

Transcript - Aramaic Origins of the New Testament

Shabbat Shalom to everybody who is with us and Shabbat Shalom to anybody who will be hearing this message when it goes out.

Praise the Father! I have just finished in the last 10 days or so the new Bible translation that we will be putting out here soon. It has been a year and a half of a great mission putting this together and one thing I have learned ... and I have learned a lot of stuff doing this translation, but one thing I learned is how bad a new translation is needed for several reasons.

If you look at the Bible translations today ... and we were just talking about this a minute ago ... most of the new translations that are coming; the NIV, and some people call it the '*Nearly Inspired Version*' because of the changes in it. You would not believe some of the people who translated the NIV and some of these newer Bibles. Some of them were homosexuals, witches, warlocks, all kinds of evil people who worked on these things.

And the manuscripts they are using are not even good Greek manuscripts. They are using Alexandria manuscripts that were found down in St Catherines which the manuscripts actually had chalk marks on them and things crossed out. They're really not good manuscripts like the Textus Receptus. The Textus Receptus is the received text of the Greek manuscript. There is 14,000 manuscripts and it's a pretty good translation but ... I'm going to prove today to you and we actually have at the Bible School a whole course on Aramaic Origins of the New Testament.

But just in an hour here or so, I'm going to prove to you that the Bible in the originally was written in Aramaic. It definitely was not written in Greek. You can prove it very easily when you take the manuscripts and put them side by side and prove the primacy of the Aramaic Peshitta over the Textus Receptus. Now that is not to say the Textus Receptus is a bad translation. It's an excellent translation but from the Greek and especially when they translated it into English, the people who translated, your Martin Luthers and your early Schofields, these were all Protestant people and their theology ... I don't care what anybody says. Mark this down, it's true. Somebody's theology is going to come into their translation.

My translation, the theology came into it. I'm a Torah observant believer so you are going to see that in the translation. But I can prove to you that if you look in the New Testament in the original Aramaic it is not anti-Torah what-so-ever, the opposite. You wouldn't believe how many things are clearer in the Aramaic that don't come out in their translations.

One, like Roman 10:4. In the King James Bible it says Yahshua is the end of the Law for righteousness. They say, "See the Torah is done away with" but even in the Greek, if you look up that word 'telos' it means He's the 'goal' of the Law. He is the goal of the Torah that how Yahshua kept the Law perfectly, we are to keep the Torah perfectly.

And in the Aramaic, because the Aramaic is just a dialect of Hebrew, Aramaic is a picture-graph language. Aramaic is a language where there are idioms everywhere and some the idioms ... and this is where some of my strongest proofs to prove to you that the New Testament was originally written in Aramaic is that idioms are not translated. You can't translate an idiom. If I had an argument with somebody here last week and we talked it out and I said, "Okay we are going to forget it. That's water under the bridge." Now if you were to literally translate that, what would it sound like in another language? Water under a bridge, what are they talking about? So, in Aramaic which is an idiomatic language, we are going to see this. And it's a poetic language.

I hope I have time and if I don't have time on the tape here, I'll share with everybody when we are done but I'll show you in the Aramaic that even Paul's letters are completely poetic in the Aramaic. You wouldn't believe how Paul was a master at poetically putting phrases together and words. It blows your mind. You get none of it in the Greek and you get none of it in the English because it doesn't come out that way.

So I find it very exciting to find out the primacy of the Aramaic origins of the New Testament. The Peshitta also is the oldest manuscripts that they have from late 1st century to early 2nd century; the manuscripts of the Peshitta which would come far before the Greek manuscripts that would probably come late 2nd or early 3rd century at the earliest. They have one that they believe from the book of Mark from the late 1st century. It's just one line or so, but probably more late 2nd century or 3rd century.

One of the things that we just talked about and it got my mind thinking about from the beginning, if you look in the Greek where they translate the name of our heavenly Father as 'Curios', 'Theos'. These are personal names of pagan deities so they are not even titles. If you take a title like ... 'El Shaddai' is a title and it's fine. It means 'The Almighty' but it's not a personal name and it's used in scripture several times in the Tanach, that's fine. But when you start using the personal names of deities, if you saw the name 'Baal' being used for our heavenly Father in the Greek or you say the name 'Allah' or the name 'Buddha', you have to say, "Something's wrong here." There's no way the apostle Paul is going to call our heavenly Father 'Buddha', the same way he wouldn't call Him 'Theos' which is 'Zeus'. Theos is Zeus from the Greek.

So that got me thinking about it and actually when you look in the earliest Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, you will find in the earliest Septuagint writings 2nd century BC, which they do have manuscripts of, even the name Yahweh was kept in gold letters in Hebrew. They felt it so sacred that they would not translate WHVH into Greek letters. So we see a primacy for that that is there.

I want to give you some New Testament writings to show you how much Aramaic is in even our English translations that probably people don't know about. We will go to a few scriptures here. Let's start in Mark 5 and more than likely, if I can't get my whole premise here, I'll have to do more than one message on this but I really think this is important to get out ... especially with my new translation coming out here in the next couple of months. As we get it printed, it's going to be important to show people the importance of the Aramaic over the Greek.

Mar 5:41 *And taking hold of the child's hand ... This is when Yahshua is healing the girl ... He said to her, **Talitha kumi; which is, being translated**, Little girl, I say to you, Rise up!*

Now '*Talitha kumi*' is what? An Aramaic word and does it mean in Aramaic? *Little girl, Rise up!* What's really interesting is when you look in the Aramaic manuscripts, it just says '*Talitha kumi*'. It doesn't say '*which is, being translated, Little girl, Rise up!*' If you look in the Greek manuscripts, it says, '*Talitha kumi; which is, being translated*'. Now if one just has '*Talitha kumi*' and one has '*which is, being translated*', which do you think is the original? Sometimes all you have to do is use a little logic.

It's like if I was saying something in English and we had an argument and I said, "It was water under the bridge" which is being translated, "Let's forget the matter" but in English you wouldn't say "which is being translated" because we all know what 'water under the bridge' means. So we

see this over and over and over, in the Aramaic it just uses the word ' *He said to her, Talitha kumi* ' and we see in the Greek manuscript ' *Talitha kumi* ' and they kept the word because it's an important word in the original language but then they had to tell you what that word means so they put ' *which is being translated* '. Let's go to another one.

Mar 7:32-34 *And they brought a deaf one to Him, hardly speaking. And they begged Him, that He put His hand on him. And taking him away from the crowd privately, He put His fingers into his ears; and spitting, He touched his tongue; and looking up into Heaven, He groaned and said to him, Ephphatha! (which is, Be opened!)*

Again ' *Ephphatha* ', it's an Aramaic word, it's not a Hebrew word although again, Aramaic is a dialect of Hebrew. If one can speak Hebrew, then you could speak Aramaic without a doubt and the other way around. Aramaic was the common language in the days of Yahshua. It was spoken all the way from the east going from the land of Israel all the way to Babylon, Persia, Parthia, all the area. It was the language of the world. Same way today, English, if you had to say one language which is the world language, it would be English. In that day it was Aramaic, far more than Greek. Greek in the western culture, in Rome, in Greece but in the east Aramaic was the common language of the people. And there is no doubt about that, every scholar admits that Yahshua spoke Aramaic.

What they are finding here in Israel ... we've worked the last 13 years here in archaeology ... they have found, they spoke a lot more Hebrew than they thought. Hebrew was also a primary language with Aramaic and they used to think Hebrew was only spoken in the synagogue but they have found in the last 25 years many many more 1,000's of inscriptions not only in Aramaic but also in the Hebrew. So again we see there in the Aramaic, it's just the word ' *Ephphatha* ' but in the Greek it's being translated so it's telling you what it's being translated from.

Mar 8:10 *And at once entering into the boat with His disciples, He came into the region of Dalmanutha ...* 'Dalmanutha' is an area and no one knows where this is today. It's an Aramaic word, without a doubt there.

Mar 7:11 *But you say, If a man says to his father or to his mother. Korban, which is to say, My offering is what you have gained from me ...* 'Korban' another Aramaic word which means 'offering'.

Mar 15:22 *And they brought Him to Golgotha Place, which is, being translated, Place of a Skull (head) ...* Again ' *Golgotha* ', it's an Aramaic word. The Hebrew word is 'Golgolet' which means 'head' or 'skull' but the Aramaic word is ' *Golgotha* '. So again we see the Aramaic origins that's of that.

One that's very interesting and I'll go there now before getting into some proofs of mistranslations from the Aramaic into the Greek. John 1:41 ... because if something is written in the scriptures, then I don't have a problem with it and I do believe some Sacred Name groups go overboard with some of these words that they are trying to connect. If you go by some of these Sacred Name books, you can't even talk. Any word that I say, probably in the 10 minutes I have been speaking here, they will say I have said 50 pagan words already. Somebody one time came up to me at the feast, was asking why Don would wear a tie when pagans wore ties. I said pagans also wore underwear, come on! The fact that a pagan wore a certain garment or a pagan wore a sandal, it doesn't mean it's wrong in itself. What's wrong is if its use of it was for pagan worship or pagan practices. And a neck tie, if you look in the history of neck ties they basically

came in to hide the buttons in formal wear. That's the basic reason for it. Now a tie, you could have something on a tie that could be a pagan picture but just wearing a tie is pagan? Some of it is just shocking. We don't want to get fanatical or go overboard but what we want to do is, we want to come to the truth. We want to come to the truth of the matter.

In John 1:41, because people have asked me about the word 'Christ'. We use the word Messiah because it's the Hebrew word Mashiach in Hebrew but people said is it wrong to use Christ? And I said if it is in scripture, it can't be wrong. Some people say it is from 'Christos' which is a pagan deity, whatever. And here it says ...

Joh 1:41 *He finds first his own brother Simon, and says unto him, We have found the **Messiah (which is, being interpreted the Christ).***

So again now, this is really an important scripture because in the Greek manuscript they are saying '*which is being interpreted the Christ*'... and before I knew of the Aramaic origin, I said then if it is in the manuscript then it can't be wrong. **But in the Aramaic original there is no '*which is being interpreted the Christ*'.** It just says, '*This one first found his own brother Simon and tells him, We have found the Messiah.*' So there is nothing being interpreted because even ... taken apart the word 'Christ' or 'Christos' is wrong ... it is a Greek word. So it's not in the original manuscripts. It's just not there, the primacy of it.

So some of these things we are finding is not only the fact of knowing what was the language, there's a lot of little things with interpretation and also with translation that are going to be very important. In an hour message here, I can't even go over 1% but when this translation comes out, you are going to be absolutely shocked and amazed at how different it is from the Aramaic and how clear most of the doctrines are, absolutely clear from the original language.

Let's start going over some mistranslations that came. Let's go to Matthew 19 and start there. And again I am not, I just want people to understand, I am not against the Greek translation, I think overall it's a good translation. There were things that were missed like in any translation. In my translation of the Aramaic of the New Testament, I not only took verbatim just the Aramaic word for word in every circumstance, what I tried to do, I used the Aramaic as a premise and as a foundation but I also looked at the Greek scriptures because sometimes in translation, believe it or not, something can actually be translated clearer than it is in the original language. Because sometimes in an idiomatic language, if you know the language you can understand what they are saying but there is not really a clear way to translate it. So sometimes the Greek can actually make us understand the Aramaic better. So by far, I'm not against the Greek.

And what they did was, one of the proofs also of the Aramaic primacy, they actually did a scientific test ... and I have all the papers with me ... of not only the New Testament but also the Old Testament and they did this with 1,000's of books. And it is scientifically ... what they did was they take all the verbs, they take all the adjectives, they take all the pronouns, they take all the personal names and they scientifically put it into a computer program and it's 100% accurate. They can tell you what is the primacy. So they did it with the Tanach and they did it with the Septuagint and you will come out with the reading of purity. Now the Masoretic Text, the Received Text, the Hebrew Text came out to be 99.2% pure. The Septuagint came out to be 96.4% so it's a good translation but it's not as pure as the original. And in every circumstance they did the scientific test, the Aramaic Text, it came out by far above.

I will give you one example. In the Aramaic, the name Yahshua is there 176 times more than in the translation of the Greek. So now you have two things you have to come up with when you see this. Either in the translation, they translated the name of Yahshua into pronoun 'He' or 'Him' 176 times throughout the New Testament or you have to figure the other way that is, the Aramaic was translated from the Greek, that somehow they added it 176 times ... which you will never get in a translation.

Some of the brethren here with us ... you have been to Neot Kedumim, the Biblical Park which is near the airport and actually they have a professional scribe there who does Torah scribes. And you wouldn't believe how distinct they are when making a Torah scribe ... I mean to every little jot and tiddle of it and they are so ... you need patience for doing this. And to think, just in one instance like one person's name you could forget 176 times or added, a scribe would never ever do that. It would be impossible. So doing the scientific test, they proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Aramaic Peshitta is the original and everything else was copied from it. So like I said, although the others are good copies, we used it.

Now let's go to Matthew 19. Let's start looking at some of the ways you can show which was first and which wasn't. And we all know the story of Yahshua with the rich man, right? And the rich man comes and says, "What do I need to do to get into the kingdom of heaven and He tells him to keep the commandments. And he's says, "I've done what else do I need to do?" What does Yahshua tell him to do? Sell everything you have and give alms and then come. And then what does the rich man say?

Mat 19:22-24 *But having heard the Word, being grieved, the young man went away, for he had many possessions. And Yahshua said to His disciples, Truly I say to you that a rich man will with great difficulty enter into the kingdom of Heaven. And again I say to you, It is easier for a **camel** to pass through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of YAHWEH.*

Huh? What on earth does that mean? A camel to go through the eye of a needle? How can a camel to go through an eye of the needle? What does this mean? It doesn't mean anything now. There was an ancient rumor that went around in Jerusalem ... some tour guides still say it but any good tour guide will tell you it's not true ... that this eye of a needle was a door and that a camel had to get in it is not true. It's one of those urban legends, there is no way to prove it. Talk to any good tour guide and they will tell you it's not true. So what does it mean here?

This is the key. The word for 'camel' in Aramaic, and the same in Hebrew, is 'gamla'. It means 'camel', it's a hump. So if the Aramaic, if the word for 'camel' is 'gamla' but word for 'rope' is 'gamala'. And remember in Aramaic, the same is in Hebrew, you don't put vowels; you only point vowels. So you would have the same letters. You would have **gimel**, **mem**, **lamed**. So the translator when he is translating, he's thinking it's 'camel' when it should be 'rope'.

But doesn't that make more sense that it is easier for and it's actually a 'heavy rope'; it's easier for a heavy rope to go through the eye of a needle. Now why is that? Because a heavy rope you can't put through the eye of a needle because it has too many strands but if you take it apart, strand by strand, You can put one strand. And this is actually an idiom; it's actually an Aramaic idiom. Yahshua is telling a joke. He's saying can a rich man get into heaven? Yeah, if he is poor by the time he dies. See, a rope with many strands can't fit but one by one, if you take away the possessions, you can get through that narrow gate. So it's actually an idiomatic phrase He is using which makes it more clearly in the Aramaic. In the mistranslation in the Hebrew, you are not going to get it. Let's go to another one here.

Mat 26:6-7 *And Yahshua being in Bethany, in Simon the **leper**'s house, a woman came to Him having an alabaster vial of ointment, very precious. And she poured it on His head ... Anybody here know the Torah? All of us right? What's not right about this? What does not make sense, right off the bat? Well, He goes into the house of who? Simon the leper? What does Leviticus 13: 45 and 46 say?*

Lev 13:45-46 *And the **leper** who has the plague in him, his garments shall be torn, and his head shall be uncovered, and he shall cover the upper lip; and he shall call out, Unclean! Unclean! And the days that the plague shall be in him, he is unclean; he shall live alone, he is unclean; his dwelling shall be at the **outside of the camp**.*

So how on earth can Yahshua in Jerusalem go into the house of a leper who can't own property, he can't live near Jerusalem, except in a leper colony. He can't employ servants, he can't have expensive jars of perfume and he can't have feasts that are legal for Jews to attend. It makes no sense. But what makes sense is when you find out the word in Aramaic for 'leper' is 'garba' and the word for jar maker is 'garaba'. So remember there is no vowel points so it's the same thing. You have **g**imel, **r**esh, **b**eth. It's the same lettering so the person who is translating this from Aramaic into Greek, he's thinking it's a 'leper', 'garba', instead of a 'jar maker'. Doesn't it make a lot more sense when He is going to Simon the 'jar maker' and here is an expensive bottle of perfume in the jar maker's house? Absolutely more and there are many of these. They make so much more sense when you understand what was said. But clearly ... you don't have to be a writer or a translator to understand it.

If you put two manuscripts side by side, when you are looking at the mistakes that are made, you can clearly tell what manuscript came first, without a shadow of a doubt. Let's go to another one that is right here. In the translation and I'm reading out of the King James first and which most Bibles would have it:

Mat 7:6 *Give not that which is **holy** unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you.*

Now when you read it, does it make sense? Why would you be comparing ... and I'm going to tell you in a minute, this is written in what is called 'kolbi komer'. It's a Aramaic type of idiomatic phrases that He's doing it. Why would you say, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs"? Why would you be equating giving holy things to the dogs and casting your pearls before swine? It doesn't make sense. But again it's a mistranslation that word 'give' in Aramaic is 'telon' and the word 'hang' is 'tiflon', almost the exact same word. And the word for 'holy' in Aramaic is 'kushda' like 'kodesh' is in Hebrew but the word for earring is 'kudasha' but again it's a mistranslation. It should read this way:

Mat 7:6 *Do not hang **earrings** on dogs, nor throw your pearls before the pigs ... so he is equating hanging an earring on a dog and casting a pearl before a swine. In both cases he is equating something valuable. An earring and a pearl is valuable, bringing it to either a dog or a swine which makes much more sense than giving that which is holy unto the dogs. Clearly again, just a mistranslation that comes from it. Here is one that is really interesting that is really strong proof of the Aramaic origin.*

Mat 23:5 *But all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their **phylacteries**, and enlarge the borders of their garments ... Again we know it's talking about the Pharisees, and we went over this before.*

Mat 23:2-5 *Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever he ... Moses ... bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not. For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers. But all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their **phylacteries**, and enlarge the borders of their garments,*

Does everybody know what a phylactery box is? The little box Jewish people put on their head, they are prayer boxes and they wrap them on their arms. Well, it's very interesting. If you go by the primacy of what most scholars say today that the Greek was the original manuscripts and the Aramaic was a translation that came in at least the 3rd to 4th century, scripture here proves that to be false. Because by the 3rd century the word for 'phylactery' ... what happens is, there are certain Greek words that became transliterated as Jewish words, the same way 'synagogue'. Everyone knows what is a synagogue, a place where Jewish people meet every Sabbath, right? But 'synagogue' is not Jewish, it's a Greek word. What is the Hebrew word? Beth Knesset. Where the congress of Israel meets, they call it the Knesset, 'beth' means 'house' and 'knesset' is 'house of gathering'. The word 'synagogue' really is a Greek word but any Jew in the world, you say 'synagogue' they know what you are talking about. Why? Because when the Jewish people were cast out of this land and they went into diaspora, certain Greek words were infiltrated into their language. 'Phylactery' is one of them. By the 3rd century every Jewish person that was putting the little box on their arm was calling it a phylactery box.

But what is really interesting, in the Aramaic, they don't use the word 'phylactery'. You know the word they use? 'Tefillin', the Hebrew word literally comes from the word for 'prayer'. That's where the word comes from. So if the Aramaic was a translation, without a doubt, it would have been 'phylactery' because the word 'tefillin' wasn't even being used anymore when they are saying it was translated. So the fact that in the original Aramaic, they used the word 'tefillin' clearly shows the primacy of the Aramaic over the Greek, without a shadow of a doubt.

Like I said, I don't have a ton of time but there is ... I want to go over the important one because there is so many of them it's unbelievable. So let's go to John 11 because this one is really important. In the New Testament ... this is one of the ones also ... many people out there that have, believe it or not, that have denied the deity of Yahshua. We know it's a problem. I have a tape called '*Is Yahshua Elohim*' in which I can clearly show from both the Tanach ... at our Bible school we have a whole course on Messianic apologetics where, without a shadow of a doubt, from the Tanach I can prove that Yahshua pre-existed. There's no doubt about it. You don't even need the New Testament, the Brit Chadashah. You can prove it strictly from the Tanach. But yet I'm not talking about Jewish people today or non-believers. Many believers, so called believers in the body of Messiah are denying the deity of Yahshua. And yet, in the New Testament there is at least ... I found 14 in the Greek, there is more in the Aramaic. There is at least 20 to 25 references of Yahshua calling Himself the I AM. I'll show you one here. This is where Lazarus died. Do you remember when Lazarus died and Yahshua came to him.

Joh 11:23-25 *Yahshua said to her, Your brother will arise again. Martha said to Him, I know that he will rise again in the resurrection in the last day. Yahshua said to her, **I AM** the Resurrection and the Life. He who believes in Me he shall yet live*

Now again in the English, we can think about it ... *I AM the Resurrection and the Life...* but there is no phrase in English that would show us for sure that this is talking about the I AM that I AM of

Exodus 3:15. But in the Aramaic and in the Hebrew there is because in the Hebrew if you are referring to yourself you would say 'ene'. In Aramaic you would say 'ena'. But when you say 'Enana' is I AM that I AM. That would only be for Yahweh because even in English, I wouldn't say, "I am that I am." If you said, "Don, I'm coming over this afternoon to meet with us." I would say, "I am coming." And what does this mean? I simply means that I am coming. That I would say, "I AM that I AM is coming" it would be something totally different. I would almost be saying that I am Yahweh.

So in the Aramaic, clearly Yahshua is calling Himself, Enana, which only means 'I AM that I AM'. It doesn't mean anything else. Now here is the interesting part, in the Greek there is no such phrase as 'I AM that I AM'. So what did they do? They took a phrase called 'Ego Eimi' and they used it in the Greek but it doesn't exist. It's not proper English in the Greek. So it's a transliteration so every time that Yahshua called Himself 'Enana, I AM that I AM', the Greeks that were translating it ... because they understood that He was not just saying "I am the resurrection". He's saying "I AM that I AM" is the resurrection. So they made a transliteration that doesn't even exist in Greek called 'Ego Eimi'. So without a shadow of a doubt, this is proving in these 20 references what came first. It had to be the Aramaic because again there is not 'Ego Eimi' in Greek but they transliterated it into Greek to try to show that Yahshua was claiming that He was the I AM that I AM.

Joh 8:57-58 *Then the Jews said to Him, You do not yet have fifty years, and have You seen Abraham? Yahshua said to them, Truly, truly, I say to you, Before Abraham existed, **I AM** ... Enanan ... 'Before Abraham existed, I AM' ... I existed.*

And again the Greek, they transliterated this 'Ego Eimi' which is something that is not proper English in Greek proper grammar but they transliterated it that way. Here is another mistranslation in Romans 5. And again I want to keep repeating, I am not down on the Greek translation. I think it is a very good translation but we are trying to show the primacy of it because it makes it very important understanding the primacy. So once you understand the primacy of the Aramaic ... another thing, is the Aramaic does use the name of Yahweh. It uses the sacred name which the Greek does not. It has the proper name of our Savior Yahshua. It is not anti-Torah whatsoever and again, we don't have time to go over this again today. Anybody who gets my translation ... we will probably have it on line in a month and we will have it printed within the next 3 months ... you will see in the Aramaic there is no anti-Torah bias whatsoever that you see in the Greek. But it also helps us with some of these harder scriptures that are hard to translate and here's one of them.

Rom 5:6-8 *for we yet being without strength, in due time Messiah died for unrighteous ones. For scarcely one will die for a **righteous** man, and perhaps one even dares to die for the sake of the good one, but YAHWEH commends His love to us in this that we being yet sinners, Messiah died for us ... Doesn't that seem something's a little odd with that?*

He's saying, scarcely will someone die for a righteous man but maybe they die for a good man. So they are saying that a good man is better than a righteous man. It just doesn't seem to make sense although when you look in the Aramaic, what you find out is that the word for 'wicked' and the word for 'righteous' is again the same root word. So again it's just the aleph and the nun that the translator had it off. It really should read this way.

Rom 5:7-8 For with difficulty one will die for a **wicked** one, and perhaps one even dares to die for the sake of the good one, but YAHWEH commends His love to us in this that we being yet sinners, Messiah died for us.

It just makes much more sense and again just a scribal error. I'm not saying it was the intent of the person who is doing it. Just a scribal error, he had one little letter wrong that looked alike and he had it wrong. Let's go to another one that is really important.

Mar 3:17 And James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed them **Boanerges**, which is, *The sons of thunder* ... Does anybody know what 'Boanerges' is? It tells us here 'Sons of Thunder' but they are using this 'Boanerges'. In Greek is there any word 'Boanerges'? No, there is no word 'Boanerges' but in the Aramaic there is a word 'B'nai Raghshree', 'B'nai Raghshree' which means 'Sons of Thunder'. So what did they do here? They transliterated 'B'nai Raghshree' as 'Boanerges'. They transliterated it but it doesn't exist in the Greek so what came first? Aramaic had to come first.

But there is another thing that is really interesting about this. Even in the Aramaic, it says, "*which is, The sons of thunder*". Now, why would it have to say 'which is'? Because 'raghshree' doesn't always mean 'thunder'. In Aramaic it can mean a few things. It can mean 'to be outraged'; 'to be in an uproar' like storms which would be the case here, '*sons of thunder*'; it can mean 'feeling, to feel'. It could mean 'to perceive' or 'be conscious of something'. It could mean 'rubbed out' or it could mean 'to be acquainted with'. So the same thing in English, we have words that can mean 5 or 6 different things right? So here, this word means this 5 different things, what is he trying to say? Are they men of feeling? Rubbed, are they men that give messages? What is He trying to tell us here?

So this is why it says the name "*B'nai Raghshree, which is, sons of thunder*". Because only with 'B'nai' next to 'Raghshree' can it mean that in the Aramaic. And again what does the Greek try to do? The Greek is trying to keep the context of it so they transliterate it 'B'nai Raghshree' into the Greek into a word that doesn't exist. So without a shadow of a doubt, there is not a translator in the world that would look at these 2 manuscripts and just from this one scripture not know what came first. Because you can't transliterate something into another language that doesn't exist and say that is the primacy language. It's impossible, it couldn't work that way; another really strong proof that the primacy of this was the Aramaic.

I want to look at a couple of other things. I want to look at some Semitic sayings that again are in Hebrew and Aramaic that you do not have in Greek. Luke 9 will show us once again where the origins of the manuscripts come from.

Luk 9:53 And they did not receive him, because **his face was as though** he would go to Jerusalem ... Typical, typical, typical Aramaic/Hebraic/Eastern text symbolism, idiomatic phrase. '*His face was as though he would go to Jerusalem.*' Would we say something like that in English? It's just not something because ours is not a picture-graph language; it's not an idiomatic language like that. We wouldn't say He was rejected because His face was going toward Jerusalem. We would say He wasn't accepted because He was going toward Jerusalem. So again you could put down some references, as we will see in the Tanach, these phrases are all over.

Lev 17:10 And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood; **I will even set my face against that soul** ... We just read in the Torah portion, "*I am Yahweh your Elohim. You shall not have any other Elohim*

before Me” but in the Hebrew, it is literally, “You shall not have any Elohim **in My face.**” It’s typical Semitic language here.

Luk 1:66 And all who heard **laid them up in their hearts**, saying, What then will this child be? And the hand of YAHWEH was with him ... ‘They laid it up in their hearts’, again typical Semitic saying. It’s not something you would have in Greek a saying like that; it’s not something you would have in English.

Gen 17:17 And Abraham fell on his face and laughed. And he **said in his heart**, Shall one be born to a son of a hundred years? And shall Sarah bear a daughter of ninety years? ... So again we see this. What does he mean, Abraham said in his heart? Again it’s a Semitic type phrase where ‘laying up in the heart’ is saying the heart is where the mind or the language comes from.

So again, little things like this, anybody who is a linguist, anybody who is trying to figure out what came first, the chicken or the egg, would look at these little things like this ... and there’s 100’s of them. It’s not like there’s 1 or 2, there’s 100’s of them. And clearly, when you put these together, without a doubt it shows the primacy of the Aramaic above the Greek. We will look at a couple more of mistranslations.

Luk 7:35 But wisdom is justified of all her **children** ...In the King James. What does it mean ‘wisdom is justified of all her children’? And again, it’s a mistranslation because in the Aramaic the word for ‘children’ is ‘bnai’ but the word for ‘deeds’ is ‘binai’, almost the same exact word. So doesn’t it make more sense that ‘wisdom is justified by all her deeds’ than ‘by all her children’? Wisdom doesn’t have children, what is it talking about? ‘But wisdom is justified by all its deeds’ ... By the deeds we do, justify if we have wisdom. So much more logical when you look in the original.

Luk 14:5 Which of you if his **donkey** or ox shall fall into a pit, and he will not at once pull it up on the Sabbath day? ... And again a mistranslation from the word for ‘donkey’ is ‘bera’ and the word for ‘son’ is ‘bra’, almost the same word. It’s a mistranslation from the Peshitta who would fall into a pit compared to one having a donkey that would fall into a pit.

Another thing that shows the primacy of a manuscript that really helps with any kind of manuscript, is something called ‘split words’. Split words like if I was to say a word in English like the word ‘bore/boar’, what could that mean? It could mean wild pig, to drill or to pierce, to bare and it could also mean boring ... he’s bored, disinterested. So you have to look at in context to see which meaning is being used. What about the word ‘lie’? What if I said in English ‘lie’, what could it mean? ‘Not to tell the truth’ or ‘to lie in bed’; two totally different things not even close. One is ‘laying down’, ‘being laid out like that’ and one is ‘not telling the truth’. So we see the same thing, that in a language, any language, there are words that can mean two different things. So when you are doing a translation, now what we have is in the Greek, we have different manuscripts. We have Textus Receptus Manuscripts; we have Alexandra manuscripts; we have Nesbel’s manuscript.

So now what is really interesting is ... what I want to show you is ... a couple of examples where in the Aramaic, a word can mean two different things and in the Greek it was translated differently. So what does that tell you? What had to come first? If I was to use the word ‘lie’ in English and in the translation, we translated it into Hungarian. In one translation it was have the person lie down and in the other translation it was having him not tell the truth, what does it tell you? Which language came first? It would have to be the English because if it was the Hungarian,

it would the other way around. You wouldn't have two different words from language being translated in something different. We will go to a couple of those.

1Co 13:3 *And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be **burned**, and have not love, it profits me nothing ... And though I give all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profits me nothing.* This is the King James.

The ISV says **1Co 13:3** *Even if I give all have and surrender my body so that I may **boast** but I have no love, I get nothing out of it.*

So it's really interesting. Some of the versions have 'burned'; some of the versions have 'boast'. But in the Aramaic the word can mean 'burn' or 'boast'. So it is showing you the Aramaic had to come first and the translators are looking at this word and some translate it as 'boast'; some translate it as 'burn'. Here's another one.

1Pe 3:13 *And who shall endure you, if you become **imitators** of that which is good?*

But the NSAB says **1Pe 3:13** *And who is there to harm you, if you prove **zealous** for that which is good?*

Is it 'imitator' or is it 'zealous'? Aramaic, it could be either. The word in the Aramaic could be either 'imitator' or 'zealous'. So again, some of the translations did it one way, but clearly it showing you the primacy because if it was 'zealous', then why would other Greek translations have 'imitator'? So the primary would have to be the Aramaic.

Like I said, I am not going to bore you with the technical parts of the computer programs, how they did the Aramaic primacy. But I'll just show you that what I mentioned before that if you are looking at a translation, what they will even take is connection words like 'and', and 'the', and prepositions, personal pronouns, personal names; all these different things, verbs. And they put it into this program and they see which comes up with the most, the purest text and in every case, it was the Aramaic, in every single case.

You will see, maybe in certain cases, 476 times that a pronoun was missing in the Greek that was there in the Aramaic. And another thing that is very interesting is, there is a book that just came out about a year ago and I don't have the name of it in front of me but it has something to do with ... It might be called 'The Discovery of the New Testament that Elohim Wrote'. But with this person who believes in the primacy of the Aramaic, he said, "If the Aramaic really is the New Testament primacy, then definitely the person who wrote, his signature would have to be there." So what he did is ... this book is about Bible codes ... and what you will notice is, like the Bible code in the Tanach that only comes in the Hebrew scriptures, the Bible code is only in the Aramaic scriptures. They are not in any of the Greek manuscripts; 14,000 manuscripts, not one Bible code did they find.

What they found is that the name of Yahweh and the name of Yahshua are encoded in the Aramaic manuscripts over 80,000 times, that they said there is no way that can be a coincidence. They would expect to find it possibly there sometimes but not 8,000% more than it should. So again showing the signature of who's writing it, the Father and the Son that their names are encoded there which again just puts the sealing on more of the primacy of it.

I want to show you here as we are going to put the closing on it in a couple of minutes, something else that really shows you like I said in the beginning, when you look in the Aramaic. The poetic side of things that you totally miss in the Greek or any translation ... because if you took a poem in English and the poem rhymes and it makes sense, when you translate it, the words are different, the rhyming is different. It's not going to sound the same.

But I want to show you a poem in Luke 1 and this is about John the Baptist, when he was born and the name they gave him. And again they had different stanzas the way it writes ... and you probably heard this before, even the whole Tanach is written as a song. If you look in the Masoretic Text, you will see a pointing that's not vowel pointing for grammar, it's actually for singing. And when you meet these scribes like the one we met at Neot Kedumim, they can sing the whole Tanach. They know the pointings and the vowels and the same way when you look in the Aramaic New Testament, it's exactly the same way and I will show you here.

Luk 1:72-75 *to show **mercy** to our father, and to **remember** His holy covenant, the **oaths** He swore to our father Abraham, to rescue us from the hand of our enemies. And without fear we might serve before Him all our days in holiness and righteousness*

And in the Aramaic, not only does it rhyme but it is really interesting, if you look at the first stoke of this 'to show mercy to our father' ... the word in the Aramaic, what is the word for 'mercy'? 'Chanana'. How do you say 'John' in Hebrew or Aramaic? Yochanan Chanana ... So his name 'John' is the same word for 'grace' and that's who Yochanan is, 'the grace of Yahweh.'

So here ... *to show 'mercy' to our father ... 'chanana' ... and to 'remember' His holy covenant ...* the word is 'zakar' for the word 'remember' and what is the father of John's name? Zachariah ... Yah remembers and then the third part ... *the oaths He swore to our father Abraham ... 'Eli' is 'Yah' and 'oath' is 'sheva', Eli-sheva, the mother of John. So right here in that one verse ... to show **mercy** to our father, and to **remember** His holy covenant, the **oaths** He swore to our father Abraham ... is **John, Zachariah and Elisabeth**. Now there is no way you get it in English; there is no way you get it in Greek, only in the Aramaic and it rhymes in the Aramaic. And the way Luke wrote this ... some of Paul's too, in Hebrews, how he puts 'king', 'malakh' and 'messenger malakh' and plays them all together. When you read it in the Aramaic, it is absolutely poetic and beautiful. And so much that we have missed; so much of the meaning, the idiomatic expressions, even the way that it is brought out in the Aramaic, the teaching way.*

But there is no way this can happen, there is no way that if this was written in Greek and translated into Aramaic that could just happen to be here. It's clear that the person who is writing this is purposely putting in the name of John, the name of Zachariah, the name of Elisabeth. So of course in the translation you are going to miss it. But to think that it can be written in another language and as it is translated all this ends up that way, is absolutely absurd. But again it shows the primacy of it.

One more thing ... there is something in the Aramaic they call the 'kolbi komer' and most of the parables are written in this form of the kolbi komer and it's a way that is used in the Aramaic to ... first you take a light expression, then you take a heavy expression and you say, "If it's this way for the light, then it's the same for the heavy." Now, granted it is all over the New Testament. All of the parables are written in kolbi komer. Not only that, if you go to the ... many times here, when I go to talk rabbis or if I talk to a Jewish person, they will say, "You know the New Testament isn't new. All the rabbinical writings have the same kind of things; they have the parables, they have the beatitudes. The same with the Dead Sea Scrolls, they have the whole

thing because the style of writing is the same. So the kolbi komer style of writing, without a doubt is the same style of writing in any language.

What I want to show you is how Yahshua used it to show the primacy of the Aramaic. So let's start in ... I have been using a study here called Ruach Qadim by Gabriel Roth which is a book on the Aramaic origins of the New Testament. "The kolbi komer is a simple comparison between two ideas. The first light idea is just a very easy concept linking thought to an equally basic application" I'll give an example.

Mat 6:27-29 *But who of you by being anxious is able to add one cubit onto his stature? And why are you **anxious about clothing**? Consider the **lilies of the field**, how they grow. They do not labor nor do they spin but I say to you that not even **Solomon in all his glory** was clothed as one of these.*

"Then the light comparison begins by making a reinforcing statement about light, introduced by a thought that if it's that way for the light then it's going to be that way for the heavy. The first part of the conditional phrase applies to what just came before, but the second portion introduces the heavy or more important idea."

And you see it, like I said, in every single parable. *If the grass of the field, that is here today and tomorrow falls into the furnace, clothed like this by Elohim. Then will He not more clothe you.* So here is the basic kolbi komer. You establish the premise ... worrying needlessly about clothing. You begin an example ... the light clothing, the lilies of the field. You compare it to another example, the heavy example and then you say, "Whatever is true for the light ... Elohim cares for the lilies, must be true for the heavy ... Elohim cares for you." Isn't a man more important than an animal? And it's all over, it's the style that was in the first century and it's the Aramaic style of speaking and it's the style Yahshua used.

But here's the neat part, now Yahshua shows His mastery over the kolbi komer when it comes to this. If you go to Matthew 6 where we were ...

Mat 6:31-33 *Then do not be **anxious**, saying, What may we eat? Or, what may we drink? Or, what may clothe us? For after all these things the nations seek. For your heavenly Father knows that you have need of all these things. But **seek first the kingdom of YAHWEH and His righteousness**, and all these things will be added to you.*

So He actually takes the kolbi komer and blows them away because first with the kolbi komer, you are taking the light expression. You're making a premise. Then you are taking a light expression and you're saying that it is good for the light then it is good for the heavy. Yahshua turns it around and says, "Seek you first the kingdom and all these things will be added to you" to say, if you do the heavy first ... seek the kingdom, then everything else will be given to you.

And that's why, by understanding the mastery of the language ... you know some the scriptures that say, "And after that they didn't question Him anymore." In any translation you can understand that Yahshua was a master at speaking and the things He says. You get it. You get the surface in anything but in the Aramaic, it goes so far deeper that the way He answered them and their own type of idiomatic language just absolutely blew them away in the way they can understand it.

So I say as I end up here, this is one short ... I guess you could say an introduction to the new Bible translation, to getting people's interest involved in the Aramaic but if you look at the proof of it. Like we said ... the split words. You look at the scientific proof; you look at the manuscripts next to each other; you look at the mistranslations. I'm not even saying 99%; 100% sure the Aramaic precedes the Greek. And again, it's not to say the Greek is a bad translation or we don't want to use the Greek. But it is to show the primary so when we are looking at doctrine, and one of the doctrines being the Sacred Name, that we can say, "Yes, in the original manuscripts, in the Aramaic, the name of Yahshua, the name of the Hebrew Savior and the name of the Father, Yahweh was there in these manuscripts."

And when our new manuscript comes out with this, many people are going to be pleasantly surprised at the ammunition you are going to have. Because again, one of the hardest things ... coming from the west . Number 1 - People thinking with a western mindset. They are not thinking in kolbi komer. They are not thinking in idiomatic language. They are thinking like a Greek. We are an extension of Babylon, of Rome, of Greece in the west. And because of that, much of our mindset is a Greek mindset than a Hebrew mindset. And being that, when you are talking to someone about scripture; whether it's we need to keep the Sabbath or not; whether we keep the holy days earlier. By having a Bible that's been translated by people that are against these things and they purposely have misaligned some of these translations to make the New Testament to look anti-Torah, we are almost starting with 2 hands tied behind our back.

But now to be able to go out and say, "Look, I read my Bible every day. I know what I'm talking about here and let's look at this. Let's take this translation." They can say, "Well, I don't know who this guy is. What is this translation from?" It doesn't matter who I am. Is it right or is it wrong? So we can look at our translation and go back to the original manuscript and say, "This is the way it says it and I stand by it.

Again, I am a man. I'm sure there are things that are there that are not perfect. I'm sure there will be a few small spelling mistakes somewhere; we are trying to go to print quick. But I'm telling you that this translation ... and I stand by it, will stand against the anti-Semitic and the anti-Torah translations of the Protestants and the Catholics and of the other ones. So praise Yahweh that He allowed me to do it. And I am so excited about getting it out and using it and it just brings it to light so much more. But I pray for nothing else that a message like this ... if you are here of you are hearing this, that it will inspire you to do your own homework. Don't believe me, look into what I am saying here. Read the book by Gabriel Roth if you want or go on the Internet. There's brand new books out now. They are starting to get more now. The Aramaic is really ... it's not something that one guy is saying. It's becoming really predominant. Even Aramaic.org, I see had even more than a million hits on it already, just in a few years. So this is cutting edge but I'm telling you as we are coming back to the origins of everything ... the origin of the Brit Chadashah, the New Testament without a doubt, was Aramaic.