18:25

...it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle
than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God.

The word for "camel" in the Aramaic manuscripts is גמלא which can mean "camel" but can also refer to a "large rope," which is certainly the meaning here.

Jn. 12:11 & 15:16

One word that the Greek translators often misunderstood was the Aramaic word אזל which normally means "to go" or "to depart" but is used idiomatically in Aramaic to mean that some action goes forward and that something progresses "more and more".

One case where the Greek translator misunderstood this word and translated to literally is in Jn. 12:11:

Because that by reason of him many of the Jews
went away (!?!), and believed on Jesus. (KJV)

Now I have translated the Aramaic of this passage as follows:

because many of the Judeans, on account of him,
were trusting more and more (אזל) in Yeshua.

And Jn. 15:16:

> ...that ye should go and bring forth fruit...
> KJV

I have translated from the Aramaic:

> ...that you also should bear fruit more and more (אזל)...

THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT ORDER
OF THE BOOKS OF THE "NEW TESTAMENT"

The Hebraic Roots Version restores the books of the "New Testament" to their original manuscript order.

Most copies of the New Testament today follow the order:

> Gospels
> Acts
> Pauline Epistles
> "Catholic"[2] Epistles
> Revelation

However the original manuscript order of the books was:

> Gospels
> Acts
> "Catholic" Epistles
> Pauline Epistles
> Revelation

This original manuscript order is followed by the Aramaic Peshitta canon[3] and thus is that which is followed by such well known Peshitta manuscripts as Codex Khaboris and the Yonan Codex (these two are mentioned by name, not because of their age but because they are good examples of complete Peshitta New Testament manuscripts).

This original manuscript order is also followed by the oldest and best ancient Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, such as Codex Vaticanus; Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Ephraem.

This original manuscript order was also followed by Westcott & Hort in their 1881 publication of the Greek New Testament (which they mistakenly believed was the "original") writing:

> We have followed recent editors in abandoning the Hieronymic[4]
> order [Jerome's order] familiar in modern Europe through the
> influence of the Latin Vulgate, in favour of the order most highly

---

[2] It is important to know that the academic term "Catholic Epistles" is not referring to the Catholic Church but the Church tradition that these epistles were "universal" ("Catholic" is Latin for "universal"). These epistles should more accurately be called "Jewish Epistles" since they are addressed to the Jews and are written by emissaries to the Jews.

[3] Setting aside the fact that the Peshitta Canon does not include 2Pt; 2&3 Jn,; Jude and Rev.

[4] A scholarly term taken from the Latin pronunciation of "Jerome" and referring to that which is related to him.

recommended by various Greek authority of the fourth century…
It differs from the Hieronymic order… the Acts are immediately
followed by the Catholic Epistles.
(***Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek***, p. 320)

In his ***Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*** Scrivener writes:

> Whether copies contain the whole or a part of the sacred volume,
> the general order of the books is the following: Gospels, Acts,
> Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles, Apocalypse.
> (***Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*** Vol. 1 p. 72)

Bullinger writes:

> Our English Bibles follow the order as given in the Latin Vulgate.
> This order, therefore, depends on the arbitrary judgment of one
> man, Jerome (A.D. 382-429). All theories based on this order rest
> on human authority, and thus are without any true foundation.
> (***Companion Bible***, Appendix 95, p. 139)

M'Clintock and Strong in their twelve volume Cyclopedia write:

> The Western Church… as represented by Jerome…
> gave priority of position to the Pauline epistles. The tendency
> of the Western Church to recognize Rome as the center
> of authority may perhaps, in part, account for the departure
> from the custom of the East. The order of the Alexandrian,
> Vatican and Ephraem manuscripts gives precedence to the
> Catholic Epistles, and this is also recognized by the Council
> of Laodicea, Cyril of Jerusalem and Athanasius,…
> (***CBTEL***, vol. 1, p. 800)

The late Dr. Ernest Martin writes:

> There can be no doubt whatever that the actual manuscript
> arrangement of the New Testament books should be restored
> in all modern versions. …the seven Catholic ("Jewish")
> Epistles should be placed in their original position before those of Paul…
> (***Restoring the Original Bible***; by Ernest L. Martin p. 16-17)

This original manuscript order is also testified to by many of the ancient "Church
Fathers". Athanasius (296-373 CE) Bishop of Alexandria gives the order of books as
"the four Gospels; the Acts of the Apostles; the seven Catholic Epistles; the fourteen
epistles of St. Paul; and the Revelation of John"[5] Leonitus of Byzantium also gives this
order.[6] The fourth century "Church Father" Philastrius also argued that the Catholic

---

[5] See Horne, ***Introduction***, vol. IV, p. 253
[6] ibid

Epistles must precede the Pauline epistles because Gal. 1:17 has Paul referring to the Emissaries of the Jewish Epistles as coming before him.[7] Cyril Bishop of Jerusalem also maintained the original manuscript order[8] as did the Council of Laodicea.[9]

This is another important feature which makes the HRV unique when compared to other Messianic editions. Just as the manuscript order of the books of the Tanak (OT), (followed by Judaism) does not agree with the ordering of the same books in the Christian "Old Testament" as printed today, so also does the manuscript order of the NT differ. The ancient manuscript order of the books of the "New Testament" has first the "Gospels" then "Acts" followed by the Jewish Epistles (Ya'akov (James); 1 & 2 Kefa (Peter); 1, 2 & 3 Yochanan (John) and Y'hudah (Jude)) followed by the Pauline epistles which are followed by Revelation. This order was rearranged by Rome in the Latin Vulgate in which the Pauline epistles were given first place and the Jewish epistles given second place. The original manuscript order had an important significance. It agreed with the precept that the message was to the Jews first and then to the Goyim (Gentiles). It also agrees with the concept that Ya'akov, Kefa and Yochanan were emissaries that come BEFORE Paul (Gal. 1:17) and with the concept that Kefa, Ya'akov and Yochanan served as three pillars which lend authority upon which Paul's message was built (Gal. 2:9) and not vice-versa. The reader of the NT was intended to read the "Jewish" epistles FIRST and then to read the Pauline epistles already having understood the Jewish epistles. The NT reader was intended to read Ya'akov's (James') admonition concerning faith and works (Ya'akov 2) as well as Kefa's warnings about Paul being difficult to understand and often twisted (2Kefa 3:15-16) etc. before ever attempting to understand the writings of Paul. The HRV follows the ancient manuscript order (which agrees also with the order of the ancient Aramaic manuscripts) in placing the "Jewish epistles" immediately after Acts and placing the Pauline Epistles AFTER them.

---

[7] ***Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament***, by Moffat, p. 13
[8] Catachetical Lectures 4:36
[9] Canon LX

THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF NEW TESTAMENT

The original language of the "New Testament" like that of the Tanak (the "Old Testament") was Hebrew and Aramaic. The following is just some of the evidence to support this fact. The in depth reader may wish to consult a more detailed treatment of this issue in my more detailed on-line e-book *Hebrew/Aramaic New Testament Textual Criticism* at http://www.nazarene.net/textcrit.htm .

Language of First Century Israel

The Middle East, through all of its political turmoil, has in fact been dominated by a single master from the earliest ages until the present day. The Semitic tongue has dominated the Middle East from ancient times, until the modern day. Aramaic dominated the three great Empires, Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian. It endured until the seventh century, when under the Islamic nation it was displaced by a cognate Semitic language, Arabic. Even today some few Syrians, Assyrians and Chaldeans speak Aramaic as their native tongue, including three villages north of Damascus.[10]

The Jewish people, through all of their persecutions, sufferings and wanderings have never lost sight of their Semitic heritage, nor their Semitic tongue. Hebrew, a Semitic tongue closely related to Aramaic, served as their language until the great dispersion when a cognate language, Aramaic, began to replace it. Hebrew, however continued to be used for religious literature, and is today the spoken language in Israel.

The Babylonian Exile

Some scholars have proposed that the Jews lost their Hebrew language, replacing it with Aramaic during the Babylonian captivity. The error of this position becomes obvious. The Jewish people had spent 400 years in captivity in Egypt[11] yet they did not stop speaking Hebrew and begin speaking Egyptian, why should they exchange Hebrew for Aramaic after only seventy years[12] in Babylonian captivity? Upon return from the Babylonian captivity it was realized that a small minority could not speak "the language of Judah"[13] so drastic measures were taken to abolish these marriages and maintain the purity of the Jewish people and language[14] One final evidence rests in the fact that the post-captivity books (Zech., Hag., Mal., Neh., Ezra, and Ester) are written in Hebrew rather than Aramaic.

---

[10] *The New Covenant Aramaic Peshitta Text with Hebrew Translation*; Bible Society of Jerusalem; 1986; p. iii

[11]Ex. 12:40-41; Acts 7:6

[12]Jer. 5:11-12; 29:10; Zech. 7:5; Dan. 9:2

[13] (Neh. 13:23-24) A euphemism for Hebrew as opposed to Aramaic (see 2Kn. 18:26)

[14] Neh. 13:23-31; Ezra 10:3-19

Hellenization

Some scholars have also suggested that under the Helene Empire Jews lost their Semitic language and in their rush to hellenize, began speaking Greek. The books of the Maccabees do record an attempt by Antiochus Epiphanies to forcibly Hellenize the Jewish people.[15] In response, the Jews formed an army led by Judas Maccabee [16] This army defeated the Greeks and eradicated Hellenism.[17] This military victory is still celebrated today as Chanukkah, the feast of the dedication of the Temple[18] a holiday that even Yeshua seems to have observed at the Temple at Jerusalem in the first century.[19] Those who claim that the Jews were Hellenized and began speaking Greek at this time seem to deny the historical fact of the Maccabean success.

During the first century, Hebrew remained the language of the Jews living in Judah and to a lesser extent in Galilee. Aramaic remained a secondary language and the language of commerce. Jews at this time did not speak Greek, in fact one tradition had it that it was better to feed ones children swine than to teach them the Greek language. It was **only** with the permission of authorities that a young official could learn Greek, and then, solely for the purpose of political discourse on the National level. The Greek language was completely inaccessible and undesirable to the vast majority of Jews in Israel in the 1st century.[20] Any gauge of Greek language outside of Israel cannot, nor can any evidence hundreds of years removed from the 1st century, alter the fact that the Jews of Israel in the 1st century did not know Greek.

The Testimony of Josephus

The first century Jewish historian Flavius Josephus (37-c.100 C.E.) testifies to the fact that Hebrew was the language of first century Jews. Moreover, he testifies that Hebrew, and not Greek, was the language of his place and time. Josephus gives us the only first hand account of the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. According to Josephus, the Romans had to have him translate the call to the Jews to surrender into "their own language". [21] Josephus gives us a point-blank statement regarding the language of his people during his time:

> I have also taken a great deal of pains to obtain the learning
> of the Greeks, and understanding the elements of the Greek
> language although I have so long accustomed myself to speak
> our own language, that I cannot pronounce Greek with
> sufficient exactness: for our nation does not encourage those
> that learn the languages of many nations.[22]

---

[15] 1Macc. 1:10-15, 41-64; 2Macc. 4:9-17; 6:1-11; Josephus ;*Ant*. 12:5

[16] 1Macc 2:19-9; 2Macc. 8f; Josephus ;*Ant*. 12:6

[17] 1&2 Macc.; Josephus ;*Ant*. 12:7;

[18] 1Macc. 4:52-59; 2Macc. 10:5-8; Josephus ;*Ant*. 12:7:6-7; b.Shabbat 21b

[19] Jn. 10:22

[20] *see below next to note 103b*

[21] Josephus; *Wars* 5:9:2

[22] Josephus; *Ant.* 20:11:2

Thus, Josephus makes it clear that first century Jews could not even speak or understand Greek, but spoke "their own language."

Archaeology

Confirmation of Josephus's claims has been found by Archaeologists. The Bar Kokhba coins are one example. These coins were struck by Jews during the Bar Kokhba revolt (c. 132 C.E.). All of these coins bear only Hebrew inscriptions. Countless other inscriptions found at excavations of the Temple Mount, Masada and various Jewish tombs, have revealed first century Hebrew inscriptions[23]

Even more profound evidence that Hebrew was a living language during the first century may be found in ancient Documents from about that time, which have been discovered in Israel. These include the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Bar Kokhba letters.

The Dead Sea Scrolls consist of over 40,000 fragments of more than 500 scrolls dating from 250 B.C.E . to 70 C.E.. Theses Scrolls are primarily in Hebrew and Aramaic. A large number of the "secular scrolls" (those which are not Bible manuscripts) are in Hebrew.

The Bar Kokhba letters are letters between Simon Bar Kokhba and his army, written during the Jewish revolt of 132 C.E.. These letters were discovered by Yigdale Yadin in 1961 and are almost all written in Hebrew and Aramaic. Two of the letters are written in Greek, both were written by men with Greek names to Bar Kokhba. One of the two Greek letters actually apologizes for writing to Bar Kokhba in Greek, saying "the letter is written in Greek, as we have no one who knows Hebrew here."

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bar Kokhba letters not only include first and second century Hebrew documents, but give an even more significant evidence in the dialect of that Hebrew. The dialect of these documents was not the Biblical Hebrew of the Tenach (Old Testament), nor was it the Mishnaic Hebrew of the Mishna (c. 220 C.E.). The Hebrew of these documents is colloquial, it is a fluid living language in a state of flux somewhere in the evolutionary process from Biblical to Mishnaic Hebrew. Moreover, the Hebrew of the Bar Kokhba letters represents Galilean Hebrew (Bar Kokhba was a Galilean) , while the Dead Sea Scrolls give us an example of Judean Hebrew. Comparing the documents shows a living distinction of geographic dialect as well, a sure sign that Hebrew was not a dead language.

Final evidence that first century Jews conversed in Hebrew and Aramaic can be found in other documents of the period, and even later. These include: the Roll Concerning Fasts[24] in Aramaic (66-70 C.E.), The Letter of Gamaliel[25] in Aramaic (c. 30 - 110 C.E.), Wars of the Jews[26] by Josephus in Hebrew (c. 75 C.E.), the Mishna in Hebrew (c. 220 C.E.) and the Gemara[27] in Aramaic (c. 500 C.E.)

---

[23]*Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus;* David Bivin and Roy Blizzard Jr.; 1984; pp. 55-68
[24]A list of days on which fasting is forbidden.
[25]This letter, according to the Talmud (j.San. 18) was written by Gamliel I, who was Pauls's teacher (Acts 22:3) and who appealed on Peter's behalf (Acts 5:34).
[26]Was first written in Hebrew and later translated into Greek (*Wars* preface:1)
[27]Commentary on the Mishna which together with the Mishna forms the Talmud.

Scholars on the Language of the New Testament

Having thus demonstrated that Hebrew and Aramaic were languages of Jews living in Israel in the first century, we shall now go on to demonstrate that the New Testament was first written in these languages.

A number of noted scholars have argued that at least portions of the New Testament were originally penned in a Semitic tongue. This argument has been asserted of the four Gospels,[28] Acts,[29] and Revelation.[30]

The following is just some of what these scholars have written on the topic:

> When we turn to the New Testament we find that
> there are reasons for suspecting a Hebrew or Aramaic
> original for the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, John
> and for the apocalypse.
> > - Hugh J. Schonfield; *An Old Hebrew Text*
> > *of St. Matthew's Gospel*; 1927; p. vii

> The material of our Four Gospels is all Palestinian,
> and the language in which it was originally written
> is Aramaic, then the principle language of the land...
> > -C. C. Torrey; *Our Translated Gospels*; 1936 p. ix

> The pioneer in this study of Aramaic and Greek relationships was
> Charles Cutler Torrey (1863-1956),... His work however fell short
> of completeness; as a pioneering effort, in the nature of the case,
> some of his work has to be revised and supplemented. His main
> contention of translation, however, is undeniably correct. ...

> The translation into Greek from Aramaic must have been made from
> a written record, including the Fourth Gospel. The language was
> Eastern Aramaic, as the material itself revealed, most strikingly
> through a comparison of parallel passages. ...

> One group [of scholars], which originated in the nineteenth century
> and persists to the present day [1979], contends that the Gospels
> were written in Greek...

---

[28] See Our Translated Gospels by Charles Cutler Torrey; Harper and Brothers, New York; 1936; p. ix; An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts by Matthew Black; The Aramaic Origin of the Four Gospels by Frank Zimmerman; New York; 1979

[29] The Composition and Date of Acts by Charles Cutler Torrey; Cambridge Mass.; 1916; p. 7; An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts by Matthew Black; Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus by David Bivin and Roy Blizzard Jr. 1984; p. 23; See also The Semitisms of Acts by Max Wilcox; 1965

[30] The Original Language of the Apocalypse by R. B. Y. Scott; University of Toronto Press; 1928; Documents of the Primitive Church by Charles Cutler Torrey; 1941

Another group of scholars, among them C. C. Torrey ... comes out flatly
with the proposition that the Four Gospels... including Acts up to 15:35
are translated directly from Aramaic and from a written Aramaic text....

My own researches have led me to consider Torrey's position
valid and convincing that the Gospels as a whole were translated
from Aramaic into Greek.
> - Frank Zimmerman*; The Aramaic Origin*
> *of the Four Gospels;* KTAV; 1979

Thus it was that the writer turned seriously to tackle
the question of the original language of the Fourth Gospel;
and quickly convincing himself that the theory of an
original Aramaic document was no chimera, but a fact
which was capable of the fullest verification...
> - Charles Fox Burney*; The Aramaic Origin*
> *of the Fourth Gospel;* 1922; p. 3

...this [Old Syriac] Gospel of St. Matthew appears at least
to be built upon the original Aramaic text which was the work
of the Apostle himself.
> - William Cureton; *Remains of a Very*
> *Ancient Recension of the Four Gospels*
> *in Syriac*; 1858; p. vi)

...the Book of Revelation was written in a Semitic language,
and that the Greek translation... is a remarkably close
rendering of the original."
> - C. C. Torrey; *Documents of the Primitive Church*
> 1941; p. 160

We come to the conclusion, therefore that the Apocalypse
as a whole is a translation from Hebrew or Aramaic...
> - R. B. Y. Scott; *The Original Language of the Apocalypse*
> 1928; p. 6

The question of the Luke/Acts tradition holds particular interest to us. This is
because the common wisdom has been to portray Luke as a Greek speaking, Greek
writing Gentile who wrote his account to the Gentiles. The reality of the matter is
(whether Luke himself knew Greek or not) that Luke was most certainly written in a
Semitic language. as Charles Cutler Torrey states:

In regard to Lk. it remains to be said, that of all the
Four Gospels it is the one which gives by far the plainest
and most constant evidence of being a translation.
> - C.C. Torrey; *Our Translated Gospels* p. lix

TESTIMONY OF THE "CHURCH FATHERS"

All of the "Church Fathers", both East and West, testified to the Semitic origin of at least the Book of Matthew, as the following quotes demonstrate:

Papias (150-170 C.E.)
Matthew composed the words in the Hebrew dialect, and each translated as he was able.[31]

Ireneus (170 C.E.)
Matthew also issued a written Gospel among the Hebrews in their own dialect.[32]

Origen (c. 210 C.E.)
The first [Gospel] is written according to Matthew, the same that was once a tax collector, but afterwards an emissary of Yeshua the Messiah, who having published it for the Jewish believers, wrote it in Hebrew.[33]

Eusebius (c. 315 C.E.)
Matthew also, having first proclaimed the Gospel in Hebrew, when on the point of going also to the other nations, committed it to writing in his native tongue, and thus supplied the want of his presence to them by his writings.[34]

Pantaenus... penetrated as far as India, where it is reported that he found the Gospel according to Matthew, which had been delivered before his arrival to some who had the knowledge of Messiah, to whom Bartholomew, one of the emissaries, as it is said, had proclaimed, and left them the writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters.[35]

Epiphanius (370 C.E.)
They [the Nazarenes] have the Gospel according to Matthew quite complete in Hebrew, for this Gospel is certainly still preserved among them as it was first written, in Hebrew letters.[36]

---

[31] quoted by Eusebius *Eccl. Hist.* 3:39
[32] Irenaeus; *Against Heresies* 3:1
[33] quoted by Eusebius; *Eccl. Hist.* 6:25
[34] Eusebius; *Eccl. Hist.* 3:24
[35] Eusebius; *Eccl. Hist.* 5:10
[36] Epiphanius; *Panarion* 29:9:4

Jerome (382 C.E.)
"Matthew, who is also Levi, and from a tax collector came to be an emissary first of all evangelists composed a Gospel of Messiah in Judea in the Hebrew language and letters, for the benefit of those of the circumcision who had believed, who translated it into Greek is not sufficiently ascertained. Furthermore, the Hebrew itself is preserved to this day in the library at Caesarea, which the martyr Pamphilus so diligently collected. I also was allowed by the Nazarenes who use this volume in the Syrian city of Borea to copy it. In which is to be remarked that, wherever the evangelist... makes use of the testimonies of the Old Scripture, he does not follow the authority of the seventy translators [the Greek Septuagint], but that of the Hebrew."[37]

"Pantaenus found that Bartholomew, one of the twelve emissaries, had there [India] preached the advent of our Lord Yeshua the Messiah according to the Gospel of Matthew, which was written in Hebrew letters, and which, on returning to Alexandria, he brought with him."[38]

Isho'dad (850 C.E.)
His [Matthew's] book was in existence in Caesarea of Palestine, and everyone acknowledges that he wrote it with his hands in Hebrew...[39]

Other "church fathers" have testified to the Semitic origin of at least one of Paul's epistles. These "church fathers" claim that Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews was translated into Greek from a Hebrew original, as the following quotes demonstrate:

Clement of Alexandria (150 - 212 C.E.)
In the work called *Hypotyposes*, to sum up the matter briefly he [Clement of Alexandria] has given us abridged accounts of all the canonical Scriptures,... the Epistle to the Hebrews he

asserts was written by Paul, to the Hebrews, in the Hebrew tongue; but that it was carefully translated by Luke, and published among the Greeks.[40]

Eusebius (315 C.E.)
For as Paul had addressed the Hebrews in the language of his country; some say that the evangelist Luke, others that

---

[37] Jerome; Of Illustrious Men 3
[38] Jerome; De Vir. 3:36
[39] Isho'dad *Commentary on the Gospels*
[40] Clement of Alexandria; *Hypotyposes;* referred to by Eusebius in *Eccl. Hist.* 6:14:2

Clement, translated the epistle.[41]

Jerome (382)
"He (Paul) being a Hebrew wrote in Hebrew, that is, his own
tongue and most fluently while things which were eloquently
written in Hebrew were more eloquently turned into Greek[42]

It should be noted that these church fathers did not always agree that the other
books of the New Testament were written in Hebrew. Epiphanius for example, believed
"that only Matthew put the setting forth of the preaching of the Gospel into the New
Testament in the Hebrew language and letters."[43] Epiphanius does, however, tell us that
the Jewish believers would disagree with him, and point out the existence of Hebrew
copies of John and Acts in a "Gaza" or "treasury" [Genizah?] in Tiberius, Israel.[44]
Epiphanius believed these versions to be mere "translations"[45] but admitted that the
Jewish believers would disagree with him.[46] The truth in this matter is clear, if Greek had
replaced Hebrew as the language of Jews as early as the first century, then why would
fourth century Jews have any need for Hebrew translations. The very existence of
Hebrew manuscripts of these books in fourth century Israel testifies to their originality,
not to mention the fact that the Jewish believers regarded them as authentic.

TESTIMONY OF THE TALMUDIC RABBIS

In addition to the statements made by the early Christian church fathers, the
ancient Jewish Rabbis also hint of a Hebrew original for the Gospels. Both the Jerusalem
and Babylonian Talmuds and the Tosefta relate a debate among Rabbinic Jews over the
method of destruction of manuscripts of New Testament books.[47] Specifically mentioned
is a book called by them as אונגליון[48] (or "Gospels"). The question which arose was
how to handle the destruction of these manuscripts since they contained the actual name
of God. It is of course, well known that the Greek New Testament manuscripts do not
contain the Name but use the Greek titles "God" and "Lord" as substitutes. This is
because the Name is not traditionally translated into other languages, but instead is
(unfortunately) translated "Lord", just as we have it in most English Bibles today, and
just as we find in our late manuscripts of the Septuagint .[49] The manuscripts these
Rabbi's were discussing must have represented the original Hebrew text from which the
Greek was translated.

---

[41] Eusebius; Eccl. Hist. 3:38:2-3
[42] Lives of Illustrious Men, Book V
[43] Epiphanius; *Pan.* 30:3
[44] Epipnanius; *Pan.* 30:3, 6
[45] Epiphanius; *Pan.* 30:3, 6, 12
[46] Epiphanius; *Pan.* 30:3
[47] t.Shab. 13:5; b.Shab. 116a; j.Shab. 15c
[48] (b.Shab. 116a) The word אונגליון is part of the title of the Old Syriac manuscripts, and is also used in
some passages of the Peshitta (such as Mk. 1:1) and may be a loan word from the Greek word for "Gospel"
and in Hebrew and in Aramaic may mean "a powerful scroll." The exact same spelling is used both in the
Talmud, the Old Syriac and the Peshitta.
[49] Greek translation of the "Old Testament"

History of the Movement

That the New Testament, like the Old Testament, was originally written in Hebrew and Aramaic is further verified by the history of the early believers in Yeshua as the Messiah. The first believers in Yeshua were a Jewish sect known as "Nazarenes".[50] Sometime later the first Gentile believers in Yeshua called "Christians" appeared.[51] This first congregation of Gentile Christians formed in Antioch, the capital of Syria, where some of the people spoke Greek and almost all spoke Aramaic, which is also called "Syriac". Then in 70 C.E., there was a mass exodus of the Nazarenes from their center at Jerusalem to Pella.[52] Eventually, they established communities in Beroea, Decapolis, Bashanitis and Perea.[53] These Nazarenes used Hebrew Scriptures[54] and in the fourth century Jerome traveled to Borea to copy their Hebrew Matthew.[55] As a result, while at least the book of Matthew was first written in Hebrew, very early on Aramaic and Greek New Testament books were needed.

The Eastward Spread

In addition to these factors we must also consider the Eastern spread of Christianity. We have heard much about the so called "Westward spread of Christianity" but little is written of the equally profound Eastward movement. While Paul made missionary journeys from his headquarters in Antioch Syria, into the Western world, most of the emissaries (apostles) traveled eastward. Bartholomew traveled eastward through Assyria into Armenia, then back down through Assyria, Babylon, Parthia (Persia) and down into India where he was flayed alive with knives. Thaddeus taught in Edessa (a city of northern Syria) Assyria and Persia, dying a martyr by arrows either in Persia or at Ararat. Thomas taught in Parthia, Persia and India. He was martyred with a spear at Mt. St. Thomas near Madras in India. To this very day a group of Christians in India are called "St. Thomas Christians. Finally Kefa (Peter) traveled to Babylon and even wrote one of his letters from there.[56]

That the emissaries brought Semitic New Testament Scriptures eastward with them is affirmed to us by the Church fathers. Eusebius writes:

> Pantaenus... penetrated as far as India, where it is reported
> hat he found the Gospel according to Matthew, which had been
> delivered before his arrival to some who had the knowledge of
> Messiah, to whom Bartholomew
> one of the emissaries, as it is said, had preached, and left them
> the writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters.[57]

---

[50] Acts 11:19; 24:5
[51] Acts 11:26
[52] Eusebius; *Eccl. Hist.* 3:5
[53] Epiphanius; *Panarion* 29:7:7-8
[54]Epiphanius; *Panarion* 29:7:2-4; 9:4
[55] Jerome; *Of Illustrious Men* 3
[56] 1Pt. 5:13
[57] Eusebius; *Eccl. Hist.* 5:10

And as Jerome writes:

> Pantaenus found that Bartholomew, one of the twelve
> emissaries, had there [in India] preached the advent of our
> Lord Yeshua the Messiah according to the Gospel of Matthew,
> which was written in Hebrew letters...[58]

This entire region of the Near East stretching from Israel through Syria, Assyria, Babylon, Persia (Parthia) and down into India, became known as the "Church of the East." At its high point the Church of the East stretched as far east as China! By the fifth and sixth Centuries Christological debates had split the Church of the East into two major factions, Nestorians and Jacobites . Today, the Church of the East has been split into even more groups: Nestorians,[59] Jacobites,[60] Chaldean Roman Catholics, and Maronites.[61] All of whom continue to use an Aramaic New Testament text.

When the Roman Catholic Portuguese invaded India in 1498 they encountered over a hundred churches belonging to the St. Thomas Christians along the coast of Malabar. These St. Thomas Christians, according to tradition, had been there since the first century. They had married clergymen, did not adore images or pray to or through saints, nor did they believe in purgatory. Most importantly they maintained use of the Aramaic New Testament which they claimed had been in use at Antioch.[62]

The Westward Spread

Now while many of the emissaries were spreading the Messianic movement eastward, Paul was taking the movement into the Western world. From his headquarters at Antioch, the capitol of Syria, Paul conducted several missionary journeys into Europe. At this time there came a need for Greek versions of New Testament books.

As time progressed several events occurred which resulted in a great rise of anti-Semitism in the West. This began when the Jews revolted against the Roman Empire in 70 C.E.. A second revolt by Jews in Egypt occurred in 116 C.E.. Things were further complicated by the Bar Kokhba revolt of 132 C.E.. In the Roman Empire anti-Semitism became very popular, and even patriotic. In the West, Gentile Christianity sought to

---

[58] Jerome; *De Vir.* 3:36

[59] Nestorians prefer the name the Holy Apostolic Catholic Assyrian Church of the East. Nestorius the Syrian was Patriarch of Constantinople from 428 to 431 C.E.. His name in Aramaic means "banner on a mountain" (see Is. 13:2) One Rabbinic tradition claims that this Nestorious was closely associated with the Nazarenes (Toldot Yeshu 7). Nestorius refused to call Miriam (Mary) "Mother of God" because he claimed that in Messiah a divine and a human person acted as one, but did not fuse inseparably, as a result Nestorius taught that Miriam was only the mother of Yeshua the man, but that God existed before Yeshua was ever born. In 431 the Council of Ephesus excommunicated Nestorious and his followers who became known as "Nestorians."

[60] The Jacobites are Monophysites. They prefer the name Syrian Orthodox Church. They were founded in 570 C.E. when Jacob Baradai, Bishop of Edessa united the Monophysites. These Jacobites are headed by the Patriarch of Antioch and claim to be the original Christians of Antioch.

[61] The Maronites are the Christians of Lebanon. They were originally Monophysites in the seventh century, but joined the Roman Catholic Church in the twelfth Century.

[62] T*he Syriac New Testament* sixth ed. ; James Murdock; Scripture Tract Repository; 1883; pp. xvi-xvii

distance itself from Judaism and Jewish customs. The Greek text began to be favored over the Semitic text and many Semitic writings were subsequently destroyed.

By 325 C.E. anti-Semitism and the priority given in the West to the Greek Scriptures had solidified. Constantine invaded Rome, making himself emperor. Constantine proclaimed Christianity to be the Catholic (universal) religion, thus making Christianity the enforced state religion of the Roman Empire. Before this occurred one could be killed for being a Christian, afterwards one could be killed for not being a "Christian." Constantine, who was an anti-Semite, called the council of Nicea in 325 C.E. to standardize Christianity. Jews were excluded from the meeting. Jewish practices were officially banned and the Greek translations officially replaced the original Semitic Scriptures.

Having alienated the Jewish Nazarenes in 325 at the Council of Nicea, subsequent councils alienated the Assyrians and Syrians over Christological debates. The Nestorian Assyrians were alienated in 431 C.E. at the Council of Ephesus while the Jacobite Syrians were alienated in 451 C.E. at the Council of Chalcedon. The division between the Semitic peoples of the Near East, and the Roman Catholic Church grew ever steeper.

With the rise of Islam in the Near East the Near Eastern Christians were even further separated from their European counterparts in the West. Relations between the Christian West and the Islamic Near East were non-existent.

As time progressed, in the West the Roman Catholic Church began to suppress the Scriptures in Europe. Those who would try to make the Scriptures available to the common man were often burned alive. Such suppression was impossible in the Near East, where the Scriptures were already in Aramaic, the common language of the people. When the Protestant reformation emerged, claiming the Greek New Testament as the original, it was a time when most Europeans were not even aware that an Aramaic version existed.

In was in this atmosphere, in 1516 that the first printed edition of the Greek New Testament was published in Europe. This edition, published by Erasmus, would become known as the Textus Receptus, and serve as the standard Greek text until the 19th Century. The first edition of this work was based solely on six manuscripts, while later editions used only ten. None of these manuscripts were complete, and only one was even particularly old, dating to the tenth century. Since none of his manuscripts were complete, Erasmus was forced to invent many of his Greek portions of Revelation by translating from the Latin Vulgate into Greek. It was this poor edition which served as the evidence by which the West would embrace the Greek as the original. This edition would later serve as the basis for the King James Version.

Grammar of the New Testament

It has long been recognized that the New Testament is written in very poor Greek grammar, but very good Semitic grammar. Many sentences are inverted with a verb > noun format characteristic of Semitic languages. Furthermore, there are several occurrences of the redundant "and". A number of scholars have shown in detail the Semitic grammar imbedded in the Greek New Testament books.[63]

---

[63] For example: *Our Translated Gospels* By Charles Cutler Torrey; *Documents of the Primitive Church* by Charles Cutler Torrey; *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* by Matthew Black; *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* by Charles Fox Burney; *The Aramaic Origin of the Four Gospels* by Frank Zimmerman and *Semitisms of the Book of Acts* by Max Wilcox

In addition to the evidence for Semitic grammar imbedded in the Greek New Testament, the fact that serious grammatical errors are found in the Greek New Testament books may be added. Speaking of the Greek of Revelation, Charles Cutler Torrey states that it "...swarms with major offenses against Greek grammar."[64] He calls it "linguistic anarchy", and says, "The grammatical monstrosities of the book, in their number and variety and especially in their startling character, stand alone in the history of literature." [65] Torrey gives ten examples[66] listed below:

1. Rev. 1:4 "Grace to you, and peace, from *he who is and who was and who is to come*" (all nom. case)

2. Rev. 1:15 "His legs were like burnished *brass* (neut. gender dative case) as in a furnace *purified*" (Fem. gender sing. no., gen. case)

3. Rev. 11:3 "My *witness* (nom.) shall prophesy for many days *clothed* (accus.) in sackcloth."

4. Rev. 14:14 "I saw on the cloud one seated like unto a *Son of Man* (accus.) *having* (nom.) upon his head a golden crown."

5. Rev. 14:19 "He harvested the vintage of the earth, and cast it into the *winepress* (fem), the *great [winepress]* (masc.) of the wrath of God."

6. Rev. 17:4 "A golden cup filled with *abominations* (gen.) and with *unclean things*" (accus.)

7. Rev. 19:20 "The lake of *blazing* (fem.) *fire* (neut.).

8. Rev. 20:2 "And he seized the *dragon* (accus.), the old *serpent* (nom.) who is the Devil and Satan, and bound him."
9. Rev. 21:9 "Seven angels holding seven *bowls* (accus.) *filled* (gen.) with the seven last plagues."

10. Rev. 22:5 "They have no need of *lamplight* (gen.) nor of *sunlight* (accus.)."

Mistakes in the Greek New Testament

In addition to grammatical errors in the Greek New Testament, there are also a number of "blunders" in the text which prove that the present Greek text is not inerrant.
One of the mistakes in the Greek New Testament may be found in Matthew 23:35 where Zechariah the son of Jehoidai (2Chron. 24:20-21; b.San. 96; j.Ta'anit 69)

---

[64] *Documents of the Primitive Church*; Charles Cutler Torey; Harper and Bothers, New York; 1941; p. 156
[65] ibid p. 158
[66] ibid

mistakenly appears as Zechariah the son of Berechiah (Zech. 1:1).[67] This error was not to be found in the ancient Hebrew copy which Jerome held. Jerome writes of Hebrew Matthew: "In the Gospel which the Nazarenes use, for 'Son of Barachias' I find 'of Joiada' written"[68]

Another mistake in the Greek New Testament is to be found in Matthew 27:9 which quotes Zech. 11:12-13 but falsely credits the quote to Jeremiah.[69] The Shem Tob Hebrew correctly attributes the quote to Zechariah, while the Aramaic (Old Syriac and Peshitta) simply attribute the quote to "the prophet."

Yet another apparent mistake in the Greek text of the New Testament is the name "Cainan" in Luke 3:36. In this passage the name appears but not in the corresponding Masoretic genealogies in Gen. 10:24; 11:12 and 1Chron. 1:18, 24. [70] The Old Syriac does not contain this reading, but reads "Elam" a name which appears in the Masoretic genealogy of Gen. 10:22 and 1Chron. 1:17 as a brother, who apparently is inserted into this family line based on Deut. 25:5-6.

Greek Mt. 1:1-17 subtracts a name in the Messiah's genealogy. The genealogy in Matthew is supposed to contain three sets of fourteen names each (Mt. 1:17) yet the last set contains only 13 names in the Greek. The missing name, Abner (Av'ner) does appear in the DuTillet Hebrew text of Mt. 1:13.

Semitic Idiomatic Expressions

Another evidence for a Semitic background for the New Testament is the abundance of Semitic idiomatic expressions in the New Testament text. Idiomatic expressions are phrases whose literal meanings are nonsense, but which have special meanings in a particular language. For example, the English phrase "in a pickle" has nothing to do with pickles, but means to be in trouble. When translated into Aramaic it is meaningless.

Several Semitic idiomatic expressions appear in the New Testament, the following are only a few:

• "good eye" meaning "generous" and "bad eye" meaning "stingy" (Mt.6:22-23; 20:15; Lk. 11:34)[71] [72]

• "bind" meaning "prohibit" and "loose" meaning "permit" (Mt. 16:19; 18:18)[73]

---

[67] It has been claimed that a similar mistake, found in the Koran, which confuses Miriam (Mary) the mother of Yeshua with Miriam the sister of Aaron and Moses (Koran; Surah 19:16-28) proves that the Koran is not inspired.

[68] Jerome; *Com on Mt. 23:35*

[69] Perhaps because of a similar prophecy in Jer. 18:2; 19:2, 11; 32:6-9

[70] The name does appear in the LXX in Gen. 11:12 but not in the other passages where it would appear if it were a true reading.

[71] Other examples: Prov. 22:9; 23:6; 28:22

[72] *Understanding the Difficult Sayings of Jesus*; David Bivin and Roy Blizzard, Jr.; Austin, TX;1984; pp. 143f; *Jewish New Testament Commentary;* David H. Stern; 1992; p. 57

[73] Other examples: j.Ber. 5b; 6c; j.San. 28a; b.Ab.Zar. 37a; b.Ned. 62a; b.Yeb. 106a; b.Bets. 2b; 22a; b.Ber. 35a; b.Hag. 3b

• "destroy the Law" meaning to teach a precept of the Law incorrectly, and "fulfil [the Law]" meaning to teach its precepts correctly (Mt. 5:17).[74]

• Use of the word "word" to mean "matter" or "thing" (1Cor. 12:8)

• Use of the word "Heaven" as a euphemism for "God"[75]
(Mt. 5:3; 21:25, Lk. 15:18; Jn. 3:27)[76]

• Idiomatic use of the word "face" (Lk. 9:51-52)

• The phrase "cast out your name as evil" (Lk. 6:22)[77]
is a poor translation of "cast out your evil name." meaning to defame someone.[78]

• "Lay these sayings in your ears" (Lk. 9:44)[79] means to listen carefully.[80]

.

---

[74] *Understanding the Difficult Sayings of Jesus;* David Bivin and Roy Blizzard, Jr.; Austin, TX;1984; pp. 152

[75] *Understanding the Difficult Sayings of Jesus*; David Bivin and Roy Blizzard, Jr.; Austin, TX;1984; p. 85

[76] Other example: 1En. 6:1-2 = Gen 6:1-2

[77] Other examples: Deut. 22:13, 19

[78] *Understanding the Difficult Sayings of Jesus;* David Bivin and Roy Blizzard, Jr.; Austin, TX;1984; p. 156f

[79]Other example: Ex. 17:4

[80] *Understanding the Difficult Sayings of Jesus;* David Bivin and Roy Blizzard, Jr.; Austin, TX;1984; p. 160f

The Pauline Epistles

The common wisdom of textual origins has always been that the Pauline Epistles were first written in Greek. This position is held by many, despite the fact that two "church fathers" admitted the Semitic origin of at least one of Paul's Epistles and one (Jerome) admits to the Semitic origin of most, if not all, of Paul's Epistles.[81] Still, Paul is generally seen as a Helenist Jew from Tarsus who Hellenized the Gospel. So strong has this image of Paul been instilled in Western scholarship that even those who have argued for a Semitic origin for significant portions of the New Testament have rarely ventured to challenge the Greek origin of the Pauline Epistles.

Paul and Tarsus

In addressing the issue of the Pauline Epistles, we must first examine the background of Tarsus. Was Tarsus a Greek speaking city? Would Paul have learned Greek there? Tarsus probably began as a Hittite city-state. Around 850 B.C.E. Tarsus became part of the great Assyrian Empire. When the Assyrian Empire was conquered by the Babylonian Empire around 605 B.C.E. Tarsus became a part of that Empire as well. Then, in 540 B.C.E. The Babylonian Empire, including Tarsus, was incorporated into the Persian Empire. Aramaic was the chief language of all three of these great Empires. By the first century Aramaic remained a primary language of Tarsus. Coins struck at Tarsus and recovered by archaeologists have Aramaic inscriptions on them.[82]

Regardless of the language of Tarsus, there is also great question as to if Paul was actually brought up in Tarsus or just incidentally born there. The key text in question is Acts 22:3:

> I am indeed a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city of Cilicia,
> but brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel,
> taught according to the strictness of our father's Torah.
> and was zealous toward God as you all are today.

Paul sees his birth at Tarsus as irrelevant and points to his being "brought up" in Jerusalem. Much argument has been given by scholars to this term "brought up" as it appears here. Some have argued that it refers only to Paul's adolescent years. A key, however, to the usage of the term may be found in a somewhat parallel passage in Acts 7:20-23:

> At this time Moses was born, and was well pleasing to God;
> and he was brought up in his father's house for three months.
> And when he was set out, Pharaoh's daughter took him away
> and brought him up as her own son.
> And Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians...

---

[81] As noted in the previous chapter.
[82] Greek Coins; Charles Feltman; p. 185

Note the sequence; "born" (Greek = gennao; Aramaic = ityiled); "brought up" (Greek = anatrepho; Aramaic = itrabi); "learned/taught" (Greek = paideuo; Aramaic = itr'di). Through this parallel sequence which presumably was idiomatic in the language, we can see that Paul was born at Tarsus, raised in Jerusalem, and then taught. Paul's entire context is that his being raised in Jerusalem is his primary upbringing, and that he was merely born at Tarsus.

Was Paul a Helenist?

The claim that Paul was a Hellenistic is also a misunderstanding that should be dealt with. As we have already seen, Paul was born at Tarsus, a city where Aramaic was spoken. Whatever Hellenistic influences may have been at Tarsus, Paul seems to have left there at a very early age and been "brought up" in Jerusalem. Paul describes himself as a "Hebrew" (2Cor. 11:2) and a "Hebrew of Hebrews" (Phil. 3:5), and "of the tribe of Benjamin" (Rom. 11:1). It is important to realize how the term "Hebrew" was used in the first century. The term Hebrew was not used as a genealogical term, but as a cultural/linguistic term. An example of this can be found in Acts 6:1 were a dispute arises between the "Hebrews" and the "Hellenistic." Most scholars agree that the "Hellenistic" here are Helenist Jews. No evangelistic efforts had yet been made toward non-Jews (Acts 11:19) much less Greeks (see Acts 16:6-10). In Acts 6:1 a clear contrast is made between Helenists and Hebrews which are clearly non-Helenists. Helenists were not called Hebrews, a term reserved for non-Helenist Jews. When Paul calls himself a "Hebrew" he is claiming to be a non-Helenist, and when he calls himself a "Hebrew of Hebrews" he is claiming to be strongly non-Helenist. This would explain why Paul disputed against the Helenists and why they attempted to kill him (Acts. 9:29) and why he escaped to Tarsus (Acts 9:30). If there was no non-Helenist Jewish population in Tarsus, this would have been a very bad move.

Paul's Pharisee background gives us further reason to doubt that he was in any way a Helenist. Paul claimed to be a "Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee" (Acts 23:6) meaning that he was at least a second generation Pharisee. The Aramaic text, as well as some Greek mss. have "Pharisee the son of Pharisees," a Semitic idiomatic expression meaning a third generation Pharisee. If Paul were a second or third generation Pharisee, it would be difficult to accept that he had been raised up as a Helenist. Pharisees were staunchly opposed to Helenism. Paul's claim to be a second or third generation Pharisee is further amplified by his claim to have been a student of Gamliel (Acts 22:3). Gamliel was the grandson of Hillel and the head of the school of Hillel. He was so well respected that the Mishna states that upon his death "the glory of the Torah ceased, and purity and modesty died."[83] The truth of Paul's claim to have studied under Gamliel is witnessed by Paul's constant use of Hillelian Hermeneutics. Paul makes extensive use, for example, of the first rule of Hillel.[84] It is an unlikely proposition that a Helenist would have studied under Gamliel at the school of Hillel, then the center of Pharisaic Judaism.

---

[83] m.Sotah 9:15
[84] kal v'khomer (light and heavy).

The Audience and Purpose of the Pauline Epistles

Paul's audience is another element which must be considered when tracing the origins of his Epistles. Paul's Epistles were addressed to various congregations in the Diaspora. These congregations were mixed groups made up of a core group of Jews and a complimentary group of Gentiles. The Thessalonian congregation was just such an assembly (Acts 17:1-4) as were the Corinthians.[85] It is known that Aramaic remained a language of Jews living in the Diaspora, and in fact Jewish Aramaic inscriptions have been found at Rome, Pompei and even England.[86] If Paul wrote his Epistle's in Hebrew or Aramaic to a core group of Jews at each congregation who then passed the message on to their Gentile counterparts then this might give some added dimension to Paul's phrase "to the Jew first and then to the Greek" (Rom. 1:16; 2:9-10). It would also shed more light on the passage which Paul writes:

> What advantage then has the Jew,
> or what is the profit of circumcision?
> Much in every way!
> To them first, were committed the Words of God.
>   - Rom. 3:1-2

It is clear that Paul did not write his letters in the native tongues of the cities to which he wrote. Certainly no one would argue for a Latin original of Romans.

One final issue which must be discussed regarding the origin of Paul's Epistles, is their intended purpose. It appears that Paul intended the purpose of his Epistles to be:

1) To be read in the Congregations (Col. 4:16; 1Thes. 5:27)

2) To have doctrinal authority (1Cor. 14:37)

All Synagogue liturgy during the Second Temple era, was in Hebrew and Aramaic[87] Paul would not have written material which he intended to be read in the congregations in any other language. Moreover all religious writings of Jews which claimed halachic (doctrinal) authority, were written in Hebrew or Aramaic. Paul could not have expected that his Epistles would be accepted as having the authority he claimed for them, without having written them in Hebrew or Aramaic.

Semitic Style of Paul's Epistles

Paul clearly writes using Semitic idiomatic expressions. Paul uses the term "word" to refer to some matter or thing (1Cor. 12:8) Paul also uses the Semitic form of magnification by following a noun with its plural form. This is used in the Tenach (Old

---

[85] Certain passages in the Corinthian Epistles are clearly aimed exclusively at Jews (1Cor. 10:1-2 for example.)

[86] Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology "Note on a Bilingual Inscription in Latin and Aramaic Recently Found at South Shields"; A. Lowy' Dec. 3, 1878; pp. 11-12; "Five Transliterated Aramaic Inscriptions" The American Journal of Archaeology; W.R. Newbold; 1926; Vol. 30; pp. 288ff

[87] see The Words of Jesus By Gustaf Dalman; Edinburg, England; 1909

Testament) in such terms as "Holy of Holies." Paul uses this idiom in such phrases as "Hebrew of Hebrews" (Phil. 3:5); "King of kings" and "Lord of lords" (1Tim. 6:15).

Paul was born in Tarsus, an Aramaic speaking city, and raised up in Jerusalem as a staunch non-Helenist. He wrote his Epistles to core groups of Jews at various congregations in the Diaspora to hold doctrinal authority and to be used as liturgy. There can be little doubt that he wrote these Epistles in Hebrew or Aramaic and they were later translated into Greek.

Tanak Quotes

It has often been claimed by the pro-Greek New Testament origin crowd, that the several quotes in the Greek New Testament which agree with the LXX prove the Greek origin of the New Testament. This argument is faulty however, for two important reasons.
First of all, the premise of this argument presumes the conclusion to be true. It is only in the Greek New Testament that such neat agreements with the LXX occur. Hebrew Matthew (Shem Tob and DuTillet) tends to agree with the Masoretic Text, While the Aramaic versions of New Testament books (Old Syriac Gospels, Peshitta New Testament and Crawford Revelation) tend to agree in many places with the Peshitta Old Testament.
The second fault with this argument is that recent discoveries in the Dead Sea Scrolls have produced first century Hebrew mss. of Old Testament books which in places agree with the LXX against the current Hebrew Text (the Masoretic text) and at times agree with the Peshitta Old Testament against the Masoretic text or the LXX. Thus many, but not all agreements of the New Testament with the LXX may be due to these first century Old Testament texts which contained such agreements.
An examination of four sample Old Testament quotes as they appear in the Aramaic New Testament will demonstrate two important facts. First, the Aramaic text of the Old Syriac and Peshitta New Testament could not have been translated from the Greek New Testament. Second, the Aramaic New Testament, as we have it today has been altered in some places so as to agree with the Greek. In all of these examples the Greek New Testament agrees with the LXX perfectly.

Heb. 10:5-7 = Ps. 40:7-9 (6-8)

With sacrifices and offerings You are not pleased
But You have clothed me with a body
And burnt offerings which are for sins You have not asked for.
Then I said, Behold I come,
In the beginning of the book it is written concerning me
I will do your will, God.

Here the phrase "But You have clothed me with a body" best agrees with the LXX which has "You have prepared a body for me," a radical departure from the Masoretic Text which has "Ears You have cut/dug for me." but agreeing with the Zohar which alludes to the passage saying "Your eyes behold me ere *I was clothed in a body*

and all things are written in your book". However the phrase "In the beginning of the book..." is a unique reading from the Peshitta Old Testament. The Hebrew has "In the roll of the book..." while the LXX has "In the volume of the book..." agreeing with the Greek of Hebrews.

Thus, this quote in the Peshitta version of Hebrews is a hybrid text sometimes agreeing with the LXX against the Masoretic Text and Peshitta Old Testament, and sometimes agreeing with the Peshitta Old Testament against both the LXX and the Masoretic Text. In fact this hybrid nature looks just like what such a quote might be expected to look like, in light of the hybrid texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls. This quote could not contain agreements with both the LXX and the Peshitta Old Testament if it were translated from the Greek New Testament. If this passage were translated from the Greek it would either have agreed with the LXX only as does the Greek, or inserted the standard Peshitta reading as a substitute. This quote therefore, is not a translation from Greek nor a substitute inserted from the Peshitta Old Testament but is a reading which originated apart from the Greek text.

1Peter 1:24-25 = Isaiah 40:6-8

Because of this all flesh is grass
And all its beauty like a flower of the field
The grass dries up and the flower withers
and the Word of our God abides forever

Here the line "And all its beauty like a flower of the field" agrees with the Peshitta Old Testament and Masoretic Text against the LXX and Greek New Testament which has "and all the glory of man like the flower of grass." In fact this quote agrees with the Peshitta Old Testament exactly except for the omission of Isaiah 40:7 which agrees with the LXX. Like the previous example, it could not have been translated from the Greek text.

Acts 8:32-33 = Isaiah 53:7-8

Like a lamb he was led to the slaughter,
and like a sheep before its shearer is silent,
Even thus he did not open his mouth.
In his humiliation he was led from prison and from judgement,
And who will declare his generation?
because his life has been taken from the earth/land

In the first two lines the words "lamb" and "sheep" are reversed in the LXX and Greek Acts but not here, where they agree with the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta Old Testament. "from prison" agrees with the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta Old Testament against the LXX, but "In his humiliation" agrees with the LXX against both. The final line contains a special problem. In this line the Peshitta Acts agrees with the LXX and Greek Acts, but this passage could not have merely come from a variant Hebrew text. In this passage the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta Old Testament agree against the LXX

with "He was cut off out of the land of the living." An examination of the two versions makes it clear that the LXX translator misunderstood the Hebrew grammar here and took the word "life/living" to be a direct object rather than a modifier. Thus this phrase could only have come from the LXX. It is apparent however, because of the agreements with the Masoretic Text and Peshitta Old Testament against the LXX in the preceding lines, that this quote could not have been translated from the Greek. Thus, we may conclude that the Peshitta New Testament has been revised in places to agree with the Greek text, as our last example will further demonstrate.

Mt. 4:4 = Deut. 8:3

> Man does not live by bread alone,
> but by every word which comes from the mouth of God.

The word "God" here agrees with the LXX against both the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta Old Testament. It might first appear that this passage was merely translated from the Greek of Matthew. However, a look at the Old Syriac version, which is recognized by most scholars as the ancestor of the Peshitta[88] has "Lord" in closer agreement with the Masoretic Text and the Peshitta Old Testament against the LXX. Thus, it is clear that the Peshitta was revised here to agree with the LXX and the more primitive text of the Old Syriac retains the original, unrevised reading.

Zech. 12:10 = Jn. 19:37

> ...they shall look upon <u>me</u> whom they have pierced... (Zech. 12:10)
> ...they shall look upon <u>him</u> whom they have pierced... (Jn. 19:37)

The origin for this variance between the New Testament and the Old appears to originate in the Aramaic versions.   (see footnote to Jn. 19:37 in the text).

From the above examples it is clear that Old Testament quotes as they appear in the Aramaic New Testament demonstrate that the Peshitta New Testament could not have been simply translated from Greek.

---

[88] See for example Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac; Arthur Voobus; 1951; p. 46; 54-55; The Text of the New Testament; Bruce Metzger; 1968; pp. 69-70 note; Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament; Sir Fredric G. Kenyon; 1951; p. 164.

WITNESSES TO THE TEXT OF THE TANAK

HEBREW WITNESSES

The Masoretic Text

Between the years 500 and 950 C.E. a group of Rabbinic Jewish traditionalists known as "Masorites" standardized the Hebrew text of the Tanak and added written vowels to the text (ancient Hebrew has no written vowels). This standardization of the text resulted in a single text with little or no variant readings from manuscript to manuscript. There are slight differences between the earliest Masoretic Text manuscripts. Toward the end of the Masoretic era the last two Masoretic families (Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali) finalized two slightly different Masoretic Texts. Most printed editions today use the Ben Asher text as their source.

It is important to note that the Masoretic vowels are not part of the original text. For example when the Masorites supplied vowels for the sacred name of יהוה (YHWH) they did not give the true vowels but borrowed the vowels from Eloah ("God"). The result was YeHoVaH which was anglicized in the KJV with "Jehovah". These vowels did not actually fit into the word YHWH so the letter ו was used as both a vowel "o" and constant "W/V" (W in ancient pronunciation; V in modern pronunciation).   Most scholars believe that the original vowels were YaHWeh or YaHuWeh. Moreover the Masorites, when adding vowels to names which began with the first three letters of the Sacred Name (יהו), used these same "false vowels" from "YeHoVaH" thus producing names like "Yehoshua" (or "Y'hoshua") and Yehoshafat (or "Y'hoshafat). However names which ended with these three letters of the Sacred Name were given the original vowels thus names such as Eli-YAHU etc. The HRV translates the sacred name with no vowels with YHWH (allowing the reader to read the word as they understand it to be pronounced) and names beginning with the first three letters of the Sacred Name as YAHU thus restoring Yehoshua to Yahushua etc..

The Samaritan Pentateuch

The Samaritan Pentateuch is the version of the Hebrew Torah not as preserved by Jewish authorities but as preserved by the Samaritan community.

The Cairo Geniza

The Cairo Geniza discovery are an archive of ancient Jewish manuscripts discovered in the 1890's in the synagogue of Fostat-Cairo, Egypt, which had been originally built in 882 C.E.. Among the documents discovered were biblical manuscripts from a time when the Masoritic Text was not yet finalized.

The Dead Sea Scrolls

The 1948 printing of ***Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*** Sir Frederick Kenyon wrote:

> There is indeed, no probability that we shall ever find manuscripts
> of the Hebrew text going back to a period before the formation
> of the text which we know as Masoretic. We can only arrive
> at an idea of it by a study of the earliest translations made
> from it…

Even as his 1948 edition was in the printing, events were unfolding that would prove him wrong, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Dead Sea Scrolls are a collection of scrolls as well as thousands of fragments of scrolls found in several caves near the Dead Sea in the Qumran area. Among the scrolls are many biblical manuscripts dating back to a time prior to the first century. These manuscripts give us a sample of the wide variety of textual readings from the pre-Masoretic period. The Dead Sea Scroll biblical manuscripts vary widely as to text-type. For example two copies of Isaiah found in cave one agree very closely with the Masoretic Text while a Hebrew copy of 1Samuel found in cave four has many important agreements with the Greek LXX (Septuagint) against the Masoretic Text.

The Masorah[89]

The term "Masorah" refers to the marginal notes which were transmitted by the Masorites along with the Masoretic Text. The notes transmitted in the side margins are called the "Masorah Parva" or "Masorah Katonah". The notes transmitted on the top and bottom margins are the "Masorah Magna" also known as "Masorah Gedolah". Finally the notes transmitted at the end of the text are the Masorah Finalis.

Among the notes preserved in the Massorah Gedolah are those of the Tikkun Soferim ("Emendations of the Scribes"). Among the Tikkun Soferim are eighteen notations which indicate that the scribes, finding the original reading irreverent, emended the reading to one less offensive. Each of these eighteen readings are indicated with footnotes in the HRV (see notes to Gen. 18:22; Num. 11:15; 12:12; 1Sam. 3:13; 2Sam. 16:12; 20:1; 1Kn. 12:16; Jer. 2:11; Ezek. 8:17; Hose 4:7; Hab. 1:12; Zech. 2:12; Mal. 1:13; Job 7:20; 32:3; Lam. 3:20 and 2Chron. 10:16). These footnotes also compare other textual readings from other witnesses to these readings.

The Massorah also notes 134 places where the Masoretic Text reads "Adonai" but which, according to the Masorah, originally read "YHWH". In each of these locations

---

[89] For documentation regarding the Massorah and the Tikkun Soferim see: ***Old Testament Textual Criticism, a Practical Introduction*** by Ellis R. Brotzman pp. 54-55, 116-120; ***The Masorah of Biblia Hebraica Struttgartensia*** by Kelley, Mynatt and Crawford pp. 1-11, 23-28, 37-43, 191; ***The Tiqqune Sopherim*** by C. McCarthy; "Scribal Emendations" by E.J. Revell, ***Anchor Bible Dictionary; Introduction to the Massoretic-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible***, by C. Ginsburg; pp. 347-363 & Chapter 3. ***Massorah Gedolah***, Vol. 1 G.E. Weil, 1971. ***The Massorah***, C. Ginsburg paragraphs 107-115.

the HRV has "YHWH" in the main text along with a footnote explaining that the Masoretic Text reads "Adonai" but that the Massorah indicates the original reading was "YHWH". These footnotes also compare readings from other textual witnesses as to whether they support YHWH or Adonai in the reading in question.

There are also several places where the Masoretic Text reads "Elohim" but which the Massorah indicates the original reading was "YHWH". In these verses the HRV has "ELOHIM" in all caps.

ARAMAIC WITNESSES

The Peshitta Aramaic Tanak

The Aramaic Peshitta Tanak is an important and under recognized witness to the text of the Tanak. The exact origin of the Peshitta Tanak is unknown. The "Syriac" version of the Tanak is mentioned by Melito of Sardis as early as the second century C.E.. One tradition has it that Hiram King of Tyre in the days of Solomon commissioned this Aramaic translation of the Tanak. Another tradition assigns the Peshitta translation as having been commissioned by the King of Assyria who dispatched Assa the Priest to Samarir (see 2Kn. 17:27-28). According to the Aramaic "Church Father" Bar Hebraeus the Peshitta Tanak originated when Abgar, king of Edessa, Syria, dispatched scholars to Israel to produce an Aramaic translation of the Tanak (Bar Hebraeus; Comm. To Ps. 10). Wichelshaus suggested that this king was the same as King Izates II of Adiabene. This king, along with his family, converted to Judaism as recorded by Josephus (Ant. 20:69-71). This king had dispatched his five sons to Israel in order for them to study Hebrew and Judaism. Burkitt maintained that the Peshitta Tanak originated not long after the first century C.E. as the product of the Jewish community of Edessa in Syria.[90]

There is certainly a good deal of evidence to support the Jewish origin of the Peshitta Tanak. The Babylonian Talmud seems to allude to the Peshitta text (see b.Shab. 10b; b.Rosh Hashanna 33b; b.Meg. 10b). The books of Ezekiel and Proverbs in the Aramaic Peshitta read very similarly to the Aramaic Targums of those same books. The Peshitta Tanak has many Jewish liturgical divisions. For example the Psalms are divided into five sections as in Jewish copies and the Torah is divided according to the triennial Torah reading cycle and festival readings are also indicated (for example Lev. 23:1; see b.Meg. 30b). Moreover the Peshitta Torah also contains many headings which are likely of Jewish origin. For example the ten commandments have the heading עסרא פתגמ "The Ten Commandments" just above Ex. 20:1 and just above Leviticus 17 the Peshitta has the heading נמוסא דקורבנא ודדבחא "The Torah of Offerings and Sacrifices" (compare with the Talmud b.Meg. 30b). The text of the Aramaic Peshitta was originally written in Hebrew letters until this was forbidden by Ephraem Syrus in the fourth century C.E. and contains many Judeo-Aramaisms.[91] Finally many readings in the Peshitta Aramaic Tanak read Jewish halacha into the text. Many of these are noted in the

---

[90] *Early Eastern Christianity*; Burkitt; p. 71ff
[91] *Encylopedia Judaica*; Article "Bible"

footnotes of the HRV translation (see notes to Ex. 20:30; Lev. 16:7; Lev. 18:21 and Lev. 24:8).

The Aramaic Peshitta translation is a literal Aramaic translation made directly from a Hebrew text which closely resembled the current Masoretic Text.

The Aramaic Targums

The Aramaic Targums are Aramaic paraphrases of Tanak books. These paraphrases were read in the synagogues along with the Hebrew. The official targum of the Torah is Targum Onkelos and the official targum of the Prophets is Targum Jonathan. There is no official targum of the Ketuvim but there were targums of most of the books of the Ketuvim. The only books that lack targum versions are Ezra and Daniel, portions of which were written in Aramaic in the first place.

GREEK WITNESSES

The Greek Septuagint

The origin of the Septuagint is well known. Flavious Josephus records that Ptolemy Philadelphus (around 250 B.C.E.) entered into negotiations with the Jewish High Priest to obtain a Greek translation of the Torah for the Library of Alexandria. Ptolemy agreed to release many Jewish prisoners in exchange for the book. The Jewish authorities chose seventy two translators to produce a Greek translator of the Torah. (Josephus; Antiquituies 12:2). Although the Greek Septuagint (named after the Greek for "seventy") was initially only a translation of the Torah, by no later than 150 B.C.E. the rest of the Tanak had been included as well, since at that time the grandson of Ben Sirach, in his prologue to his Greek translation of his grandfather's "Wisdom of Ben Sirach" briefly compares the Hebrew and Greek versions of "the law itself, the prophecies and the rest of the books".

The Greek Septuagint is very important because it is the earliest known translation of the Tanak into another language and preserves a Greek translation of a Hebrew text of the Tanak that existed in the third century C.E. (in the case of the Torah; the second century in the case of the Prophets and the Writings).

RESTORING THE ORIGINAL TEXT

The HRV Tanak it translated primarily from the Hebrew Masoretic Text however there are some readings in which other versions and manuscripts such as the Septuagint,

the Peshitta Tanak and/or the Dead Sea Scrolls preserve an obviously original reading which was lost from the Masoretic Text and which the HRV version has restored (with an explanatory footnote). The following are just two examples:

Psalm 145 is an acrostic Psalm. This means that each section of the Psalm begins with each of the 22 Hebrew letters from ALEF through TAV. However in the Masoretic Text the section that should begin with a NUN is missing from the text entirely! However in the Septuagint, the Peshitta Tanak, one Hebrew ms. from the middle ages, and the Dead Sea Scroll copy of this Psalm (11QPs(a)) the missing section appears immediately after Ps. 145:13: "YHWH is faithful to all his promises, and loving toward all he has made." The Hebraic-Roots restores the "lost" NUN section along with an explanatory footnote.

Next let us examine Isaiah 53:11. In the Hebrew of the Masoretic Text this verse has a serious grammatical problem. The Hebrew of the Masoretic Text reads literally:

> From the travail of his soul he shall see _____
> shall be satisfied in his understanding.
> My Righteous servant shall justify many
> and their iniquities he bears.

There is very clearly a missing word in the Hebrew resulting in two verbs in a row "shall see" and "shall be satisfied". What shall he see? Now the missing word "light" DOES appear in the Septuagint and has also now turned up in two Hebrew copies of Isaiah found among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The passage SHOULD read (as it does in the HRV):

> From the travail of his soul he shall see light
> and shall be satisfied in his understanding.
> My Righteous servant shall justify many
> and their iniquities he bears.
> (Is. 53:11 HRV translation)

(In the HRV the missing word "light" is restored with an explanatory footnote).

WITNESSES TO THE TEXT OF THE "NEW TESTAMENT

Hebrew Sources

DuTillet Matthew

The DuTillet version of Matthew is taken from a Hebrew manuscript of Matthew which was confiscated from Jews in Rome in 1553. On August 12th, 1553, at the petition of Pietro, Cardinal Caraffa, the Inquisitor General,[92] Pope Julius III signed a decree banning the Talmud in Rome. The decree was executed on September 9th (Rosh HaShanna) and anything that looked like the Talmud, that is, anything written in Hebrew characters was confiscated as the Jewish homes and synagogues were ravished. Jean DuTillet, Bishop of Brieu, France was visiting Rome at the time. DuTillet was astounded to take notice of a Hebrew manuscript of Matthew among the other Hebrew manuscripts. DuTillet acquired the manuscript and returned to France, depositing it in the Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris. It remains there to this day as Hebrew ms. No. 132.[93]

While most scholars have ignored the DuTillet Hebrew version of Matthew, two scholars, Hugh Schonfield and George Howard,[94] have stated their opinion that this Hebrew text underlies our current Greek text.[95] Schonfield writes:

> ...certain linguistic proofs... seem to show that the Hebrew
> text [DuTillet] underlies the Greek, and that certain
> renderings in the Greek may be due to a misread Hebrew
> original.
> (***An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel***; 1927, p. 17)

Munster Matthew

Sebastian Munster was a Hebrew teacher who published many Swiss books for Hebrew and Aramaic language students (and also about Geography). In his books on Hebrew he often gave examples coming from a Hebrew copy of Matthew he received from the Jews. Many people asked him to publish this Hebrew Gospel so he decided to hold of on all his other studies in order to work full time to publish his Matthew Hebrew Gospel.

The Munster Hebrew text of Matthew agrees very closely with the DuTillet Hebrew text of Matthew.

---

[92] later to become Pope Paul IV

[93] *An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel,* Hugh Schonfield; 1927; p. 3-4

[94] Initially Howard concluded that the DuTillet text was a translation from Greek, (JBL 105/1 (1986) p. 53, 62) later Howard concluded that DuTillet is a "revision of an earlier Hebrew Matthew" related to the Shem Tob version (JBL 105/1 (1986) p. 63 n. 34). Howard elsewhere states his belief that the Shem Tob text is a descendant of a Hebrew text which served as a model for our present Greek text, as shown later in this chapter.

[95] See *An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel,* Hugh Schonfield; 1927,; *The Gospel of Matthew according to a Primitive Hebrew Text;* George Howard; Mercer University Press; 1987; Journal of Biblical Literature 105/1 (1986) pp. 49-63; 108/2 (1989) pp. 239-257

The Munster Hebrew Text of Matthew was published in 1537 and again in 1557 by Sebastian Munster. The Munster Hebrew version of Matthew may be of much more value than we previously believed.

Most of the academic literature on Munster Hebrew Matthew over the last 126 years has indicated that the Munster text is of limited value because Munster had supplemented missing portions of his text with his own reconstructions without marking them.

For example George Howard writes:

> "In the letter of dedication, Munster reported that he had
> received the Hebrew Matthew from the Jews in defective form with
> many lacunae and had, from necessity, restored what was lacking in
> the manuscript. His work today is of limited value because he
> failed to mark the passages he had restored."
> (***Hebrew Gospel of Matthew***; George Howard; 1995 p. 161)

In fact Munster actually wrote in Latin:

> "Matthaei evangeluium in nativa sua, hoc est Hebraica lingua, non
> qualiter apud Hebraeorum vulgus lacerum inveni, sed a me
> redintegratum et in unum corpus redactum emittemus"

Literally in English:

> "The Gospel of Matthew in the original, the actual Hebrew
> language, not as it is among the people in the Hebrew. I came
> upon it lacerated (cut), but I reintigrated it, and published a
> rendering of it in one body."

Now the Shem Tob Hebrew version of Matthew was transcribed by Shem Tob into 114 sections into his book The Touchstone, each section was followed by a rebuttal. Shem Tob even writes:

> I adjure by the life of the world that every copyist that he not
> copy the books of the gospel unless he writes in every place
> the objections that I have written just as I have arranged them
> and written them.

 The DuTillet manuscript was all written together, but was followed by a series of rebuttals and may once have also been spliced into such sections.

Munster's statement seems to indicate that he obtained Hebrew Matthew "lacerated" or "cut up in sections" and that he reintegrated these sections and published the Hebrew text in one body.

Unfortunately Adolf Herbst misunderstood Munster and in 1879 paraphrased him in German as saying:

"Die hebraeische Übersetzung habe er, berichtet Munster in der
Zuschrift an Heinrich VIII., von den Juden mangelhaft und mit
vielen Lücken empfangen, daher habe er sich genöthigt gesehen,
solche Lücken zu erganzen"

Literally in English:

"The Hebrew Translation Munster reports in his dedication letter
to Heinrich VIII he received it from the Jews mangled/deffective
and with many spaces, seeing this, he took upon himself to
supplement such spaces."

This led Hugh Schonfield to report in English in 1927:

"Munster states in his dedication to Henry VIII. that he received
the Hebrew translation from the Jews in a deffective condition,
and with many lacunae, which he took upon himself to fill in."
(*An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel*; 1927; pp. 11-12)

So the problems began when Herbst translated "lacerum inveni" (it was found lacerated)
as "mangelhaft und mit vielen Lücken empfangen" (mangled/deffective and with many
spaces) and which Schonfield took in English to mean "in a deffective condition, and
with many lacunae".

Then the next phrase "mangled" is Munster's Latin "sed a me redintegratum et in unum
corpus redactum emittemus" (but reintigrated it and published a rendering of it in one
body." But which Herbst translated in German to mean "daher habe er sich genöthigt
gesehen, solche Lücken zu erganzen" (seeing this, took upon himself to supplement such
spaces) which Schonfield rendered in English as "which he too upon himself to fill in."

Thus the myth was born that, as Howard wrongly reported:

"In the letter of dedication, Munster reported that he had
received the Hebrew Matthew from the Jews in defective form with
many lacunae and had, from necessity, restored what was lacking in
the manuscript. His work today is of limited value because he
failed to mark the passages he had restored."
(*Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*; George Howard; 1995 p. 161)

In fact Munster's Hebrew Matthew is of much greater value than previously believed and
should not be dismissed based on this false report that it was defective and full of holes.

Cinquarbres Matthew

Johannes Quin-Quarboreus of Aurila was also a Hebrew teacher who had been a colleague of Munster. He held the chair of Hebrew and Syriac at the College de France, and was generally considered one of the foremost linguists of his time. He published many books in Paris for Hebrew language students. His name appears with many variants, such as Johanne Quinquarboreo Aurilacensi, Jean Cinquabres, etc. He died in 1587.

In 1551 Cinquarbres published his own edition of Hebrew Matthew in Paris. In this edition Cinquarbres republished Munster's text as his main text but added marginal notes to add "a sufficiency of authorities" and deferring to "the ancient author" over Munster's "restorations". It would appear that Cinquarbres had access to multiple copies of Hebrew Matthew, but to Munster's notes as well (since Munster's printed edition did not mark his restorations). Cinquarbres writes in his preface (which is dated 1550):

> I would not dare to affirm anything on the matter
> than what I think is needful in consideration
> of a sufficiency of authorities. If, however,
> Munster has recommended to us as almost certainly
> better restorations or additions of his own suggestion,
> by asterisk or whatever other sign he noted them,
> to the extent that we know the style and phraseology
> of the ancient author, the better judgment has been
> placed on the author. When St Matthew wrote his gospel
> in Hebrew, I think, following the many opinions of
> illustrious men saying so, that no-one, unless he
> wanted to be tarnished or resist the truth, would
> turn in such a true pearl for a marble.[96]

 It is clear from this statement that Cinquarbres regarded this Hebrew Matthew as having been the work of the "ancient author" (Matthew).

Shem Tob Matthew

The Shem Tob Hebrew version of Matthew was transcribed by Shem Tob Ben Yitzach Ben Shaprut into his apologetic work *Even Bohan* sometime around 1380 C.E.. While the autograph of Shem Tob's *Even Bohan* has been lost, several manuscripts dating between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries still exist, complete with the transcribed text of Hebrew Matthew. George Howard writes of Shem Tob's Hebrew Matthew:

---

[96] *Torat HaMashiach; Torat Elohim Khadashah V'hi B'shorat HaAdonaeynu Yeshua HaMashiach K'pi Matti HaM'Bsher ; Sanctum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Hebraicum Euangelium secundum Matthaeum*; Paris, France; 1551; Latin Preface.

...an old substratum to the Hebrew in Shem Tob is a prior
composition, not a translation. The old substratum, however,
has been exposed to a series of revisions so that the present
text of Shem-Tob represents the original only in an impure
form.
(***The Gospel of Matthew according to a Primitive Hebrew Text***; 1987;p.223)

It might appear from the linguistic and sociological
background to early Christianity and the nature of some
theological tendencies in Shem-Tob's Matthew that the
Hebrew text served as a model for the Greek. The present
writer is, in fact, inclined to that position.
(ibid p. 225)

Shem-Tob's Matthew... does not preserve the original in a pure
form. It reflects contamination by Jewish scribes during the
Middle Ages. Considerable parts of the original, however,
appear to remain...
(***Hebrew Gospel of Matthew***; 1995; p. 178)

The Shem Tob version of Matthew is not the same as the Hebrew version preserved by in
DuTillet, Munster and Cinquarbres (a version which I term the "Traditional Version").
Although the Shem Tob Version and the "Traditional Version" have many agreements
with each other against all other versions (for example 1:1 and 3:11b) and are both part
of the larger body of the same Hebrew Matthew scribal tradition, they are two very
different versions. As George Howard states:

I think that Shem Tob's Hebrew Matthew is a different
edition of Matthew than what we are accustomed to in our
canonical Gospel of Matthew. And its not like Munster
and DuTillet. Munster and DuTillet have basicly the same
text as our canonical Matthew and certainly the same theology.
But Shem Tob's Hebrew Matthew does not have the same theology,
I can asure you of that.[97]

As a result Shem Tob has been used as a source only sparingly in the HRV.

Munster Hebrew Hebrews

In 1537 Munster had published Hebrew Matthew (as discussed in above). Twenty
years later, in 1557, a second edition was printed containing a complete Hebrew text of
Hebrews in an appendix.

Although we have no clear record of a statement by Munster that he obtained his Hebrew
Hebrews from among the Jews, it seems safe to say that this was the case. Munster did

---

[97] George Howard speech 11/10/96

plainly make this claim of his Hebrew Matthew in 1537 so it seems likely that this was also the source for the supplemental Hebrew Hebrews in the 1557 edition of his Hebrew Matthew. (Munster had died before the publication of his second edition in 1557, which may explain why he had not written an introduction for the Hebrew Hebrews explaining its origin.)

Aramaic Sources

The Old Syriac Gospels

Another relatively unknown fact to much of Christendom is the existence of two ancient Aramaic manuscripts of the Four Gospels dating back to the Fourth century.   The first was discovered by Dr. William Cureton in 1842. It was found in a monastery at the Naton Lakes Valley in Egypt. This manuscript is known as Codex Syrus Curetonianus or, the Cureton and is catalogued as British Museum Add. No. 14451. The second was discovered by Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis in 1892. It was found at St. Catherine's Monastery at the foot of traditional Mount Sinai in Egypt. This manuscript is known as Codex Syrus Sinaiticus or the Syriac Siniatic and is catalogued as Ms. Sinai Syriac No. 30. After making his profound discovery Dr. Cureton studied the Old Syriac text of the manuscript in detail. Cureton concluded that at least the version of Matthew found in the Old Syriac has its basis in the original Semitic text and was not merely a translation from the Greek or Latin. Cureton published his findings to the world saying:

> ...this Gospel of St. Matthew appears at least to be built upon
> the original Aramaic text which was the work of the Apostle
> himself.
> (***Remains of a Very Ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac***;
>   1858; p. vi)

The Peshitta New Testament

The Peshitta Bible is an Aramaic version of the Scriptures which is used throughout the Near East. The birth of the Peshitta looms beyond the horizon of antiquity.

Although one tradition has the Tanak portion of the Peshitta being translated at the time of Solomon at the request of Hiram, and another ascribes the translation to a priest named Assa sent by the king of Assyria to Samaria.[98] More likely is that the Peshitta Tanak was prepared at the edict of King Izates II of Abiabene who with his entire family converted to Judaism. Josephus records that at his request, King Izates' five

---

[98] 2Kings 17:27-28; *Encyclopedia Judaica* Bible article

son's went to Jerusalem to study the Jewish language and customs.[99] It was probably at this time that the Peshitta Tanak was born.[100]

The New Testament portion of the Peshitta was added to the Peshitta Tanak in the earliest Christian centuries. It is universally used by Jacobite Syrians; Nestorian Assyrians and Roman Catholic Chaldeans. The Peshitta must predate the Christological debates of the fourth and fifth centuries, since none of these groups would have adopted their rival's version. Thus, this version certainly originated in the pre-Nicean Church of the East. It includes all of the books except 2Peter; 2John; 3John; Jude and Revelation. These books were not canonized by the Church of the East. The Peshitta is not merely a translation from the Greek text, but rather a revision of the Old Syriac, as Arthur Voobus writes:

> ... the Peshitta is not a translation,
> but a revision of an Old Syriac version.
> (***Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac***; 1951; p. 46
> see also pp. 54-55).

The Crawford Manuscript of Revelation

The Crawford Aramaic version of Revelation is a very rare, little known version. How the manuscript made its way to Europe is unknown. What is known is that the manuscript was purchased by the Earl of Crawford around 1860. In the Earl of Crawford's possession the ms. became catalogued Earl of Crawford's Haigh Hall, Wigan, no. 11. It has since come into the possession of the well known John Rylands Library of Manchester, England. The manuscript contains a complete Peshitta text supplemented by the extra-Peshitta epistles[101] and this unique version of Revelation.[102] Concerning the variants of this version John Gwyn Writes:

> Two or three... are plausible readings; and might well be
> judged worthy of adoption if there were any ground for
> supposing the Apocalypse to have been originally written,
> or to be based on a document written, in an Aramaic idiom.
> (***The Apocalypse of St. John in a Syriac Version Hitherto Unknown***;
>   1897; p. lxxix)

And to this we may add to show that there ***is*** ground for "supposing the Apocalypse to have been originally written, or to be based on a document written, in an Aramaic idiom.":

> ...the Book of Revelation was written in a Semitic language,
> and that the Greek translation... is a remarkably close

---

[99] Josephus; *Antiquities of the Jews* 20:2-4; *Encyclopedia Judaica* Bible article.
[100] ***Encyclopedia Judaica*** Bible article; ***The New Covenant Aramaic Peshitta Text with Hebrew Translation***; The Bible Society of Jerusalem; 1986; p. iii
[101] Being translations from Greek 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John and Jude.
[102] The other Aramaic Revelation which appears in most manuscripts is entirely different and is clearly a translation from the Greek.

rendering of the original."
>> - C. C. Torrey; ***Documents of the Primitive Church***
>> 1941; p. 160

We come to the conclusion, therefore that the Apocalypse
as a whole is a translation from Hebrew or Aramaic...
>> - RBY Scott; ***The Original Language of the Apocalypse***
>> 1928; p. 6

When we turn to the New Testament we find that
there are reasons for suspecting a Hebrew or Aramaic
original for the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, John
and for the apocalypse.
>> - Hugh J. Schonfield; ***An Old Hebrew Text***
>> ***of St. Matthew's Gospel***; 1927; p. vii

Editions used as Source Text for the HRV

For the DuTillet Hebrew text of Matthew I have used:

Des Schemtob ben Schaphrut hebraeische des Evangeliums Matthaei nach den Druken des S. Munster and J. DuTillet-Mercier; Adolf Herbst, 1879

Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris; Hebrew Manuscript No. 132 (on Microfilm)

For the Munster Hebrew Text of Matthew I have used:

Torat HaMashiach: Evangelium secundum Matthaeum in Lingua Hebraica;
Sebastian Munster; Basilae Switzerland, 1537

For the Cinquarbres Hebrew Text of Matthew I have used:

Torat HaMashiach; Torat Elohim Khadashah V'hi B'shorat HaAdonaeynu Yeshua HaMashiach K'pi Matti HaM'Bsher ; Sanctum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Hebraicum Euangelium secundum Matthaeum; Paris, France; 1551

For the Shem Tob Hebrew Text of Matthew I have used:

Hebrew Gospel of Matthew; George Howard; Mercer University Press; 1995

For the Muster Hebrew Text of Hebrews I have used:

Torat HaMashiach: Evangelium secundum Matthaeum in Lingua Hebraica; 2nd
edition; Sebastian Munster; 1557; Appendix: ***Beati Pauli Apostoli epistola ad Hebraeos***.

For the Old Syriac Aramaic text of the Four Gospels I have used:

Remains of a Very Ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac; Dr. William Cureton; 1858

Evangelion da-Mepharreshe; F. C. Burkitt; 1904

The Old Syriac Gospels or Evangelion da-Mepharreshe; Agnes Smith Lewis; 1910

For the Peshitta Aramaic text I have used:

(Eastern; "Nestorian" texts)

Codex Khaboris (I was fortunate enough to have direct access to the Codex for about a year beginning in July of 1995; and since that time have had access to photographs)

The New Covenant Aramaic Peshitta Text with Hebrew Translation; The Bible Society in Israel; 1986

(Western "Jacobite" texts)

The New Testament in Syriac; The British and Foreign Bible Society; 1950

Syriac Bible; United Bible Societies; 1979

For the Aramaic of Revelation I have used:

The Apocalypse of St. John in a Syriac Version Hitherto Unknown; John Gwynn. D.D.. D.C.L.; 1897

TRANSLATION ISSUES

Priority Given to Sources

The ***HRV*** Book of Matthew has been based primarily on the Hebrew Matthew tradition. The ***HRV*** uses the DuTillet version of Matthew as its primary Hebrew text because it appears to be the best, purest manuscript of Hebrew Matthew available. Munster Matthew is deficient as a source text because Munster is known to have augmented his text without notation, and the source manuscript has not survived. Shem Tob does not serve well as a source text because it contains far to many variants and far to many corruptions. I have however followed Munster and/or Shem Tob against DuTillet on a few occasions where Munster and/or Shem Tob seem to preserve the original reading. I producing the HRV text of Matthew I have given equal weight to the Old Syriac Aramaic text of Matthew. I have often followed Old Syriac readings against all of the Hebrew versions whenever the Old Syriac seemed to preserve the more original reading.

For the ***HRV*** base text of Mark, Luke and John I have used the Peshitta Aramaic. Although the Old Syriac is far older and more primitive, it is not complete. I have however given preference to the Old Syriac readings and often followed the Old Syriac against the Peshitta in the main text. In all four Gospels I have also used the symbols < > to enclose and offset readings with do not appear in the Old Syriac text at all (since it is our oldest, most primitive text).

The ***HRV*** text for Acts, James, 1 Peter, 1 John and the Pauline Epistles is the Peshitta Aramaic text except for Hebrews where the primary text was Munster Hebrew Hebrews.

The ***HRV*** text for Revelation has been the Crawford Aramaic manuscript.

The ***HRV*** text of 2 Peter, 2 & 3 John and Jude has been taken from Greek (no original Aramaic seems to have survived for these books). However these books have been rendered with the understanding that the originals had been in Aramaic. Moreover the corresponding Aramaic to Greek vocabulary for 1 Peter was helpful in reaching behind the Greek of 2Peter to the original Aramaic behind it. This was also helpful with rendering 2 & 3 John in light of the Aramaic and Greek of 1 John. For example wherever the Greek of 1 John uses the term "antichrist" the Aramaic of 1 John has "false Messiah". Thus when rendering 2 John from the Greek the term "antichrist" is rendered "false Messiah" thus using 1John to reach behind the Greek of 2 John to its original Aramaic.

The Judaikon

Some 36 or more Greek manuscripts of Matthew contain subscriptions preserving readings of a Jewish version (Greek: Judaikon) of Matthew which is described as a standard version on Zion the Holy Mount, in Jerusalem. These Judaikon readings appear to be alternate Greek renderings of an original Semitic version. None of these mss.

contain all of the readings but each of the 36 manuscripts contains some of them. There are a total of 13 such notes. All of them are included in the footnotes to Matthew.

The Sacred Name

In the past, sacred name versions of the New Testament have depended largely on guesswork to determine where "Lord" means YHWH and where "Lord" means ADON/ADONAI. This is because the Greek New Testament (at least as we have it today) does not distinguish between the two, having Greek KURIOS for both YHWH and ADON/ADONAI. However we know from both the Tosefta and Talmuds (ancient Jewish writings) that certain New Testament manuscripts contained the name of YHWH in their text (t.Shab. 13:5; b.Shab. 116a; j.Shab. 15c). Now our Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts preserve for us knowledge of where "Lord" in the NT was YHWH and where it was ADON/ADONAI. The DuTillet Hebrew manuscript of Matthew repeats the Hebrew letter YUD two or three times encircled as to mark places where the name of YHWH should go. The Shem Tob Hebrew version of Matthew has the Hebrew letter HEY standing alone (and in one place the word HASHEM spelled out) to mark places where the name of YHWH belongs. The Munster Hebrew text of Matthew actually contains the name of YHWH spelled out where it belongs. The Old Syriac, Peshitta and Crawford Aramaic manuscripts of NT books also distinguish between YHWH and ADON/ADONAI.   As a rule[103] the Aramaic Peshitta Tanak (Old Testament) renders EL/ELOAH/ELOHIM with ALAHA; ADONAI/ADON with MAR and YHWH with

---

[103] "as a rule" MARYA = YHWH and MAR = ADONAI in the Tanak. There are some few exceptions to the rule: In Gen. 15:2 & Jer. 1:6 The Peshitta renders the phrase ADONAI YHWH as MARYA ALAHA and this is confusing because the Peshitta also has MARYA ALAHA for YHWH ELOHIM in Gen. 2:4. Also in Eze. 2:4 & Amos 1:8 the Peshitta renders ADONAI YHWH with MARYA MERUTA And in Micah 1:2 The Peshitta renders ADONAI YHWH... ADONAI with MARA MERUTA... MARYA. In all of these examples the exception to the rule involves the phrase ADONAI YHWH which is often a source of confusion because of the Jewish tradition of reading ADONAI in place of YHWH. Since that tradition would normally produce the odd phrase ADONAI ADONAI the Phrase ADONAI YHWH is therefore read by this tradition as ADONAI ELOHIM. Thus creating the confusion in the Peshitta as to how to render the phrase. The only place where the Peshitta has MARYA for ADON is in Mal. 3:1. Here the Peshitta translator may have been influenced by the fact that the phrase "Temple of the Lord" is almost always "Temple of YHWH" and only appears as "Temple of Adon" in Mal. 3:1. The same variant may have been caused by a scribe working ahead by memory but wrongly recalling the phrase as it appears in other passages as the "Temple of YHWH". Finally there is Is. 45:22. Here the Peshitta translator was likely influenced by surrounding passages such as 45:18, 21 where the same or similar phrase appears with the word YHWH rather than ELOHIM. Or the Peshitta translator may have been working from a variant Hebrew text which had a scribal error in this verse, due to a scribe working ahead from memory and wrongly remembering the phrase as it appears in a similar passage. For example working ahead into 45:22 without consulting his manuscript, thinking he remembered the next few words, but wrongly recalling the wording of 45:18 where YHWH does appear. Also in the 134 places where the Masorah indicates that the scribes altered YHWH to Adonai in the Hebrew text, the Peshitta rightly reads MARYA. These very few exceptions are clearly explainable exceptions and only a tiny percentage compared to the thousands of passages in which YHWH is rendered MARYA; ADONAI is rendered MAR and EL, ELOAH and ELOHIM are rendered ALAHA with great consistency. This is UNLIKE the LXX and Greek NT which render both ADON/ADONAI and YHWH with the same Greek word KURIOS. Thus we have a key as to where YHWH actually belongs in the NT in the Aramaic text.

MARYA. For Example:

> Psalm 110:1a Hebrew: YHWH said to my ADON…

> Psalm 110:1a Aramaic: MARYA said to my MAR…

This pattern continues through the Aramaic NT as well. These Aramaic manuscripts have Aramaic MARYA for YHWH and Aramaic MAR (or MARI or MARAN) for ADON/ADONAI.   Now we have objective manuscript evidence to support placement of the sacred name into the NT text, the era of guesswork is over. The Hebraic Roots Version will be the first "sacred name" NT to use such objective manuscript evidence to restore the sacred name to the New Testament.

Gender of Ruach

One problem that presents itself in translating the New Testament from Hebrew and Aramaic into English is that of the gender of the Ruach HaKodesh (Holy Spirit). English is very different from Hebrew and Aramaic. To begin with English has three genders, masculine, feminine and neuter (i.e. he, she and it). Hebrew and Aramaic have no neuter gender. In Hebrew and Aramaic everything is either a "he" or a "she" and nothing is an "it". Also gender plays a much more important role in Hebrew and in Aramaic than in English. In English gender is usually only an issue when dealing with pronouns. But in Hebrew and in Aramaic nouns and verbs are also masculine or feminine. And while there are no true adjectives in Hebrew (nouns are used as adjectives), noun modifiers must agree in gender with the noun. Now the Hebrew word RUACH (Aramaic RUCHA) is grammatically feminine as is the phrase Ruach HaKodesh. This is matched by the role of the Ruach HaKodesh as "comforter" (Jn. 14-16) and the identification of the "comforter" with YHWH acting as a "mother" (Is. 66:13).

Now in English the Ruach is often referred to as "he" or "it" as also in the Greek New Testament. However this seems very odd indeed to the Semitic mind.

Now it is very clear that the gender of the RUACH has been revised in many passages of the Aramaic to agree with the Hellenistic concept of the Holy Spirit as being either a "he" or an "it". Thus the pronouns used for the Ruach HaKodesh in Jn. 14-16 in the Peshitta are all masculine. However the hand of revision is very clear. For example while both the Peshitta and Old Syriac have "he" in Jn. 16:8 the Old Syriac has "she" just a few verses further down in 16:13 while the Peshitta has "he".

Moreover there are many passages in which the Peshitta itself pairs the Ruach HaKodesh with feminine verbs and/or feminine modifiers: Mk. 1:10; Jn. 1:32, 33; 6:63; 7:39; Acts 8:29, 39; 16:17; Rom. 8:9, 10, 11, 16, 26a, 26b, 1Cor. 3:16; 1Tim. 4:1; 1Pt. 1:11; 4:14 and 1Jn. 5:6. In fact the Peshitta Aramaic of Rom. 8:16 opens with:

<div dir="rtl">

…והי רוחא מסהדא
</div>

And *she* the Ruach gives testimony….

While it is clear that the Ruach HaKodesh has no literal gender, it is also clear that the Ruach HaKodesh is grammatically and figuratively a "she".

Ambiguous Words

There are a number of cases in which the Greek translator appears to have misunderstood the contextual meaning of certain ambiguous Hebrew or Aramaic words. Several examples are given in the footnotes.
(see Mt. 3:1-2; 5:32; 5:48; 13:18; 15:22; 15:34; 19:12; 19:24; 21:43; 26:6; 26:41; Mk. 9:15; 10:12; 14:3; Lk. 2:1; 6:22; 8:27; 10:4; Lk. 12:49; 16:8; 16:16; Jn. 8:56; 12:11; 15:16; Acts 8:27; 11:28; Rom. 1:24, 28; Rev. 2:22; 5:5; 15:1; 19:17 for just a few examples).

The Dalet Clause

One of the most easily misunderstood elements of Aramaic is the Dalet Clause. This very ambiguous preposition is so easily mistranslated into other languages.

The Aramaic particle ד or די[104] can mean any of several things. This preposition can mean "of; that; which; that which; who, because or because of" This ambiguity caused the Greek translator to misunderstand Eph. 2:25a. The Aramaic reads:

<div dir="rtl">

ובעלדבבותא בבסרה ונמוסא דפוקדא בפוקדנוהי בטל

</div>

This translates word by word as:

ו(and) בעלדבבותא (enmity)   ב(by) בסרה (his flesh)   ו(and) נמוסא (the Torah)

ד(because of) פוקדא (commands)   ב(in) פוקדנוהי (his commandments)

בטל (is abolished).

Thus the correct meaning is:

> And enmity (by his flesh and the Torah,
> because of commands in his commandments)
> he abolished.

However the Greek translator misunderstood the DALET CLAUSE here to mean "of"

---

[104] In some dialects of Aramaic this preposition appears as a separate word spelled די while in other dialects it appears simply as a ד prefix.

thus producing the meaning:

> And enmity in his flesh,
> and the Torah of commands in commandments
> he abolished.

or as the KJV reads:

> Having abolished in his flesh the enmity,
> even the law of commandments [contained] in ordinances...

This demonstrates how badly the text in question becomes misunderstood in the Greek translation simply by misunderstanding the DALET CLAUSE.

Misread Words

There are a number of places in which the Greek translator seems to have misread certain Hebrew and Aramaic words as look-alike words, thus mistranslating the text. Several examples are given in footnotes (see Mt.1:21; 3:10; 4:12; 4:24; 5:29; 8:21; 11:20; 11:28; 13:48; 14:20; 16:7; 17:20; 17:12; 18:16a; 18:21; 20:11; 21:16; 21:24; 22:34; 22:37; 23:5; 23:16a, 16b; 24:12; Mk. 7:26; Lk. 2:30; 20:46; 24:32; Jn. 4:25; Rom. 5:7; 1Cor. 7:5; Rev. 6:14; 13:3 for a few).

Synoptic Variances

There are also several cases in which a variation between parallel passages in the synoptic Gospels (Matt., Mk. And Luke) is clearly due to the Hebrew or Aramaic text. In these cases the synoptic variation occurred either because of an ambiguous Hebrew or Aramaic text (see notes to Mt. 4:19; 11:8; 11:27; 12:50; 16:26 & 27:15) or because of Hebrew and/or Aramaic words which look very much alike and were misread (see notes to Lk. 19:17, 19; Mt. 8:16; 16:6; 22:22 & 28:1) A number of these instances have been noted in footnotes.

Jews or Judeans?

In Hebrew and in Aramaic the same word can mean either "Jews" or "Judeans" depending on the context. Most NT translators has not understood this and thus have often mistranslated NT passages in ways that came across as anti-Semitic. The HRV translates "Jew(s)" or "Judean(s)" based upon the context of the passage.

Works of the Law and Under the Law

Much of the confusion about Paul's teachings on the Torah involves two scripture phrases which appear in the New Testament only in Paul's writings (in Rom. Gal. & 1Cor.). These two phrases are "works of the Law" and "under the Law", each of which appears 10 times in the Scriptures.

The first of these phrases, "works of the Law", is best understood through its usage in Gal. 2:16. Here Paul writes:

> knowing that a man is not justified by
> WORKS OF THE LAW but by faith in
> Yeshua the Messiah, even we have believed
> in Messiah Yeshua, that we might be justified
> by faith in Messiah and not by the
> WORKS OF THE LAW; for by the WORKS OF
> THE LAW no flesh shall be justified.

Paul uses this phrase to describe a false method of justification which is diametrically opposed to "faith in the Messiah". To Paul "works of the Law" is not an obsolete Old Testament system, but a heresy that has never been true.

The term "works of the Law" has shown up as a technical theological term used in a document in the Dead Sea Scrolls called MMT which says:

> Now we have written to you some of the
> WORKS OF THE LAW, those which we
> determined would be beneficial for you...
> And it will be reckoned to you as righteousness,
> in that you have done what is right and good
> before Him...
> (4QMMT (4Q394-399) Section C lines 26b-31)

The second of these phrases is "under the Law". This phrase may best be understood from its usage in Rom. 6:14, "For sin shall not have dominion over you, for you are not UNDER THE LAW but under grace." Paul, therefore, sees "under grace" and "under the Law" as diametrically opposed, one cannot be both. The truth is that since we have always been under grace (see Gen. 6:8; Ex. 33:12, 17; Judges 6:17f; Jer. 31:2) we have never been "under the Torah". This is because the Torah was created for man, man was not created for the Torah (see Mk. 2:27). "Under the Torah" then, is not an obsolete Old Testament system, but a false teaching which was never true.

There can be no doubt that Paul sees "works of the Law" and "under the Law" as categorically bad, yet Paul calls the Torah itself "holy, just and good" (Rom. 7:12), certainly Paul does not use these phrases to refer to the Torah itself.

In order to preserve the intent that these two phrases were technical theological terms I have rendered the Aramaic phrase for "works of the Law" with the Hebrew phrase "Ma'aseh HaTorah" ("Works of the Law") which is the exact Hebrew phrase found in the Dead Sea Scrolls (MMT). In the same way the technical term for "under the Law" has been transliterated from the Aramaic as "T'cheit Namosa".

Torah and Nomos

The Hebrew word which the KJV renders "Law" is "Torah" which actually means "guidance; instruction). The Greek word used in the Greek NT is **NOMOS**. While this is generally taken as a Greek word it is also an Aramaic word. There are two Aramaic words for Torah. The actual Aramaic cognate of Torah is אוריתא "Orita". Orita is the word which appears for Torah in the Targums and Talmuds. The Peshitta Aramaic Tanak however uses the Aramaic word נמוסא NAMOSA for Torah. NAMOSA is based on a three letter Semitic root נמס meaning "to civilize". The same root is used in Modern Hebrew to mean to be polite. The Aramaic NT also uses the word נמוסא for "Torah" (except in Mt. 11:13; 12:5; 22:40 where אוריתא is used. I have always translated אוריתא as Torah. Wherever נמוסא seems to refer to the Torah I have translated "Torah" as well.

Torahlessness

Although this translation is taken from the Hebrew and Aramaic there are two important Greek words that appear in the Greek NT which I felt must be highlighted. This is the Greek word **ANOMOS** and **ANOMIA**. **ANOMOS** is made up of the Greek word **NOMOS** (Torah) with the Greek prefix **A**- (there is not; without). Thus **ANOMOS** means "without Torah". **ANOMIA** is simply another form of the Greek word **ANOMOS**. Wherever the Greek translator had translated the Hebrew or Aramaic with **ANOMOS** or **ANOMIA** I have rendered the English as "Torah-less" or "Torah-less-ness". Thus I have preserved the Greek translator's understanding that these passages refer to the heresy of Torah rejection which eventually became the orthodox position in Christendom.

The Son of Man Idiom

The phrase "Son of Man" creates something of a problem in translating the Hebrew and Aramaic NT. In Hebrew and in Aramaic the phrase "son of man" is simply an idiomatic expression for a mortal, a mere human being. The phrase stresses the mortality of man by stressing that he must reproduce himself, is born and therefore dies. This sheds light on the Aramaic of Dan 7:13 which uses the phrase in an unexpected way:

… [one] like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven…

The passage presents an ironic Messianic picture. A mere mortal in an exalted immortal position. The passage is applied to Yeshua in several NT passages (Mt. 24:30; 26:64; Mk. 13:26; 14:62; Lk. 21:27; Rev. 1:7, 13; 14:14). Now the question arises, when does the term "son of man" in the Hebrew/Aramaic refer to the Messianic title, and when is it simply an idiom for "a mortal; a human being"? This question is especially important in the HRV which frequently renders the Semitic idiom "son of man" literally for the English reader as "a son of man". This can make a big difference. For example Mt. 12:8 in the KJV reads:

For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day.

Does this mean that Messiah was Lord of the Sabbath because he was "the Son of Man" (the Messianic figure of Dan. 7:13) or does it mean that a "son of man" (a human being) is Lord of the Sabbath?

Fortunately the Hebrew and Aramaic contain some clues. For example the Hebrew (DuTillet) of Matthew has "ben adam" for "a son of man" but "ben ha-adam" for "the Son of Man". There are also clues in the Aramaic NT which often uses phrases like ברה דאנשא indicating a certain man's son for "the Son of Man". Thus I have rendered "the Son of Man" and "a son of man" based on clues in the Hebrew and Aramaic text.

Nefesh and Nafsha

The Hebrew word NEFESH (pronounced in Aramaic as NAFSHA) is a very ambiguous word which simply cannot be rendered well into English. NEFESH can mean "soul, life or self" and often carries connotations of combinations of those meanings at the same time. In order to properly convey the real usage of this word to the reader I have in most cases, in the New Testament, transliterated the word NEFESH into the English text. This has an interesting effect on many passages (see for example Mt. 3:17 and Phil. 2:7) that I believe will enlighten the English reader to the subtleties of the Semitic text.

Misunderstood Questions

In Hebrew and in Aramaic there is no required interrogative clause as we know it in English. The only way to determine whether a phrase is a statement or a question in Hebrew and Aramaic is through the inflection of the voice. The result is that on some occasions the Greek translator mistook questions for statements. (see examples in Ex. 6:3; Jn. 6:32 and 11:49).

The Good News

There are two Aramaic words for "Gospel" or "Good News". These are אונליון and סברתא. אונליון seems to be of Greek origin (from Evangelion) however the word is also used in the Talmud (b.Shabbat 116a) to refer to a book or books used by the ancient Nazarenes. Interestingly the Aramaic of this word could also mean "powerful roll/scroll". סברתא is the Aramaic cognate of the Hebrew word B'SORAH which appears in passages like Is. 52:7 & 61:1. I have translated both Aramaic words as "good news".

Demons and Devils

There are two Aramaic words for "demon" or "devil". The first is שאדא which I have translated with "shad" or in the plural with "shadim". This word (and it's Hebrew cognate) are the same words used for "demon" in most ancient Jewish literature of Kabbalah. The other word that the Aramaic uses for "demon" or "devil" is דיוא which I

have translated as "devil" since the English "devil" is clearly a cognate of דיוא.(daiwa)
(the letter ו in Aramaic and Hebrew is equivalent alphabetically to our "w" and our "v".

The Cross

Another issue which arises in translating the New Testament from Hebrew and
Aramaic into English is the word "cross" as it appears in our KJV editions. The Geek
phrase which appears is *staus ros* "a stake or pole". The Hebrew of DuTillet/Munster has
צליבת "gallows" while the Aramaic has צליבא "gallows" in Mk. 10:21; Lk. 14:27;
Acts 13:29; Heb. 12:2 & 1Pt. 2:24. The Aramaic has זקיפא in all other places. זקיפא is
the noun form of the Aramaic verb זקף (Strong's #4223) which appears in the Tanak in
the Aramaic of Ezra 6:11:

> Also I [Darius] have made a decree, that whoever shall alter this word,
> let timber be pulled down from his house, and being set up, let him be
> hanged (זקף) thereon; and let his house be made a dunghill for this.

Now a great deal of confusion has been caused by the use of the word "cross" in the New
Testament. The term "cross" as used in the New Testament never refers to a symbol or
religious icon, but to an event (or to the actual device of Yeshua's death). But since the
cross is now used as a symbol of Christianity, many New Testament passages are
misunderstood by the reader. For example:

> God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ….
> (Gal. 6:14 KJV)

Some Christians have quoted this passage as "proof" that the cross should be used as a
symbol or icon. In fact it is clear that Paul was not referring to the *symbol* of the cross as
used by modern Christians, but to the *event* of the cross. This radically changes the
meaning of the passage. However if we translate:

> …I have not to boast about but on the gallows of our Lord Yeshua the Messiah…
> (Gal. 6:14 HRV)

then suddenly it is clear that Paul was boasting only in the *event* of the gallows, that is,
the crucifixion of Messiah, and not that he boasted in a religious icon.

Yeshua or Yahushua?

In rendering the name of the Messiah the HRV uses "Yeshua" except in the Book of
Hebrews where the Hebrew manuscript has יהושע "Yahushua". The following brief
discussion of various forms of the name of Messiah will help the reader understand the
renderings used in the HRV.

Yeshua (ישוע) (KJV "Jesher") (Strong's # 3442, 3443) - This Hebrew name means "salvation" and was used as a contraction of "Yahushua" as well as used as a name itself. Contrary to a popular teaching "Yeshua" was not Aramaic. This Hebrew word for "salvation" does not exist in Aramaic. The DuTillet Hebrew manuscript sometimes has ישוע for Messiah (as in Mt. 1:21) and sometimes has ישו (see below). The printed text of Munster Hebrew Matthew has ישוע throughout. However the introduction indicates that in at least some places the manuscript Munster worked from had יהושע ("Yahushua") and Munster standardized the printed edition to read "Yeshua" throughout. The Aramaic Old Syriac, Peshitta and Crawford texts have ישוע in every case.

Yeshu (ישו) – This is a very controversial and somewhat misunderstood word. The Hebrew name Yeshua (ישוע) is pronounced in Aramaic as "Yeshu" or "Ishu" (depending on the Aramaic dialect). In Aramaic this final AYIN is silent. Now if one wanted to transliterate the Aramaic pronunciation of "Yeshua" into Hebrew letters in a Hebrew document then one would do so by dropping the AYIN as ישו. The original followers of Yeshua may have seen in these three letters an acronym taken from the first letters of a series of words of a Messianic prophecy in Gen. 49:10. Perhaps in reaction to this Rabbinic Judaism created its own acronym from the same letters spelling a Hebrew phrase meaning "may the name be blotted out forever". Unfortunately this derogatory acronym has been largely been mistaken as the origin of "Yeshu" rather than the more obvious fact that "Yeshu" is the Aramaic pronunciation of Yeshua.

Yahushua (יהושע) (KJV "Joshua") (Strong's # 3091) – This is the name for Messiah which appears in the Munster Hebrew text of Hebrews and in at least some places in the manuscript which served as the source for Munster's Hebrew text of Matthew. This is the same name as that of "Joshua" of the book of "Joshua" in the Tanak. The Masoretic Text transliterates all names which begin with the "tri-gammaton" (first three letters of the Sacred name) as "Yeho-" but all names which end in the tri-grammaton as "-yahu". This is because the Masorites transplanted the vowels from the Hebrew word ELOAH ("God") into the name YHWH forming the word YeHoWaH. These same Masorites transplanted these same vowels into names that started with the tri-grammaton while (for whatever reason) neglecting to make this revision to names that ended in the tri-grammaton. In the HRV we have restored "Yahu-" to the beginning of these words rather than the Masoretic "Yeho-".

James Trimm
PO Box 471
Hurst, TX 76053
U.S.A.
jstrimm@nazarene.net
http://www.nazarene.net

SYMBLOLS AND ABREVIATIONS
USED IN THIS VOLUME

LXX – Septuagint (Greek version of Tanak)

Sh – Shem Tob Hebrew Matthew

D – DuTillet Hebrew Matthew

M- Munster Hebrew Matthew

Q – Cinquarbres Hebrew Matthew

OS – Old Syriac Aramaic Gospels

OS(c) or C – Old Syriac, Curetonian Aramaic manuscript of the Gospels

OS(s) or S – Old Syriac, Siniatic Aramaic manuscript of the Gospels

P – Peshitta Aramaic New Testament

< > - Mark passages which do not appear in the 4th Century Aramaic Old Syriac text.

Bold face text – These are quotations from the Tanak that appear throughout the New Testament.

Pl. and S. in superscript are added to certain words to indicate whether they are plural or singular in the Original Hebrew or Aramaic in certain locations where the translator felt this was helpful.

Table of Torah and Haftorah Readings

Name of Reading	Torah Reading	Haftorah Reading	Sephardic Tradition
B'reshit	Gen. 1:1-6:8	Isaiah 42:5-43:11	Isaiah 42:5-43:21
Noach	Gen. 6:9-11:32	Isaiah 54:1-55:5	Isaiah 54:1-54:10
Lekh L'kha	Gen. 12:1-17:27	Isaiah 40:37-41:16	
Vayera	Gen. 18:1-22:24	2Kings 4:1-37	2Kings 4:1-23
Hayyei-Sarah	Gen. 23:1-25:18	1Kings 1:1-31	
Toldot	Gen. 25:19-28:9	Malachi 1:1-2:7	
Vayetze	Gen. 28:10-32:3	Hosea 12:13-14:10	Hosea 11:7-12:12
Vayishlach	Gen. 32:4-36:43	Hosea 11:7-12:12	Obadiah 1:1-21
Vayeshev	Gen. 37:1-40:23	Amos 2:6-3:8	
Mikketz	Gen. 41:1-44:17	1Kings 3:15-4:1	
Vayigash	Gen. 44:18-47:27	Ezekiel 37:15-28	
Vayechi	Gen. 47:28-50:26	1Kings 2:1-12	
Sh'mot	Ex. 1:1-6:1	Is. 27:6-28:13; 29:22-23	Jeremiah 1:1-2:3
Va'era	Ex. 6:2-9:35	Ezekiel 28:25-29:21	
Bo	Ex. 10:1-13:16	Jeremiah 46:13-28	
B'shallach	Ex. 13:17-17:16	Judges 4:4-5:31	Judges 5:1-31
Yitro	Ex. 18:1-20:23	Isaiah 6:1-7:6; 9:5-6	Isaiah 6:1-13
Mishpatim	Ex. 21:1-24:18	Jer. 34:8-22; 33:25-26	
T'rumah	Ex. 25:1-27:19	1Kings 5:26-6:13	
Tetzaveh	Ex. 27:20-20:10	Ezekiel 43:10-27	
Ki Tissa	Ex. 30:11-34:35	1Kings 18:1-39	1Kings 18:20-39
*Vayak'hel**	Ex. 35:1-38:20	1Kings 7:40-50	1Kings 7:13-26
*P'kudei**	Ex. 38:21-40:38	1Kings 7:51-8:21	1Kings 7:40-50
Vayikra	Lev. 1:1-5:26	Isaiah 43:21-44:23	
Tzav	Lev. 6:1-8:36	Jer. 7:21-8:3; 9:22-23	
Sh'mini	Lev. 9:1-11:47	2Samuel 6:1-7:17	2Samuel 6:1-19
*Tazria**	Lev. 12:1-13:59	2Kings 4:42-5:19	
*M'tzora**	Lev. 14:1-15:33	2Kings 7:3-20	
*Acharei Mot**	Lev. 16:1-18:30	Ezekiel 22:1-19	Ezekiel 22:1-16
*K'doshim**	Lev. 19:1-20:27	Amos 9:7-15	Ezekiel 20:2-20
Emor	Lev. 21:1-24:32	Ezekiel 44:15-31	
*B'har**	Lev. 25:1-26:2	Jeremiah 32:6-27	
*B'chukkotai**	Lev. 26:3-27:34	Jeremiah 16:19-17:14	
B'midbar	Num. 1:1-4:20	Hosea 2:1-1:22	
Naso	Num. 4:21-7:89	Judges 13:2-25	
B'ha'alotkha	Num. 8:1-12:16	Zechariah 2:14-4:7	
Shlach L'kha	Num. 13:1-15:41	Joshua 2:1-24	
Korach	Num. 16:1-18:32	1Samuel 11:14-12:22	
*Hukkat**	Num. 19:1-22:1	Judges 11:1-33	
*Balak**	Num. 22:2-25:9	Micah 5:6-6:8	
Pinchas	Num. 25:10-30:1	1Kings 18:46-19:21	

Mattot*	Num. 30:2-32:42	Jeremiah 1:1-2:3	
Masa'ei*	Num. 33:1-36:13	Jeremiah 2:4-28; 3:4	Jer. 2:4-28; 4:1-2
D'varim	Deut. 1:1-3:22	Isaiah 1:1-27	
Va'etchanan	Deut. 3:23-7:11	Isaiah 40:1-26	
'Ekev	Deut. 7:12-11:25	Isaiah 49:14-51:3	
Re'eh	Deut. 11:26-16:17	Isaiah 54:11-55:5	
Shof'tim	Deut. 16:18-21:9	Isaiah 51:12-52:12	
Ki Tetze	Deut. 21:10-25:19	Isaiah 54:1-10	
Ki Tavo	Deut. 26:1-29:8	Isaiah 60:1-22	
Nitzavim*	Deut. 29:9-30:20	Isaiah 61:10-63:9	
Vayelekh*	Deut. 31:1-30	Isaiah 55:6-56:8	
Ha'azinu	Deut. 32:1-52	2Samuel 22:1-51	
V'Zot HaBrachah	Deut. 33:1-34:12	Joshua 1:1-18	Joshua 1:1-9

* Indicates readings that are combined except on leap-years of the Hebrew Calendar.