

# Semi Split Words in the New Testament, Suggest Peshitta Primacy – Part 1

Compiled and edited by Christopher Lancaster and Paul Younan

Hopefully by now you have read the 2 split words articles. Let us now look at other forms of linguistic proof that the New Testament was written in Aramaic, as opposed to Greek. While there is much historical evidence of Peshitta Primacy (for example: Jesus and the Apostles spoke Aramaic, the earliest Christians were Judeans and other Semitic peoples who spoke Aramaic, Judean historian Josephus wrote in Aramaic and admitted how difficult and sacrilege it was for Judeans to speak Greek, Gospel writer Luke was an Aramaic-speaking Assyrian, etc.), I prefer to delve into the texts themselves, for the ultimate proof. Historical proof is marred by opinions, but linguistic proof cannot be as easily dismissed.

While split words deal with variants explained in a Greek text/s with another Greek text/s, pointing to an Aramaic original, “semi split words” deal with differences in the Greek compared to the Aramaic, which can be explained by an Aramaic original. So they are very similar to split words, except that no (or few) Zorbans (those who translated the Aramaic New Testament into the Greek we have now) actually came up with the correct reading. Since semi split words always deal with wrong renderings in the Greek, they are often more simply referred to as “mistranslations”. The beauty of many semi split words, is that they often shed more light on the original Bible message and make us say “Ah! That’s what it meant, when it said...”, by solving many Greek Bible anomalies and contradictions.

Let us begin!

Note: A vital semi split word is omitted from this article, as it is very large, and has been given its own space in another article. It is the mistranslation of **ܡܪܝܡ** from the Aramaic, leading to the contradictory genealogies of Jesus, in the Greek. The gist of it is that Matthew lists Mary’s genealogy NOT Joseph’s, as the Joseph in the Matthew genealogy was the father/guardian of Mary, not her fiancé. i.e. there were 2 important Joseph’s in Mary’s life. The article is called “Use of **ܡܪܝܡ** in Classical and Contemporary Aramaic Thought”, by Paul Younan and should be close to where you obtained this article from.

## 1. Hardly die for a **righteous** man or a **wicked** man? – Romans 5:7

I just love linguistic proof from books such as Hebrews (Judea), 1 and 2 Corinthians (smack-bang in the middle of Greece) and Romans (Roman Empire). Examples in such books denounce claims that these books were written in “Old Hebrew” (the language of the Hebrews in the time of Jesus was Aramaic, and hence, often called Hebrew), Greek and Latin, respectively. And they lend more weight to the fact that the New Testament letters, while written to people in foreign lands, were written to the earliest Christians, who were Semites, and thus spoke Aramaic. To make it clearer that the people in these foreign lands were indeed Aramaic-speakers, think about this. Jesus appointed as His Disciples, twelve then, seventy. Mostly uneducated people, and Aramaic-speaking Semitic people, just like Jesus (though I am sure Jesus was extremely educated!). When they went out and formed Churches, did they appeal to people who couldn’t converse with them? Or did they have greater appeal to those who could speak the same language? Would the Churches be filled with pagans who spoke other languages, or would they be filled with Aramaic-speaking Semites, particularly Judeans who were expecting a Messiah?

The KJV says: “For scarcely for a **righteous** man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die.”

“Romans 5:7 in the GNT contains a critical mistranslation. That this is a mistranslation from an Aramaic source is indisputable.

The reading of the GNT is as follows:

For one would hardly die for a righteous δίκαιος man; though perhaps for the good αγαθος man someone would dare even to die.

Perplexed? Good! Because this is a horrible mistranslation from the Aramaic!

In Aramaic, the word for "wicked" is ܪܫܝܢܐ Rasheya (#20309) - but the word for "blameless/innocent" is ܪܫܝܢܐ ("Reshyana") (#20289) - there's only 1 letter difference, and both of those letters (Ayin א and Nun נ) look very, very similar.

Look at the two words again with the differing letter highlighted in red:

ܪܫܝܢܐ "innocent"

ܪܫܝܢܐ "wicked"

The Aramaic text of the Peshitta reads:

For one would hardly die for a wicked ܪܫܝܢܐ man; though perhaps for a good ܐܘܪܝܢܐ man someone would dare even to die.

The point is that Meshikha died for the wicked (the very next verse: Romans 5:8 - "But God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.").” – Paul Younan

## **2. Why hast thou forsaken me or why have you spared me? – Matthew 27:16 / Mark 15:34**

The importance of this semi split word, dealing with God’s alleged forsaking of Jesus, especially to the field of Christian apologetics, hardly needs to be stressed.

The KJV says (Matthew 27:46): “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 KJV says (Mark 15:34): “And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, **why hast thou forsaken me?**”

The first issue with this story, is that the Greek and English tell us that God allegedly forsook Jesus, resulting in the unfortunate twisting of Scripture by Christian apologists. The second issue, applies to Aramaic primacists. Greek primacists say, “If Matthew and Mark were written in Aramaic, why do the Gospel-writers write the same thing twice (i.e. first the Aramaic words of Jesus, then the Greek translation)”, instead of just simply translating it?

Let us deal first with the first.

“Had Jesus in this last hour said that God had forsaken Him, the Jews would have used this saying against Him. They would have taken it as a confession that He was a blasphemer and therefore God had deserted Him in His darkest hour; because God never forsakes the righteous, but He may forsake the sinners.

This is not all. Had Jesus' cry meant forsaking, He not only would have destroyed the faith of his disciples and followers, but would have contradicted His own teaching, the very assurance which He had given to His disciples, and the very cause for which He was dying. On the other hand, judgement and death on the cross did not come upon Jesus suddenly. On many occasions He had told his disciples that He would die on the cross and rise again; they had heard him saying, "You will leave me alone; and yet I am never alone because the Father is with me." (John 16:32)

How is it that the European translators of the Bible in the 17th Century A.D. who were thousands of miles from Palestine, and who could not speak Aramaic, knew more about Jesus' cry on the cross than the Jews who spoke Aramaic and stood near the cross watching Him die? And how is it that Peter, John, and other disciples and follows of Jesus never commented on these ominous words? Indeed, if Jesus had meant desertion they would have commented on it, because such a statement, or even such a thought was contrary to all Jesus had preached and taught. The apostles did not comment on these last words simply because they knew what Jesus meant in their Galilean dialect, or northern Aramaic. Moreover, they knew had He meant forsaken, He would have used the Aramaic word *taa tani*, which means forsaken.” – Dr. George Mamishisho Lamsa

Another problem with this, is that apologists will often try to explain that at that moment, Jesus was sin, and that is why God forsook Him. Well, if God forsook His own Son for sin, what hope do we have?

The simple solution, from the Aramaic, is that Jesus did not imply that God forsook Him at all! The Aramaic “*sabachthani*” does not have to mean forsaken. It can mean many things, among them, “spared”. Now “*lemana*” (written as “*lama*” in the Greek copies) denotes a question, so a fairly accurate translation would be:

“This is why I have translated this verse:

“My God, My God, **Why have you spared me?**” (i.e., let's finish this, let's get this over with!)” – Paul Younan

Now, does this rendering make sense? For what reason/s did Jesus ask, “Why have you spared me?” Well for one thing, Jesus was suffering horrendous pain for about SIX HOURS. Crucifixions can last even longer! This is a valid explanation, especially as soon after saying this, He finally died. Also, this is consistent with the fact that many in the crowd thought He cried for Elijah. Why would they think that? Perhaps, as He called out for “Eli”, His exhaustion and heavy breathing caused Him to add an “ah” on the end. Try talking when you have gone for a long run (or been crucified for 6 hours) and you’ll see what I mean. “Eli-ah” sounds a lot like “Elijah” does it not?

However, there are other possibilities too. It may have been Jesus’ eagerness to fulfill His destiny and to go to Paradise. It may also have been His wish to fulfill more Torah prophecy! It was prophesied that a bone of His would not be broken, and since He died, there was no need for the Roman soldiers to break His legs.

So basically we have two main possibilities. The “forsaken” rendering is not very possible, due to the word chosen, and the resulting contradictions. The “spared” rendering is very possible, doesn’t allow for contradictions, and just makes sense. And that’s what the Peshitta is all about.

Now let us deal with the second issue, the attack on Peshitta primacy, caused by the “doubling up” of the same message in the Peshitta (first Jesus’ Aramaic words, then a translation into the Aramaic Peshitta).

Well, to start with, the book of Matthew in the original Aramaic does not “double up”. It does not have the translation of what “Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?” means. But this does indeed occur in Mark. Why?

Well, Mark was writing to people who spoke a different dialect of Aramaic than Jesus, and, many thought that Jesus was calling for Elijah. Evidently, Mark wanted to be very clear, and translated this into his audience’s dialect.


Acknowledgements: Thanks to Steve Caruso, "Coblentz", Dean Dana, Dr. George Mamishisho Lamsa, "Otto", Andrew Gabriel Roth, "Sieg", Stephen Silver and Paul Younan for the constant analysis of this critical Greek mistranslation.

### **3. Camel or rope? – Matthew 19:24 / Mark 10:25 / Luke 18:25**

The KJV says (Matthew 19:24): “And again I say unto you, It is easier for a **camel** to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.”

The KJV says (Mark 10:25): “It is easier for a **camel** to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.”

The KJV says (Luke 18:25): “For it is easier for a **camel** to go through a needle’s eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.”

“Greek, reads "καμηλον" (*kamélon*) which is the accusative form of "καμηλος" (*kamélos*). This word, in greek, only means "camel" and sometimes can mean "pack animal" however, if we take a look at it's Aramaic equivalent, we find the word *gamlo'* [  - Chris] is the only word in Aramaic to describe a generic camel (without getting specific, ie we have the words "colt," "foal," "mare," and "stallion," to describe types of horses, but one general word for the species, "horse").

However, *gamlo'*, has a double meaning! As Aramaic evolved separately from Hebrew, it picked up new idioms and meanings to it's vocabulary. *gamlo'* is a perfect example, for Aramaic speaking peoples fashioned a rough, thick rope from camel's hair that had a very decent tensile strength, and after a while, it became to be known as, you guessed it, *gamlo'*. For example, modern-day society has the same phenomena where a product or item is referred to by the first name introduced, regardless of what brand it is. Millions of Americans still ask for a "Kleenex" instead of a tissue, the word for "razor" in Brazil is "Gilette," and an "IBM Computer" still refers to any Windows-compatible machine.

We appear to have come across an idiom long lost in the Greek translation of an Aramaic original. Although it doesn't really change the meaning of the parable, it grants us insight into how in tune with his audience the Messiah actually was. Cool, huh?” – Steve Caruso

“I've found a quote given by a 10th-century Aramaic lexicographer whose name was Bar-Bahlul. He produced an Aramaic dictionary and in it is the following comment for "Gamla" [same word as *gamlo'* with a different pronunciation – Chris]:

"Gamla is a thick rope which is used to bind ships"

Considering that Jesus was speaking to fishermen, this meaning of Gamla seems more appropriate, and I think is a fantastic proof that the Greek was translated from an Aramaic [original – Chris]” – Paul Younan

#### **4. Give not a holy thing or hang not earrings? - Matthew 7:6**

The KJV says: “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.”

“In the Greek versions of Matthew 7:6, we read with astonishment:

"Give not a holy thing to dogs: and cast not your pearls before swine; lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you."

There are two mistranslations in this one verse! The more important one involves the Aramaic word **ܩܘܕܫܐ** - here are the relevant Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon entries:

qwd\$#2 N qd\$)  
1 JLAGal,JLATg,Sam,Syr **ear-,nose-ring**  
LS2 649  
LS2 v: qdA\$A)

qwd\$#3 N qwd\$)  
1 Syr **consecration**  
2 Syr eucharist  
3 Syr voice crying 'holy'  
LS2 649  
LS2 v: quwdA\$A)

qwd\$ N  
1 passim holiness  
2 Syr holy place  
3 JLATg pl. **consecrated objects**  
4 JLATg various sacrifices  
LS2 649  
LS2 v: quwd\$A)

As you can see, the exact same spelling is interpreted as either "ear-, nose-ring" or "consecrated (holy) thing".

The second word that is mistranslated is the Aramaic root **ܩܘܕܫܐ** - it should be translated as "hang", rather than "give" (see word# 22596 in the Lexicon.)

Therefore, the verse should read:

"**Hang** not **earrings** on dogs: and **cast** not your **pearls** before swine; lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you."

As you can see, there is a beautiful parallelism here only apparent in the Aramaic (rings/pearls - dogs/swine). The Greek totally misses it! 😊

As Akhan Rob & Dean Dana pointed out, there are several instances in the Aramaic Targums where this root (QDSH) is used to mean "ear-,nose-ring.) Here is Dean's reply:

“So far I've seen 6 references in the Targum to the Torah (Onkelos) containing the root QD\$ for earring/nose-ring/ring. They are:

Gen 24:22

Gen 24:30

Gen 24:47

Gen 35:4

Exo 32:2

Exo 32:3

The significance of this holy vs earrings debate is unfolding before our very eyes. I think what we've seen so far contributes 4 very important elements for Aramaic primacy:

#1: The mistranslation to Holy establishes that the Peshitta has preserved Meshikha's original teaching thereby rendering every other version as incorrect beginning with the Greek.

#2: The correct reading reveals Yeshua's use of a parallelism absent in every other version.

#3: The finding of the QD\$/earring root in Palestinian Jewish Aramaic (the Targum) establishes the fact that Peshitta Matthew is *\*not\** the work of post Nicene Syriac translators (since even Assyrians are not familiar with the QD\$/earring root. Rather it is the work of Mathew himself, a Palestinian Jewish writer.

#4: The use of the QD\$/earring root in Mathews Gospel proves that Mathew wrote in Aramaic and *\*not\** in Hebrew since both extant Hebrew Matthews follow the mistake of Greek Matthew even to the extent of adding "flesh" and "thing" (Shem Tov & Dutillet, respectfully) to force the verse to make sense.”” – Paul Younan

## **5. Simon the leper or potter/jar maker? – Matthew 26:6 / Mark 14:3**

The KJV says (Matthew 26:6): “Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper,”

The KJV says (Mark 14:3): “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.”

In this case, the Aramaic word  is misunderstood as ‘leper’.

“Greek reads "Σιμωνος του λεπρου" (*Simōnos tou leprou*), which literally means "Simon the Leper" or "Simon the Skin-Diseased" ("λεπρου" (*leprou*, or *lepros* in the nominative case) can stand for various skin diseases like it's Hebrew-Aramaic counterpart). This seems strange, because according to the Law laid down in Leviticus, Lepers are not allowed within the city:

"And the leper who has the disease on him is to go about with signs of grief, with his hair loose and his mouth covered, crying, "Unclean, unclean!" While the disease is on him, he will be unclean. **He is unclean: let him keep by himself, living outside the town.**" -Leviticus 13:45-46

*Garibo'* can easily be confused with *Garobo'* since Aramaic at that time was written without vowel markers.

*Garibo'* means POTTER or JAR MERCHANT where,  
*Garobo'* means LEPER or SKIN DISEASE

But both are spelled with the same consonants: *Gomal - Reesh - Beyth – Olaf*


In addition, why was there no record of Yeshu` (Jesus) healing Simon? If he were a leper, it would be very dangerous for His disciples and other people in the house. Leprosy is a very contagious disease and not worth the risk of catching. Here the Aramaic sheds some light on a story whose host was a non-sequitur of the circumstances. ” – Steve Caruso

“Since ancient Hebrew and Aramaic were written without vowels, there was no distinction between the Aramaic words. Since in this story a woman pours oil from a jar it is apparent that Simon was a jar merchant or jar maker and not a leper.” – Dr. James Trimm

## **6. Eunuch or believer? – Matthew 19:12 / Acts 8:27**

The KJV says (Matthew 19:12): “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 KJV says (Acts 8:27): “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 word in the Peshitta , translated as “eunuch” by Zorba, also means “believer”, as well as other similar words.

“The word in question is ευνουχος (*eunoukkos*) which is where our word "eunuch" comes from. The fact of the matter is that ευνουχος (*eunoukkos*) **shouldn't** be here at all. Also note that the Ethiopian eunuch had come to Jerusalem to worship. This makes things even stranger when we take a quick look at Deuteronomy 23:1:

***"No one who has been emasculated by crushing or cutting may enter the assembly of the LORD." -- Deuteronomy 23:1 NIV***

How could this be then? What is a eunuch doing in Jerusalem? He can't worship in the temple, because such behavior was forbidden.

Perhaps our Messiah meant it this way:

"For there are **believers** who from the womb of their mother were born that way, and there are **believers** who, from men, became **faithful** and there are **believers**, they whom crossed over their souls **believing** for the sake of the Kingdom of Heaven..." --Matthew 19:12

Taking into account the word's large range of definition, and the fact that eunuchs are forbidden from worshipping in the temple, this passage should most likely be rendered:

"So he [Philip] started out, and on his way he met an Ethiopian **believer**, an important official in charge of all the treasury of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians. This man had gone to Jerusalem to worship, " --Acts 8:27" – Steve Caruso

## **7. Hate or put aside? – Luke 14:26**

This is an awesome example, as it solves one of the biggest problems/contradictions of the Greek New testament. The command to hate others and ourselves!

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."

“Luke 14:26 I have seen used against Christians in attacks against their faith:

*"If any man comes to me, and **hates** not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yes, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."*

The argument goes, "How could one follow someone who claims that you need to hate your family and OUR SELF and only love him? Didn't he say to love your neighbor?"

The answer lies in the Aramaic word "ܣܘܢܐ" (*sone'*).

ܣܘܢܐ

(sone')

to put aside

to hate

to have an aversion to

This also makes sense of 1 John 1:20:

*"If someone says, "I love God," and **hates** his brother, he is a liar; for he who does not love his brother whom he has seen, how can he love God whom he has not seen?"*

So with this in mind, the more correct translation of Luke 14:26:

*"If any man comes to me, and **doesn't put aside** his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yes, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."” – Steve Caruso*



## 8. Salted or scattered/destroyed? – Mark 9:49

The KJV says: "For every one shall be **salted** with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt."

In the Greek version of Mark 9:49, we read with astonishment:

"And everything will be **salted** with fire...."

In Aramaic, the root **ܠܬܢܝܢ** can mean "to salt" or "to scatter" as the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon demonstrates:

mlx V  
011 Palestinian,Syr,JBA **to salt**  
012 Syr **to scatter**  
013 BibAr,Syr to use someone's salt  
014 Syr to become salty  
041 Syr to be salted  
051 Syr to treat someone in a familiar way  
LS2 390,J 788  
R melxA) N

Obviously, what Meshikha meant was:

"And everything will be **scattered/pulverized** (Neth-mel-ekh) with fire...."

Now that's not all. Yes, the verb root also means "to salt" - and, yes, Meshikha uses the second meaning in the second phrase of verse 49:

"And every sacrifice with salt will be salted (Teth-mel-ekh)." (c.f., Leviticus 2:13)

Finally, the Aramaic root in question is also used in this same manner in the Hebrew scriptures:

"Lift up your eyes to the sky, Then look to the earth beneath; For the sky will **vanish** **נמלחו** like smoke, And the earth will wear out like a garment And its inhabitants will die in like manner; But My salvation will be forever, And My righteousness will not wane." (Isaiah 51:6)

Therefore, the proper interpretation of Mark 9:49 is:

"For everything will be **destroyed** **ܠܬܢܝܢ** with fire, and every sacrifice will be **seasoned** **ܠܬܢܝܢ** with salt."

A beautiful word-play Meshikha [the Messiah - Chris] used with the dual meaning (scatter~salt) of this root! – Paul Younan

## 9. This generation or this family? – Mark 13:30

This is another important example for apologists, as it is a verse that is often attacked, as that generation has surely passed away, around 2000 years after Jesus spoke to them.

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

“Greek reads "γενεα" (*genea*), which can mean "generation" (not to be confused with "γενοσ" (*genos*) which means "offspring"). Here it would seem that our Messiah prophesized incorrectly in the Greek.

The answer comes in the Aramaic. Here we don't see the word for "generation," but the word *sharvtho'*, which means "family," or "family branch." A *sharvtho'*, is like a ray in geometry. It starts at a point, then continues onwards. Usually *sharvtho'* (plural) come from other *sharvtho'* (plural), so we can see these branching rays make up a family tree. The only way for a *sharvtho'* can be extinguished, is if the entire family is wiped out, an entire branch destroyed. And *sharvtho'* can also be used to describe a people as a whole, like someone could be from an Italian *sharvtho'* or the *sharvtho'* of New York.

So you can see that since "γενεα" (*genea*) implies a length of time equal to one person's lifespan, a generation, a *sharvtho'* can last from a few days to thousands of years (for example, we are all still within the *sharvtho'* of Adam).

Since we now know what *sharvtho'* means, how do we know which *sharvtho'* our Messiah was referring to? Who was He talking to? Taking a look at the beginning of the chapter, at verse 3:

*"And as he sat on the mount of Olives over against the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him privately, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished?" -Mark 13:3-4*

Bingo: His disciples. But some of them came from different biological families. What did they all have in common?

They were **Christians**.

This is of even more importance, considering the events of the night before the Messiah was handed over:

When he gave the last supper, it paralleled the Jewish betrothal custom of wine drinking. Back in the days of old, in Jewish custom, when a man wanted to get betrothed to a woman, a cup of wine would be poured at the table. He would drink from it, then offer it to his intended. If she took the wine and drank from it as well, it meant that she accepted the betrothal offer. This also jives with the many parables Yeshu` taught concerning marriage, placing himself as the bridegroom.

*"Verily I say to you, That this **family** shall not pass away, until all these things occur."* -Mark 13:30

**The Christian family** will not die out. :-)" – Steve Caruso

## **10. Pains or cords? – Acts 2:24**

The KJV says: “Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the **pains** of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.”

“In the Greek version of Acts 2:24, we read with astonishment:

"Whom God raised up, having loosed the *pains* of death, because it was not possible that He should be held by it."

In Aramaic, this verse reads:

"Whom God raised up, having loosed the **ܨܠܝܗܐ** of Sheol, because it was not possible that He should be held by it."

Now, everyone knows that Sheol is normally translated into Greek as "death" or "grave" - so we should expect that that occurred in this verse.

What is so unexpected is how the Greek translators of Acts totally missed the proper translation of **ܨܠܝܗܐ**

**ܨܠܝܗܐ** comes from a root that can mean "pain/travail/corruption" (#6167) - and in fact it's used with that meaning in verses like Acts 2:27 (just 3 verses from the one in question) or Acts 13:34-37. This is the majority reading - "pain/travail/corruption."

However, there is a minority meaning to **ܨܠܝܗܐ**, or more accurately, the lexeme of this word which is **ܨܠܝܗܐ** (#6165)

That meaning is "rope" or "cable" - as used in Yuhanan 2:15 and Acts 27:32 (with the exact same lexeme & word spelling) - THAT'S THE MEANING THAT BELONGS IN ACTS 2:24 !

Here are the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon entries:

xblyn N xbly)  
1 JLA,Syr pl. **labor pains**  
LS2 210  
LS2 V: xeb:le)

xbl N xbl)  
1 JLATg destroyer

xb1#2 N xbl)  
1 Palestinian,CPA,Syr **rope**  
2 Syr snare  
3 Syr measuring line  
4 Syr space  
5 Syr line  
6 JLAGal,Syr region  
7 Syr %xbel@yamA)% seashore  
8 Syr flame  
LS2 210  
LS2 V: xablA)

The verse should obviously read:

"Whom God raised up, having loosed the **chords** [cords – Chris]of Sheol, because it was not possible that He should be held by it."

How much more sense does THAT make? Here, Shimon Keepa [Simon Peter – Chris] is saying that Sheol could not hold him - because God raised him up - having loosed the figurative ropes that held Him there.

Not surprisingly, this very same word ALSO exists in Hebrew (חבל Strong's #2256) and also has the same broad meaning as the Aramaic cognate! ("pain/travail" and "rope/cord") !!!

See the following in the Hebrew OT:

Joshua 2:15

2 Samuel 17:13

2 Samuel 22:6 - Where the verse reads - "The CORDS of SHEOL surrounded me; the snares of death confronted me!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!"

Psalms 18:% - "The cords (Khebel) of Sheol surrounded me; The snares of death confronted me."

Psalms 1163 - "The cords (Khebel) of death encompassed me, And the terrors of Sheol came upon me; I found distress and sorrow."

It's impossible to imagine Shimon Keepa not knowing that the original said "cords" and not "pains." Especially when we read the context of Acts 2:24 - it becomes clear that Shimon's statement was conveying the image of "loosing" a "prisoner" being held in a dungeon-type place - which was always how Sheol was portrayed in all Semitic literature!

Only the Peshitta has the correct reading. And the mistake could only have been made by going from Aramaic to Greek.” – Paul Younan

## **11. Bed or coffin? – Revelation 2:20**

The KJV says: “Behold, I will cast her into a **bed**, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of their deeds.”

“Although this error seems to be understandable, there are a few things to be noted. First, let's take a look at the context of this verse:

*" And to the angel of the church in Thyatira write: These things saith the Son of God, who hath his eyes like a flame of fire, and his feet are like unto burnished brass: I know thy works, and thy love and faith and ministry and patience, and that thy last works are more than the first. But I have this against thee, that thou sufferest the woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess; and she teacheth and seduceth my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols. And I gave her time that she should repent; and she willeth not to repent of her fornication. **Behold, I cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of her works.** And I will kill her children with death; and all the churches shall know that I am he that searcheth the reins and hearts: and I will give unto each one of you according to your works." - Rev 2:18-23*

In the Aramaic of Revelation, the word translated as "bed" is *'arso*, which can mean bed, but can also mean **"rubbish heap," or "coffin."**

This would also complete the parallel between the two halves of verse 22 (Jezebel in a coffin (dead), her consorts under tribulation), and in verse 23 (her children dead).

With this in mind, the verse would read:

*"Behold, I cast her into a coffin, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of her works."* - Rev 2:22” – Steve Caruso

## **12. House or among? – Matthew 11:8**

The KJV says: “But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? behold, they that wear soft *clothing* are in kings’ **houses**.”

“...those wearing soft garments are **ܠܟܝܢܝܢ** kings.”

The Aramaic word "BYT" can mean both "house" and "among."

The fact that the Greek versions read "houses" (EN TOIZ OIKOIZ) proves that the translator who rendered the Aramaic into Greek was unaware that BYT could mean "among."

Obviously, the proper translation is:

"...those wearing soft garments are among kings."

NOT

"...those wearing soft garments are in the house of kings."

The lack of the Beth Proclitic (the preposition "in") before the **ܠܟܝܢܝܢ** favors the "among" reading.” – Paul Younan

## **13. Voice or sound? – Acts 9:7**

This is a very special example, as it solves yet another contradiction in the Greek New Testament.

The KJV says: “And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a **voice**, but seeing no man.”


“The Greek versions falsely read:

Act. 9.7 And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, **hearing a voice**, but seeing no man.

vs

Act. 22:9 And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; **but they heard not the voice** of him that spoke to me.

Which appears to be a contradiction, right? But this is not a contradiction at all, only a misunderstanding of the Aramaic when the Greeks translated it.

In Aramaic the word  ("Qala", or "Qol" in Hebrew) means both "voice" and "sound." (c.f., Mattai 20:30, Luke 1:44 for instances where it means 'sound', and Mattai 2:18, Yuhanan 1:23 where it means 'voice.')

The Greeks mistranslated both instances (Acts 9:7 and 22:9) as "voice", erroneously.

The reading of the Aramaic of Acts 9:7 should be:

And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, **hearing a sound**, but seeing no man.

And Aramaic Acts 22:9 correctly reads:

And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; **but they heard not the voice** of him that spoke to me.

This proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Greeks (mis)translated the book of Acts from the Aramaic original - the Peshitta. ” – Paul Younan

#### **14. Teacher or my great one? – Matthew 23:8**

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

“I was thinking about a fairly subtle proof, and to my knowledge this is the one place where I am sure it is, although I would welcome suggestions as to other candidates.

I do not know the scholarly name for this kind of proof, but I call it a "bad idiom transfer". Perhaps Rob can give me a better title later, but for right now let me explain what I am talking about.

A "bad idiom transfer" is when an Aramaic word that is meant to be taken literally is instead translated as its idiom into the receiving language. I am also looking for an example where the reverse also happens.

However, for this first case, such a situation I believe is in Matti 23:8: "And call no man RABBI because you have one Rabbi and all of you are brothers..."

Now of course no one need know Hebrew or Aramaic to know what "Rabbi" means, as even the GNT interprets it as "teacher" repeatedly. However, if any of you thought that was the LITERAL MEANING, you are mistaken. I will get to that aspect shortly, but for now let us look at why that literal reading may not be correct.

"Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, TEACHING them to observe all that I commanded you..."

Matthew 28:19-20

So, if Y'shua is saying "call no one TEACHER (rabbi)", why does he seem to reverse himself here by commanding these same disciples to teach?

The answer, I believe, is the LITERAL meaning of "rabbi".

RAB=great  
I= my

When combined, the literal meaning is "MY GREAT ONE", and NOT "teacher". Now if we turn back to a few lines earlier, this context clearly emerges:

"The scribes and the Pharisees have seated themselves in the seat of Moses...and they love the place of honor at banquets and the chief seats at the assembly and to be greeted in the streets by men as RABBI (my great one)."

Matti 23:1,6-7

So it looks like to me that Zorba was so busy showing off how he THINKS he can translate and Aramaic word like "rabbi" into Greek as "teacher" that he neglected--as usual--to observe the full breadth of meaning of the word--as well as make the critical distinction between figurative and literal meanings.” – Andrew Gabriel Roth

### **15. Perform repeatedly or revert? – Romans 2:1-3**

The KJV says: “Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest **doest the same things**. But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth against them which **commit such things**. And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which **do such things**, and **doest the same**, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?”

“The word in the Greek text means 'to perform repeatedly or habitually' while the Aramaic text has a word meaning 'to revert back to something'.

In the Peshitta Text of Romans chap. 2, vss. 1-3, there are some word meanings that were hidden from the eyes of the Greeks. The Aramaic words I'm referring to are "meth'hapakh" (#24666) in verses 1 and 3 and "meth'hapkiyyn" (#5326) in verses 2 and 3. For definitions, SEDRA has 'conduct, turn, return.' The key idea here is of 'reverting back to something' in the Ethpael verbal conjugation. This is attested to in Smith's Compendious Syriac Dictionary (Wow! What a great study aid! ) On page 105, under 'hpk,' there is considerable duality--"to turn about, back, round; to overturn; to go about, do, have to do, be occupied, employed, deal, live (with beith proclitic--of the place, occupation, or mode of life). On page 313 of Smith's Comp. we have two very kindred words to the ones used in the Peshitta--"meth'hapkinotha," defined as 'turning from, changing, wavering, retrogression, perversion.' The other word immediately above this one is "meth'hapkin-aiyth" and when used adverbially with the 'la' negative means 'straightforward, without turning back, without retrogression.'

Victor Alexander made the most of this observation in his translation--

1. Because of this, the Spirit is not speaking through you, O, human being, as you judge your companion, for against that which you judge, you shall also **revert**.
2. And we know that the judgment of God will be heavy against those who **revert**
3. What do you suppose then, O, human being, that you should judge those who **revert** thus, while you are also **going back to the same thing**, do you think you will run away from the judgment of God?

The base words in the Greek Text are 'prasso' (Strong's #4238) and 'poieo' (Strong's #4160). The difference between them is as follows:

4238 prasso pras'-so a primary verb; to "practise", i.e. perform repeatedly or habitually (thus differing from 4160, which properly refers to a single act); by implication, to execute, accomplish, etc.; specially, to collect (dues), fare (personally)” – Larry Kelsey

## **16. Given up to vile passions or diseases of disgrace? – Romans 1:26**

The KJV says: “For this cause God gave them up unto **vile affections**: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature:”

“Even though translations from Aramaic and Greek typically begin Romans 1:26 with "Therefore God has given them up to **vile passions**;" wouldn't '**disease of disgrace**' (syphilis, gonorrhoea, etc.) be another possibility?

Word Number: 9757

Pronunciation: (Eastern) LK,iAB,eA (Western) LK,iAB,eA

Meaning:: pain, suffering, **disease**

k)b N k)b)

1 Syr grief

2 Syr,JBA wound, sore

3 JBA ulcer

4 Syr **disease**

5 JBA pain

Word Number: 17844

Pronunciation: (Eastern) D'TSaERaA (Western) D'TSaERoA

Meaning:: **shame, dishonor, ignominy, disgrace**

c(r N c(r)

1 JLAGal,JLATg,CPA,Sam,JBA pain, sorrow

1 Syr **contempt**

2 Syr dishonesty

3 Syr insult ” - Larry Kelsey

“Whenever we encounter a construct beginning with "Keba d'" (something) it is usually a medical term referring to some sort of illness. In this case, the latter term is a sociological one (dishonor, disgrace), which of course works well in the context given.” – Paul Younan

## **17. Cities or talents? – Luke 19:17-19**



The KJV says: "And he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten **cities**. And the second came, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained five pounds. And he said likewise to him, Be thou also over five **cities**."

"This nobleman was a ruler of a city. He went on a journey to pay his respects to the king and to seek confirmation of his official position. He entrusted his servants with small coins called in Aramaic *menin* **ܡܢܝܢ**. On his return he rewarded his servants who had traded and made large profits with *kakrey* **ܟܟܪܝܐ**, the largest coins in those days, probably equivalent to 3000 shekels. *Kakra* **ܟܟܪܐ**, talent, was a large coin of silver or gold. A man could carry only one of them. The Greek translators made an error when they translated this word *Kakra* **ܟܟܪܐ**, for *Karkha* **ܟܪܟܗ**, province. The difference between these two words is noted with a single dot placed over one of the characters and can be easily confused. This nobleman could not have given his servants ten and five cities as a reward for their faithfulness, for he himself had only one city and his servants were not qualified to be rulers. **Because of their business fidelity they were entrusted with larger sums in view of larger profits in the future.** This is characteristic of the East where only small sums are loaned at first until a servant's honesty and ability are demonstrated. Matt. 25:14-30" – Dr. George Mamishisho Lamsa

### **18. Gall or anger? – Acts 8:23**

The KJV says: "For I perceive that thou art in the **gall** of bitterness, and *in* the bond of iniquity."

They [the Greek texts – Chris] read:

"For I perceive that you are in the gall of bitterness, and in the bonds of iniquity."

Now the Aramaic reads:

"For I perceive that you are in a bitter **ܟܒܕܐ** ("Kabda"), and in the bonds of iniquity."

Here is the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon entry for the root in question:

kbd N kbd)  
1 Palestinian, Syr, JBA liver  
2 Syr anger

It is obvious that the Greek translators misread "gall~liver" here, instead of the more contextually proper "anger."

Simon was angry that he could not have the power that the Apostles had. He was jealous.

Besides, what is the "gall of bitterness", anyway? – Paul Younan

### **19. Feet or foot soldiers? – Romans 3:15**

The KJV says: "Their feet *are* swift to shed blood:"

“I just read, to my astonishment, in Romans 3:15:

Their **feet** are swift to shed blood.

In the greek, the word according to Strongs is:

4228 **pous pooce** a primary word; a "**foot**" (figuratively or literally):--**foot(-stool)**.

Craziness.... A foot or a FOOT STOOL? What is Paul envisioning? Using CHAIRS AS WEAPONS?!

Funny, though, that in the Peshitta, the word is "reghlaihoon" which comes from the base word, "reghlo". GUESS what I found in the CAL:

rgl N rgl)

**1 passim foot**

2 Syr base, bottom

3 Syr foot (measure)

4 JLAGal,JBA pilgrimage festival

5 JLAGal w. %(l, b\_% because of

4 Syr plant name

5 JBA festival season

LS2 712

pl: r:egle)

LS2 v: reglA)

abs. voc: rgel

rgl#2 N rgl)

**1 Syr foot-soldier**

LS2 712

LS2 v: rag.AIA)

R rgl N

rgl V

011 Syr ??

021 JLAGal to overturn

041 Syr to get off a horse

LS2 712

R rgl N ?

Their **FOOTSOLDIERS** not **FOOTSTOOLS** or **FEET!**” – Steve Caruso

## **20. World or land of Israel? – Acts 11:28**

The KJV says: “And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the **world**: which came to pass in the days of Claudius Caesar.”

“Acts 11:27-30

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

Now this doesn't make sense at all, why would those in Antioch send relief to those dwelling IN JUDEA if the famine was to strike all THE WORLD. They would be facing famine themselves. The Jewish New Testament translates the Greek word as "throughout the Roman Empire" but this has the same problem, since Antioch and Judea were both in the Roman Empire. The solution lies in the fact that the word for "WORLD" in the Aramaic manuscripts is ERA (Strong's #772) the Aramaic form of the Hebrew word ERETZ (Strong's 776). This word can mean "world" (as in Prov. 19:4) "earth" (as in Dan. 2:35) or "land" (as in Dan. 9:15) and is often used as a euphemism for "The Land of Israel" (as in Dan. 9:6).

**אֶרֶץ** is misunderstood by the Greek to mean "world" when here it actually means "land" and is used as it is so often as a Euphemism for the "land of Israel". Certainly the word here is not meant to mean "world" but "land of Israel."” – Dr. James Trimm

---

Now that we have covered split words and semi split words, you should be pretty much convinced that the New Testament was written in Aramaic, and translated into Greek (and we have not even had to discuss the historical proofs...). Just to be safe, be sure to read the upcoming compilations, dealing with poetry, word plays, Aramaic idioms, and more! – Christopher Lancaster