

Contradictions in the Greek New Testament, Prove Peshitta Primacy – Part 1

Compiled by Christopher Lancaster

Not only will this article show the practical side of the original Aramaic New Testament, but will provide yet more linguistic evidence of Peshitta primacy. The Greek NT has many contradictions and errors, while the Peshitta lacks them, and makes you say “ah! So that’s what it means...”. The Peshitta is an awesome tool for Christian apologetics.

Why apologetics? Because it is our duty! We must always be ready to defend our faith.

1Peter 3:15 [Lamsa]

15 But sanctify the Lord Christ in your hearts; and be ready to give an answer in meekness and reverence to everyone who seeks from you a word concerning the hope of your faith,

Now that we are armed with the original NT, there is no more need to twist Scripture...

Verses from the KJV and NIV will be used to represent the Greek text (covering the two main families of Greek texts: Byzantine and Alexandrian) while the Lamsa, Younan or some other translation will be used to show the verses from the Peshitta.

Note: Many of these examples are discussed in greater detail in other articles in this series, dealing with other subsections of Peshitta primacy proof (such as ‘split words’).

1. The Genealogies of Jesus – Matthew 1:6-16 / Luke 3:21-31

This is a massive topic worthy of its own article. Besides the “contradictions” in the Greek that are solved by the Peshitta, there are other issues to consider, such as Jechonias’ curse, and how the genealogies merged through Salathiel and Zerubabel. As this article deals with Greek “contradictions” lacking in the Aramaic, such issues will be left for another time. In both genealogies, there is agreement until David. From there, Matthew’s genealogy goes through David’s son Solomon, while Luke’s genealogy goes through David’s son Nathan.

Matthew 1:6-16

The KJV says: “And Jesse begat David the king; and David the king begat Solomon of her that had been the wife of Urias; And Solomon begat Roboam; and Roboam begat Abia; and Abia begat Asa; And Asa begat Josaphat; and Josaphat begat Joram; and Joram begat Ozias; And Ozias begat Joatham; and Joatham begat Achaz; and Achaz begat Ezekias; And Ezekias begat Manasses; and Manasses begat Amon; and Amon begat Josias; And Josias begat Jechonias and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon:

And after they were brought to Babylon, Jechonias begat Salathiel; and Salathiel begat Zorobabel; And Zorobabel begat Abiud; and Abiud begat Eliakim; and Eliakim begat Azor; And Azor begat Sadoc; and Sadoc begat Achim; and Achim begat Eliud; And Eliud begat Eleazar; and Eleazar begat Matthan; and Matthan begat Jacob; And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.”

The NIV says: “and Jesse the father of King David. David was the father of Solomon, whose mother had been Uriah's wife, Solomon the father of Rehoboam, Rehoboam the father of Abijah, Abijah the father of Asa, Asa the

father of Jehoshaphat, Jehoshaphat the father of Jehoram, Jehoram the father of Uzziah, Uzziah the father of Jotham, Jotham the father of Ahaz, Ahaz the father of Hezekiah, Hezekiah the father of Manasseh, Manasseh the father of Amon, Amon the father of Josiah, and Josiah the father of Jeconiah and his brothers at the time of the exile to Babylon.

After the exile to Babylon: Jeconiah was the father of Shealtiel, Shealtiel the father of Zerubbabel, Zerubbabel the father of Abiud, Abiud the father of Eliakim, Eliakim the father of Azor, Azor the father of Zadok, Zadok the father of Akim, Akim the father of Eliud, Eliud the father of Eleazar, Eleazar the father of Matthan, Matthan the father of Jacob, and Jacob the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.”

Luke 3:21-31

KJV: “Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased. And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli, Which was the son of Matthat, which was the son of Levi, which was the son of Melchi, which was the son of Janna, which was the son of Joseph, Which was the son of Mattathias, which was the son of Amos, which was the son of Naum, which was the son of Esli, which was the son of Nagge, Which was the son of Maath, which was the son of Mattathias, which was the son of Semei, which was the son of Joseph, which was the son of Juda, Which was the son of Joanna, which was the son of Rhesa, which was the son of Zerobabel, which was the son of Salathiel, which was the son of Neri, Which was the son of Melchi, which was the son of Addi, which was the son of Cosam, which was the son of Elmodam, which was the son of Er, Which was the son of Jose, which was the son of Eliezer, which was the son of Jorim, which was the son of Matthat, which was the son of Levi, Which was the son of Simeon, which was the son of Juda, which was the son of Joseph, which was the son of Jonan, which was the son of Eliakim, Which was the son of Melea, which was the son of Menan, which was the son of Mattatha, which was the son of Nathan, which was the son of David,”

NIV: “When all the people were being baptized, Jesus was baptized too. And as he was praying, heaven was opened and the Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form like a dove. And a voice came from heaven: “You are my Son, whom I love; with you I am well pleased.” Now Jesus himself was about thirty years old when he began his ministry. He was the son, so it was thought, of Joseph, the son of Heli, the son of Matthat, the son of Levi, the son of Melki, the son of Jannai, the son of Joseph, the son of Mattathias, the son of Amos, the son of Nahum, the son of Esli, the son of Naggai, the son of Maath, the son of Mattathias, the son of Semein, the son of Josech, the son of Joda, the son of Joanan, the son of Rhesa, the son of Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel, the son of Neri, the son of Melki, the son of Addi, the son of Cosam, the son of Elmadam, the son of Er, the son of Joshua, the son of Eliezer, the son of Jorim, the son of Matthat, the son of Levi, the son of Simeon, the son of Judah, the son of Joseph, the son of Jonam, the son of Eliakim, the son of Melea, the son of Menna, the son of Mattatha, the son of Nathan,”

Here are some of the “contradictions” from the Greek, that are solved by the original Aramaic:

1. Matthew says (in verse 17) that the generations listed make a 14-14-14 structure. However, We clearly see, that from the captivity of Babylon to Jesus, are only 13 generations, making a 14-14-13 structure. Traditional apologetics attempted to solve this by explaining that David counts twice. This is invalid, and twists Scripture. If David counts twice, why not also count Jechonias twice? Zorbans (those who hold to Greek primacy) must face the truth, the Greek is in error here.

2. **Both genealogies are of Joseph.** Why are they so different? Traditional apologetics attempted to solve this by explaining that **Luke actually gives the genealogy of Mary** (instead of Joseph), while **Matthew gives the genealogy**

of Joseph. This is desperation. The truth is, that the Greek Bible makes it clear that BOTH genealogies go to Jesus through Joseph.

3. If no genealogy of Mary is given, how can we know that Jesus is indeed a descendant of David (as stated in verses such as Romans 1:3)?

The original Aramaic solves these problems, with one swift move. Matthew 1:16 from the Greek usually calls Joseph the husband of Mary. The Aramaic says that Joseph is the **ܡܘܪܐ** (gowra) of Mary. The definition of this word is crucial and solves all these problems. **ܡܘܪܐ** CAN refer to ‘husband’, but can ALSO mean ‘man’, and ‘father’. A few verses later, Matthew talks of Joseph as the **ܐܘܘܪܐ** (a more traditional Semitic term for ‘husband’) of Mary. It seems that Matthew was dealing with two Joseph’s here, and wanted to clearly differentiate them by using different terms. Would it be pure coincidence that the Joseph in verse 16, being the father or father figure (e.g. an uncle) of Mary, solves so many problems?

The Greek blew this big time. There were two Joseph’s involved. This explains why the genealogies are so different (i.e. Matthew actually gives Mary’s genealogy, while Luke gives her husband’s) and adds one more generation, making the 14-14-14 structure that Matthew was talking about. Additionally, since we now know that Mary’s genealogy is given, and that she is a descendant of David, we know can see that Jesus was indeed a descendant of David.

All credit to Paul Younan for discovering the alternate meanings of “gowra” that seemed to stump Zorba and even Dr. Lamsa.

This contradiction example is also an example of a semi-split word, as it stems from a word being mistranslated.

2. Did Joseph name Jesus? – Matthew 1:21 / Luke 1:31

Matthew 1:21

The KJV says: “And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.”

The NIV says: “She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins.”

Here is the problem for Greek primacists: Mary was the one who named Him Jesus.

Luke 1:31

KJV: “And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS.”

NIV: “You will be with child and give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus.”

Does the Peshitta also have this “contradiction”?

The Peshitta says (Matthew 1:21, direct translation by Paul Younan): “And she will bear a son, and she will call his name Yeshua; for he will save his people from their sins.”

The Peshitta shows us that Mary named Jesus, and thus does not share this contradiction with the Greek texts.

While unfortunate that Zorba (a nickname for the people who translated the Aramaic original into Greek) created a contradiction here, it is understandable. The error they made is so common, even Lamsa did not avoid it in his translation. The error came about because the Aramaic word **ܐܘܨܘܚܐ** can be translated as 2nd-person masculine, or 3rd-person feminine. i.e. the same text can mean “**you will call...**” and “**she will call...**”

This contradiction example is also an example of a semi-split word, as it stems from a word being mistranslated.

3. Does God lead us into temptation? – Matthew 6:13 / Matthew 4:3 / 1Thessalonians 3:5

Matthew 6:13 (the end of The Lord’s Prayer)

The KJV says: “And lead us not into **temptation**, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.”

The NIV says: “And lead us not into **temptation**, but deliver us from the evil one.”

The evil one being talked about is Satan, also known as the tempter! I need not warn you of the dangers of calling God a tempter...

Matthew 4:3

KJV: “And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.”

NIV: “The tempter came to him and said, “If you are the Son of God, tell these stones to become bread.””

1Thessalonians 3:5

KJV: “For this cause, when I could no longer forbear, I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you, and our labour be in vain.”

NIV: “For this reason, when I could stand it no longer, I sent Timothy to find out about your faith. I was afraid that in some way the tempter might have tempted you and our efforts might have been useless.”

As if that wasn’t enough, a clear contradiction arises when the Scriptures say that God does not tempt:

James 1:13

KJV: “Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man:”

NIV: “When tempted, no one should say, “God is tempting me.” For God cannot be tempted by evil, nor does he tempt anyone;”

Following is a transliteration (to show what a great poet the Lord is) and translation of the Lord’s Prayer (Matthew 6:9-13), by noted Aramaic scholar, Paul Younan:

“Awon d'washmayya (our Father in Heaven)

nith-Qaddash Shmakh (holy be your Name)

Teh-teh Malkothakh (your Kingdom come)

Nehweh sow-ya-nakh (your Will be done)

Aykanna d'washmaya (as it is in heaven)

ap b'ar-aa (also on earth)

Haw-lan lakh-ma (give us the bread)

d'son-qa-nan yo-ma-na (of our need this day)

w'ashwooq lan khaw-beyn (and forgive us our offences)

aykanna d'ap akhanan shwaqan l'khay-ya-weyn (as we have forgiven those who have offended us)

w'la taa-lan l'nis-yo-na ([and do not lead us into trial](#))

ella passan min bee-sha (but deliver us from the evil one)

mottol de-lakh he mal-ko-tha (for yours is the kingdom)

w'khayla (and the power)

w'tishbokhta (and the glory)

l'alam, almen, amen. (forever and ever, amen)”

The Aramaic lacks the Greek problem of virtually calling God, “the tempter”. God may lead us into trial, to “purify us”, but he certainly does not tempt us to do evil! It is noteworthy that this isn’t the only time the Greek makes allusions to God being Satan. The Alexandrian Greek texts for instance, call both Jesus and Lucifer, “the morning star”, while also replacing “cornerstone” (Jesus’ much used symbol in the Bible), with “capstone” (a pagan symbol, often representing Satan).

4. Is wisdom vindicated by her [children](#)? – Matthew 11:19 / Luke 7:35

Matthew 11:19

The KJV says: “The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her [children](#).”

The NIV says: “The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, 'Here is a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and "sinners." ' But wisdom is proved right by her [actions](#).”

The problem arises when we look at what Luke has to say. Both passages are dealing with the same story, about Jesus and John the Baptist, so a difference in the Greek texts would be an error.

Luke 7:35

KJV: “But wisdom is justified of all her [children](#).”

NIV: “But wisdom is proved right by all her [children](#).”

Does the Peshitta also have this “contradiction”?

The Lamsa says (Matthew 11:19): “The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they said, Behold, a glutton and a wine-bibber, and a friend of tax collectors and sinners. And yet wisdom is justified by its **works**.”

The Lamsa says (Luke 7:35): “And yet wisdom is justified by all its **works**.”

The Peshitta does not share this contradiction with the Greek texts, nor is it affected by the mistranslation of “children” for “deeds/works”.

There is more to this example though. We see that the Alexandrian Greek has the contradiction, while the Byzantine Greek does not. That is because the Byzantine text has the wrong word both places, while the Alexandrian at least got it half right. The reason for the mistranslation in these places is that **בנים** can mean “**her deeds**” and can also mean “**her offspring**”. We know that the correct reading is “deeds” and not “children”, because in Matthew 11:9, the a more specific word for deeds is used, “**מעשים**”. So now we know why the Alexandrian text has the contradiction. But there is yet more to this! The mistranslation should occur in Luke, not in Matthew, and this we see in the Alexandrian text. The Byzantine however also has “**children**” in Matthew, which should never have happened (seeing as how Matthew uses the more specific word for “**deeds**”). I suspect that fraud was involved here. i.e. someone noticed the contradiction in the Byzantine Greek text, so altered Matthew 11:19 to comply with Luke 7:35, when it should have been done the other way around! See what I mean when I say that with the original Bible, there is no more need to twist Scripture?

Due to the differences among the Greek texts, this example is also a split word.

5. Was the Ethiopian a **eunuch? – Matthew 19:12 / Acts 8:27 / Deuteronomy 23:1**

Matthew 19:12

The KJV says: “For there are some **eunuchs**, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some **eunuchs**, which were made **eunuchs** of men: and there be **eunuchs**, which have made themselves **eunuchs** for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.”

The NIV says: “For some are **eunuchs** because they were born that way; others were made that way by men; and others have renounced marriage because of the kingdom of heaven. The one who can accept this should accept it.”

Acts 8:27

The KJV says: “And he arose and went: and, behold, a man of Ethiopia, an **eunuch** of great authority under Candace queen of the Ethiopians, who had the charge of all her treasure, and had come to Jerusalem for to worship,”

The NIV says: “So he started out, and on his way he met an Ethiopian **eunuch**, an important official in charge of all the treasury of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians. This man had gone to Jerusalem to worship,”

Matthew 19:12 doesn't seem to lead to a contradiction (we will get back to it later) but Acts 8:27 certainly gives us a problem:

Deuteronomy 23:1

KJV: “He that is wounded in the stones, or hath his privy member cut off, shall not enter into the congregation of the LORD.”

NIV: “No one who has been emasculated by crushing or cutting may enter the assembly of the LORD .”

How can this so-called eunuch worship in Jerusalem when he cannot enter the assembly of the LORD?

The Younan says (Acts 8:27): “and arose [and] went and he met a **believer** certain who come had from Cush an official of Qandeq queen of the Cushites and he in authority was over all of her treasure and he come had to worship in Urishlim”

The Aramaic lacks the Greek problem.

The mistranslation was likely caused by the word for “believer” (ܡܝܡܢܐ – “MHYMNA”) which can also mean “eunuch”. As for Matthew 19:12, it is hard to determine whether Jesus is talking about eunuchs or believers”, but interesting to note that “believer” would fit nicely in that passage also.

This “contradiction” is also an example of a semi-split word, as it involves a mistranslation.

6. Can we be **teachers or not? – Matthew 23:8 / Matthew 28:19-20**

Matthew 23:8

The KJV says: “But be not ye called **Rabbi**: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren.”

The NIV says: ““But you are not to be called '**Rabbi**,' for you have only one Master and you are all brothers.”

The Greek repeatedly interprets “Rabbi” as “**teacher**”. There is a problem when we look at Matthew 28:19-20.

Matthew 28:19-20

KJV: “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.”

NIV: “Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age.”

We can't be called “**teacher**”, but we must teach? The Aramaic says “Rabbi” also, but it is the misunderstanding of this word we are looking at. “**Teacher**” is not the literal interpretation of “Rabbi”, it is the idiomatic interpretation. The literal interpretation is “**my great one**”. Clearly, Jesus is allowing us to be **teachers**, but not to be called “**my great one**”.

This is an example of a misunderstanding of a word that is often used idiomatically.

7. Was Simon really a **leper? – Matthew 26:6 / Mark 14:3 / Leviticus 13:45-46**

Matthew 26:6

The KJV says: “Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of **Simon the leper**,”

The NIV says: “While Jesus was in Bethany in the home of a man known as **Simon the Leper**,”

Mark 14:3

KJV: “And being in Bethany in the house of **Simon the leper**, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious; and she brake the box, and poured it on his head.”

NIV: “While he was in Bethany, reclining at the table in the home of a man known as **Simon the Leper**, a woman came with an alabaster jar of very expensive perfume, made of pure nard. She broke the jar and poured the perfume on his head.”

The problem here lies with a certain command in the Old Testament, for these Judean people:

Leviticus 13:45-46

KJV: “And the leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent, and his head bare, and he shall put a covering upon his upper lip, and shall cry, Unclean, unclean. All the days wherein the plague shall be in him he shall be defiled; he is unclean: he shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his habitation be.”

NIV: ““The person with such an infectious disease must wear torn clothes, let his hair be unkempt, cover the lower part of his face and cry out, 'Unclean! Unclean!' As long as he has the infection he remains unclean. He must live alone; he must live outside the camp.”

Yet somehow this man was able to not only live in town, but also with his wife. Another oddity here (while not really being a contradiction) is that there is no record of Jesus healing him. Why not?

The Younan says (Matthew 26:6): “and when was Yeshua in Beth-Anya in the house of **Shimon the potter**”

The Younan says (Mark 14:3): “and while he was in Beth-Anya in the house of **Shimon the potter** while reclining came a woman who had with her an alabaster vase of perfume of nard the best very expensive and she opened it and poured it upon the head of Yeshua”

As you can see, the Peshitta lacks the Greek contradiction, as Simon was a **potter**, not a **leper**.

This happened very easily as the Aramaic **ܟܘܒܐ** is without vowel markers, and can mean “garibo” (potter, jar merchant) and “garobo” (leper). It is also a handy coincidence (or maybe not) that this jar maker (or jar merchant) had a wife who used a jar to pour perfume on Jesus.

This example is also a semi-split word as it involves a mistranslated word.

8. Was it really **Jeremiah the Prophet? – Matthew 27:9-10 / Zechariah 11:13**

Matthew 27:9-10

The KJV says: “Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by **Jeremy the prophet**, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value; And gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.”

The NIV says: “Then what was spoken by **Jeremiah the prophet** was fulfilled: "They took the thirty silver coins, the price set on him by the people of Israel, and they used them to buy the potter's field, as the Lord commanded me.””

Here is the problem for Greek primacists: The prophecy was actually by Zechariah.

[Zechariah 11:13](#)

KJV: “And the LORD said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that I was prized at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the LORD.”

NIV: “And the LORD said to me, "Throw it to the potter"-the handsome price at which they priced me! So I took the thirty pieces of silver and threw them into the house of the LORD to the potter.”

Does the Peshitta also have this “contradiction”?

The Lamsa says (Matthew 27:9-10): “Then what was spoken by **the prophet** was fulfilled, namely, I took the thirty pieces of silver, the costly price which was bargained with the children of Israel, And I gave them for the potter’s field, as the Lord commanded me.”

The Peshitta does not name the prophet, and thus does not share this contradiction with the Greek texts.

It may be that the Greek translators chose to name Jeremiah (being very liberal and adding to God’s Word I might add) as “the prophet”, because of similar prophecies in the Book of Jeremiah. Jeremiah’s prophecies however are different than the NT quotation, as they do not mention “the potter” and seventeen pieces of silver are involved, instead of thirty. God told us not to add to His Word for a reason!

9. Was Jesus **forsaken? – Matthew 27:46 / Mark 15:34 / Psalms 37:25-28 / John 16:32**

Matthew 27:46

The KJV says: “And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, my God, **why hast thou forsaken me?**”

The NIV says: “About the ninth hour Jesus cried out in a loud voice, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?"--which means, "My God, my God, **why have you forsaken me?**””

This same “forsaken” reading also occurs in Mark 15:34. The problem for Zorbans here is that there are verses that tell us that God does not forsake the righteous (many actually try and teach that at that moment, Jesus was evil and unrighteous and thus was forsaken!) and that Jesus is not alone because the Father is with him.

Psalms 37: 25-28

KJV: “I have been young, and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread. He is ever merciful, and lendeth; and his seed is blessed. Depart from evil, and do good; and dwell for evermore.

For the LORD loveth judgment, and forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved for ever: but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off.”

NIV: “I was young and now I am old, yet I have never seen the righteous forsaken or their children begging bread. They are always generous and lend freely; their children will be blessed. Turn from evil and do good; then you will dwell in the land forever. For the LORD loves the just and will not forsake his faithful ones. They will be protected forever, but the offspring of the wicked will be cut off;”

John 16:32

KJV: “Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me.”

NIV: ““But a time is coming, and has come, when you will be scattered, each to his own home. You will leave me all alone. Yet I am not alone, for my Father is with me.”

Does the Peshitta also have this “contradiction”?

The Younan says (Mark 27:46): “and about the ninth hour cried out Yeshua with a voice loud and said [my] God, [my] God, [why have you spared me?](#)”

The Peshitta says clearly lacks this vital contradiction, unlike the Greek.

It is easy to understand how this mistranslation occurred, as “sabachthani” can mean “forsaken” and “spared”, among other things. People may argue that it doesn’t make sense that Jesus would ask why He has been spared (though it does make sense when you realise that He was suffering for about 6 hours, and died soon after that plea. i.e. “Why have you spared me? Let’s get it over with!”) but it surely makes a lot more sense that Jesus contradicting His own Word!

This example is also a semi-split word, as it deals with a mistranslation.

10. Was she [Greek](#) or not? – Mark 7:26 / Matthew 15:22

Mark 7:26

The KJV says: “The [woman was a Greek](#), a Syrophenician by nation; and she besought him that he would cast forth the devil out of her daughter.”

The NIV says: “The [woman was a Greek](#), born in Syrian Phoenicia. She begged Jesus to drive the demon out of her daughter.”

Here is the problem for Greek primacists: This “Greek” woman was actually a Canaanite. We know this is the same woman, due to the “even dogs eat the crumbs” story in both accounts.

Matthew 15:22

KJV: “And, behold, a [woman of Canaan](#) came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil.”

NIV: “A **Canaanite woman** from that vicinity came to him, crying out, “Lord, Son of David, have mercy on me! My daughter is suffering terribly from demon-possession.””

Does the Peshitta also have this “contradiction”?

The Lamsa says (Mark 7:26): “But the **woman was a heathen**, from Phoenicia in Syria; and she besought him to cast out the demon from her daughter.”

The Peshitta says that she is a heathen, not a Greek, and thus does not share this contradiction with the Greek texts.

From the Greek we can be confused as to whether she was Greek or Semitic. From the Peshitta, we only ever get the impression that she was a Semite. This may have been purposely changed to “Greek” by Zorba, in order to “Hellenize” the Bible. This wouldn’t be the first time. Many references to “Arameans/gentiles”, were substituted to “Greeks” by Zorba, causing much confusion as to the ethnicity of Timothy and Titus (their fathers were Aramean, not Greek).

11. Shall we sinners maim ourselves? – Mark 9:43-47 / 1Corinthians 6:19-20

Mark 9:43-47

The KJV says: “And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire:”

The NIV says: “If your hand causes you to sin, cut it off. It is better for you to enter life maimed than with two hands to go into hell, where the fire never goes out. And if your foot causes you to sin, cut it off. It is better for you to enter life crippled than to have two feet and be thrown into hell. And if your eye causes you to sin, pluck it out. It is better for you to enter the kingdom of God with one eye than to have two eyes and be thrown into hell,”

This seems to teach self-mutilation. We see no record in the Bible that self-mutilation is good. In fact, we are instructed to glorify God in our body (it is the temple of the Holy Ghost).

1Corinthians 6:19-20

The KJV says: “What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.”

The NIV says: “Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit, who is in you, whom you have received from God? You are not your own; you were bought at a price. Therefore honor God with your body.”

Did Jesus really intend us to maim ourselves? The answer lies in Jesus’ language, Aramaic. “If your hand offends you, cut it off”, “if your eye offends you, pluck it out” and “if your foot offends you, cut it off” are Aramaic idioms that have been used for centuries, meaning, “If you have a habit of stealing, stop it”, “If you have a habit of envying, stop it” and “If you have a habit of trespassing on other's property, stop it”, respectively. This is why no Assyrian (an Aramaic-speaking people) has mutilated themselves in the Lord’s name, unlike the Christians in the West.

This problem is also an example of a misunderstood Aramaic idiom.

12. Is that **generation still alive? – Mark 13:30**

The KJV says: “Verily I say unto you, that this **generation** shall not pass, till all these things be done.”

The NIV says: “I tell you the truth, this **generation** will certainly not pass away until all these things have happened.”

The problem here is that if Jesus was talking about events in the end-times, then surely that generation of people are already long gone.

The Younan says: “truly say I to you that not will pass **tribe** this until these [things] all occur”

The Peshitta lacks the problem of the Greek, as it doesn't mention a generation.

The Aramaic word here, **ܫܪܘܬܐ**, pronounced “sharvtho”, can mean **generation**, **tribe** or **family**, while the Greek γενεα (genea) means “generation”. What family/tribe is being discussed here? Well, He is talking to Christians! And the Christian family is yet to die out.

This example is also a semi-split word, as it is caused by a simple mistranslation.

13. Why does Jesus wake up Peter, James and John, after telling them to “sleep on**”? – Mark 14:41 / Mark 14:42**

Mark 14:41

The KJV says: “And he cometh the third time, and saith unto them, **Sleep on now, and take your rest**: it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.”

The NIV says: “Returning the third time, he said to them, “Are you still sleeping and resting? Enough! The hour has come. Look, the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.”

Notice how the NIV betrays “the original Greek” behind it when it should clearly say something along the lines of “sleep on now and take your rest”, as it has the words καθευδετε (“sleep on”), αναπαυεσθε (“take your rest”) and λοιπον (“now”).

Now, why does Jesus wake them up again (in verse 40 they were sleeping), only to tell them to sleep, and then wake them up again in the following verse?

Mark 14:42

KJV: “Rise up, let us go; lo, he that betrayeth me is at hand.”

NIV: “Rise! Let us go! Here comes my betrayer!””

The Aramaic COULD mean what the Greek says, but can ALSO mean “So they are already having sleep and rest! ...”, which would make more sense of the context (they kept sleeping and Jesus kept waking them up). The Aramaic grammar here can very much show that Jesus was speaking to both Himself and the Apostles in verse 41 (it was fairly common for Him to speak in the 3rd person – e.g. “the Son of man”).

Zorba just made a complete mess of these verses, by misunderstanding the grammar of a couple of ambiguous verbs (which can be taken to be imperative or perfect verbs).

14. Do we need to hate to become good Christians? – Luke 14:26 / Romans 9:13 / 1John 3:15 / 1John 4:20-21

Luke 14:26

The KJV says: “If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.”

The NIV says: “If anyone comes to me and does not hate his father and mother, his wife and children, his brothers and sisters--yes, even his own life--he cannot be my disciple.”

Well the problem here is that we are to “love our neighbour” and “honour our parents”. More specifically, we are seemingly told to hate our “brothers”, while this is clearly condemned:

1John 3:15

KJV: “Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.”

NIV: “Anyone who hates his brother is a murderer, and you know that no murderer has eternal life in him.”

1John 4:20-21

KJV: “If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God love his brother also.”

NIV: “If anyone says, “I love God,” yet hates his brother, he is a liar. For anyone who does not love his brother, whom he has seen, cannot love God, whom he has not seen. And he has given us this command: Whoever loves God must also love his brother.”

A similar problem occurs with Romans 9:13, where our loving God is portrayed in a different light, by the Greek.

Romans 9:13

KJV: “As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.”

NIV: “Just as it is written: “Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.””

Once again, the Peshitta comes to the rescue.

The Lamsa says (Luke 14:26): “He who comes to me and does not **put aside** his father and his mother and his brothers and his sisters and his wife and his children and even his own life cannot be a disciple to me.”

The Lamsa says (Romans 9:13): “As it is written, Jacob have I loved but Esau have I **set aside**.”

The answer lies in the Aramaic word "ܣܘܢܐ" (*sone'*). It can mean “to put aside” and “to hate”. Clearly He is teaching that in order to be His disciple, we must be able to put aside those we love, and even be prepared to give our lives.

As this error is caused by a mistranslated word, it is an example of a semi-split word.

15. Is the Gospel really foolish? – 1Corinthians 1:21 / 2Timothy 3:15-16

1Corinthians 1:21

The KJV says: “For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the **foolishness** of preaching to save them that believe.”

The NIV says: “For since in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom did not know him, God was pleased through the **foolishness** of what was preached to save those who believe.”

The Greek would have us believe that: 1) The Gospel is foolish, and 2) that the Bible teaches that a foolish Gospel can make us wise.

2Timothy 3:15-16

The KJV says: “And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:”

The NIV says: “and how from infancy you have known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make you wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness,”

Does the Apostle Paul really say that the Gospel is foolish?

The Lamsa says (1Corinthians 1:21): “Because all the wisdom which God had given was not sufficient for the world to know God, it pleased God to save those who believe by the **simple** gospel.”

The Aramaic word in question, ܣܘܢܐ, means “**simple**”. “Simple” CAN be taken to mean “**foolish**” (e.g. a simple person / a foolish person), but it boggles the mind why Zorba would translate it so, when the verse refers to the Gospel.

16. A medley of Old Testament apologetics

Now that we have finished looking at some of the many Greek contradictions and errors solved by the Peshitta New Testament, I would like to share a few Massoretic (the most accepted Hebrew form of the Old Testament)

contradictions solved by the Peshitta Old Testament, for interest, and to show further evidence of the use of the Aramaic language in Biblical times.

Was Ahaziah 22 (2Kings 8:26) or 42 (2Chronicles 22:2) when he began to rule over Jerusalem?

Lamsa - 2Kings 8:26

Ahaziah was **twenty-two** years old when he began to reign; and he reigned one year in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Athaliah, the daughter of Omri king of Israel.

Lamsa - 2Chronicles 22:2

Twenty-two years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign, and he reigned one year in Jerusalem. His mother's name was Athaliah the daughter of Omri.

By reading the context, we see that Ahaziah must have been 22 and not 42, otherwise his father would have been of a similar age!

Lamsa 2Kings 8:16-26

And in the fifth year of Joram the son of Ahab king of Israel, Jehoshaphat being then king of Judah, Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat king of Judah began to reign. Thirty and two years old was he when he began to reign; and he reigned eight years in Jerusalem. And he walked in the way of the kings of Israel, as did the house of Ahab: for the daughter of Ahab was his wife: and he did evil in the sight of the LORD. Yet the LORD would not destroy Judah for David his servant's sake, as he promised him to give him alway a light, and to his children. In his days Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah, and made a king over themselves. So Joram went over to Zair, and all the chariots with him: and he rose by night, and smote the Edomites which compassed him about, and the captains of the chariots: and the people fled into their tents. Yet Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah unto this day. Then Libnah revolted at the same time. And the rest of the acts of Joram, and all that he did, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah? And Joram slept with his fathers, and was buried with his fathers in the city of David: and Ahaziah his son reigned in his stead. In the twelfth year of Joram the son of Ahab king of Israel did Ahaziah the son of Jehoram king of Judah begin to reign. Ahaziah was twenty-two years old when he began to reign; and he reigned one year in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Athaliah, the daughter of Omri king of Israel.

In this case, the POT (Peshitta Old Testament) proves useful.

Was Jehoiachin 8 (2Chronicles 36:9) or 18 (2Kings 24:8) when he began to reign?

This is a similar example to which many apologists have come up with a complex answer involving a two-phase system of kingship. The real solution is far more simple. Again, it is a "copyist error", and is solved by the much older Peshitta Old Testament:

Lamsa 2Chronicles 36:9

Jehoiachin was **eighteen** years old when he began to reign, and he reigned three months and ten days in Jerusalem; and he did that which was evil in the sight of the LORD.

Lamsa 2Kings 24:8

Jehoiachin was **eighteen** years old when he began to reign, and he reigned three months in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Nehushta, the daughter of Eliathan of Jerusalem.

These are but a few examples, and this isn't the only version to solve Massoretic contradictions. Even the Greek LXX seems to play witness to the original Hebrew OT. While the Aramaic and Greek New Testaments read "**75 persons/souls**" in Acts 7:14, the Massoretic says 70, in Genesis 46:27, Exodus 1:5 and Deuteronomy 10:22. The

LXX however, also reads "75" just like the NT, in Genesis 46:27 and Exodus 1:5, partly solving this "contradiction".

The Dead Sea Scrolls OT also gets in on the action, clarifying some obscure Massoretic passages. In Massoretic Psalm 22:16, we have "like a lion" which makes no sense in the context, while the POT, LXX and Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) all have "pierced". This makes a lot more sense: "a band of evil men have encircled me, and they have pierced at my hands and feet". How can you "like a lion" somebody?

The point of this is not to imply that one OT version is better than the other, rather to show that each has its uses, and all are witness to an older Hebrew original, that most likely had no contradictions. Isn't the Massoretic text, the original Hebrew OT Bible? No. It is a copy of a copy of a copy (ad nauseam) that surfaced around 900 AD (long after the Peshitta OT, LXX, DSS and even the New Testament!). For this reason, older OT versions, though they may be translations, are still vital pursuits in Biblical studies. And what is the importance of this to OT apologetics? Well, when someone comes to you with a contradiction in the OT, you can always say, "you are not quoting from the original"...

We have now seen mounds of evidence that the NT was originally written in Aramaic, from linguistic, historical and apologetic perspectives. The next article in the series, shows us how the original NT can impact our lives, as it deals with doctrinal issues such as Jesus' Divinity, the Sabbath, and homosexuality. – Christopher Lancaster