

## Aramaic English New Testament (AENT) 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Errors and Suggestions

The AENT has had a tremendous impact on me personally. It was the first thing I really read and studied as I came into the Hebrew Roots movement almost immediately after the 1<sup>st</sup> edition was released in 2008. As such, it holds a special place in my heart, which is why the following suggestions and criticisms should not be taken lightly because I have no bias or agenda against Roth, his theology, or the AENT. I recognize it for what it is, and I have read it cover to cover more than once. This list of feedback is made out of my love for the AENT and the effect it had on me coming into the Hebrew Roots movement, not because I am biased against it. But I also must be fair and honest in my assessment, and I know that both Andrew and Baruch encourage people to give feedback.

Now, I have always warned everyone that like with any translation, it won't be perfect, and that all commentary must always be taken with a grain of salt. As my theology and language skills continue to improve however, the more time I keep spending with the AENT the more I begin to recognize its typographical and translational errors. It is my hope that in compiling this list that it will help to improve the AENT for the sake of the Body of Mashiach, as well as show people that like any translation, it is not perfect or without its errors.

Therefore, I offer the following list of about 75-80 of the mistakes/errors I have found, as well as a few of my own suggestions, all for the sake of helping the Body of Believers. There will be more errors than this list offers (I usually notice some every time I read), but I do not have the time to keep adding to this list, and my use of the AENT is becoming less and less.

- **Matthew Chapter 1** – Footnotes 1 and 17
  - *Suggestion:* There is theology in here trying to make a connection of the name Jesus with Je-Zeus. This is a linguistic myth concocted by those who cannot read Greek because in Greek the two words are spelt differently and share no relation. This error should not be further promoted, even in light passing.
- **Matthew 2:6** – "And you, Beth-Lekhem of Yehuda you will not be the least of Yehuda. From you, therefore, will go out a king who will shepherd among the kings, my people, Israel. "
  - *Suggestion:* "among the Kings" should be placed before "of Yehuda" in the preceding line with the commas then removed to correctly read – ""And you, Beth-Lekhem of Yehuda you will not be the least among the kings of Yehuda. From you, therefore, will go out a king who will shepherd my people Israel."
- **Matthew 13:27** - "the House of Master YHWH."
  - *Suggestion:* Switch to "the master" as the Aramaic text reads "Mare" not "Marya" - "the house of the master".
- **Matthew 21:4** – "And these \_\_\_ things happened"
  - *Suggestion:* The Eastern Peshitta agrees with Khabouris which reads "all these things happened". If the English text is supposed to be changed to line up with the Eastern Peshitta than this must be changed also and not

## Aramaic English New Testament (AENT) 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Errors and Suggestions

merely footnoted. Paul Younan admitted that this was an error in his interlinear.

- **Matthew 28:1** – "Now in the closing (evening) of the Sabbath"
  - *Suggestion:* There is an inconsistency here with transliteration. When we compare with Matthew 12:12 and 24:20 as well as in other books it should be Shabbat - "Now in the closing (evening) of the Shabbat"
- **Luke 6:2** - "Why do you the thing that is not Lawful.."
  - *Suggestion:* add in "do" - "why do you (do) the thing" or, alternatively, switch to a less literal more flowing "why are you doing the thing"
- **Luke 22:17-18**
  - *Suggestion:* While not in the English it is in the Aramaic. As this is a major east/west difference, I suggest updating the Aramaic text unless the Eastern Peshitta is acquired for the Aramaic side.
- **John 1:18** - "The Only Begotten of Elohim"
  - *Suggestion:* Since "of" is not in the Aramaic text I suggest putting it back into brackets as found in Younan's interlinear - "The Only Begotten (of) Elohim"
- **John 1:22** - "And they said to him, "And then, who are you"
  - *Suggestion:* The vav/waw particle can mean either "and" or "then", but not both at the same time. I suggest getting rid of the first "and" and then leave the "then" - "And they said to him, "then who are you".
- **John 1:29** - Footnote 16 regarding Y'shua being "the Son of YHWH via Yoseph and Maryam."
  - *Suggestion:* Some have been highly offended in the inclusion of Yoseph in this footnote because they think there is a denial of the virgin birth, which is not true, but for their sake it may be wise to take it out since Y'shua is only Yoseph's son legally, but not by seed.
- **John 3** - YOCHANON 3
  - *Suggestion:* The chapter is labelled as "YOCHANON 3" when it should just be "Chapter 3" like in the rest of the AENT.
- **John 9:21** - "indeed, we do not know. \_\_\_\_\_"
  - *Suggestion:* add in the remainder of the verse from both the Peshitta and 1905 that is missing - "He is of age, ask him, he will speak for himself".
- **John 11:2-3** - "with her hair, was the sister of this one. 3. And Lazar who was sick sent both of his sisters to Y'shua..."
  - *Suggestion:* There is no sister in verse 2, it rather reads "brother", and Lazarus is within verse 2, not verse 3. So it should read - "with her hair. Lazar who was sick was the brother of this [one]. 3. And his two sisters sent to Y'shua".
- **John 11:30** - "And Y'shua had not yet come into the village yet but..."
  - *Suggestion:* Remove the second "yet" as it is not in the Aramaic text - "And Y'shua had not yet come into the village but..."
- **John 14:16/23/26, 15:26/16:7** – "redeemer"
  - *Suggestion:* Although this was a translation decision by Paul Younan who is footnoted as explaining why, he has recently changed his mind. As

## Aramaic English New Testament (AENT) 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Errors and Suggestions

quoted from peshitta.org – “I’m not sure anymore of the parsing of this, Akhay. I may remove the footnote to the translation, and revise the translation in the Interlinear to more traditionally translate this phrase as "Intercessor" or "Advocate." Although it could be understood as parsed in the Aramaic, I’m not so sure anymore after having consulted many texts (including the Hebrew sources) which have this loanword from Greek within the Jewish milieu. Perhaps there is a wordplay there, an interesting one, but I don't think I'm comfortable with translating this way anymore given the weight of the historical evidence that I've since seen.”

<http://www.peshitta.org/forum/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=2841&p=18074&highlight=redeemer#p18075>. Therefore, I suggest that it should be switched back to

comforter, intercessor or advocate as the Greek loanword represents.

- **Acts 1:6** - "if at this time will you restore the Kingdom to Israel?"
  - *Suggestion:* While the particle "if" is in the Peshitta text, it grammatically does not make sense in English and no other translation brings it forth (it would be like writing “in the beginning was the Word and it the word was with Elohim” in John 1:1). Therefore it should be removed.
- **Acts 2:36** - "that Master YHWH has made this Y'shua whom you have crucified both Elohim and Mashiyach"
  - *Suggestion:* Noun confusion. The Aramaic reads "d'Marya w'Meshikha awdeh Alaha l'hana Esho': literally "That Master YHWH and Mashiyach has Elohim made this Y'shua." This was switched in the 1st edition, but the original reading is as above. To explain this theologically, I talked to Paul Younan and he explained this as it being a reference to the creation of the union between humanity and divinity. In other words, what was created in the womb of Maryam was "made" to be YHWH come in the flesh (i.e. Col 1:9, 2:9), or Emmanuel - Elohim with us. I suggest the reading gets switched back and the footnotes clarify this explanation. Crucified was also an update from the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> editions when this passage was changed. However, zkaftun is always translated as “execute” in AENT, not crucify. This is a translation inconsistency.
- **Acts 4:3** - "because evening (it) was drawing near"
  - *Suggestion:* Not a typographic error, but I'm not sure why "it" was added in. I know in the original text it says "drawing near" followed by “happen, become, be” and then "to it" and finally "evening", but the smoothest rendition I think would be to get rid of the added "it" in the AENT passage - "because evening was drawing near".
- **Acts 8:37**
  - *Suggestion:* While not in the English it is in the Aramaic. As this is a major east/west difference, I suggest updating the Aramaic text unless you are able to get a hold of the Eastern Peshitta for the Aramaic side.
- **Acts 10:37** - "And also (you) know you about the word that was..."
  - *Suggestion:* Put the second you from within the text in place of the first added one - "And also you know about the word that was..."
- **Acts 13:6** - "a Jew who was a false \_\_\_\_\_."

## Aramaic English New Testament (AENT) 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Errors and Suggestions

- *Suggestion:* Add in the missing word "prophet" - "A Jew who was a false prophet". Also, I noticed that from the first edition Yehudean was changed to Jew. There does seem to be a certain level of inconsistency in the text between transliterated and anglicized forms of this particular word, this being one of them.
- **Acts 15:17** - ""So that the remainder of mankind and all the Gentiles will seek YHWH, those who My Name is called over them"
  - *Suggestion:* I know this was changed from the previous editions, but I still see a subject confusion. The literal word order is "so that will seek the remainder of mankind Marya and all the Gentiles..." which, grammatically, I think would be best rendered as "So that the remainder of mankind will seek Master YHWH and all the Gentiles who are called by my name". We know Semitic syntax goes verb-subject, so the verb is "will seek" and the subject is "mankind" with "all the Gentiles" being a separate (second) subject. YHWH should also be translated as "Master YHWH" for consistency sake with the rest of the AENT.
- **Acts 15:34**
  - *Suggestion:* While not in the English it is in the Aramaic. As this is a major east/west difference, I suggest updating the Aramaic text unless you are able to get a hold of the Eastern Peshitta for the Aramaic side.
- **Acts 17:18** - "what does this babblers or words mean?"
  - *Suggestion:* take out "or words" as babblers is a translation of "mlekat mele" or take out babblers for the more literal translation of "accumulator of words / word-monger".
- **Acts 22:27** - "Tell me; Aren't you a Roman?"
  - *Suggestion:* correct capitalization for proper grammar - "Tell me; aren't you a Roman?"
- **Acts 25:12** - "To Caesar will you go."
  - *Suggestion:* Switch word order for English grammatical clarity - "To Caesar you will go."
- **Acts 28:29**
  - *Suggestion:* While not in the English it is in the Aramaic. As this is a major east/west difference, I suggest updating the Aramaic text unless you are able to get a hold of the Eastern Peshitta for the Aramaic side.
- **Hebrews 3:18-19** – “and of whom swore he, that they should not enter into his rest, but of those who did not believe? So we see that they could not enter, because they did not obey”
  - The 1<sup>st</sup> edition has believe in both passages, the subsequent editions have changed it to the above. The first word is אִשְׁרָאֵלִים which means “persuade, convince, instruct; to desire, make petition, ask” (Payne Smith) which Magiera and Ethridge have, as opposed to the believe that Murdock chose. The second word, אֱמוּנָה, carries the meaning believe/trust, to be faithful, etc. While in the Semitic mind the idea of believe/trust is coupled with obedience/walking out what you believe, perhaps a more literal translation would be “they were not faithful”. Alternatively, it could be changed back to “did not believe” with a footnote clarifying the word and theology. But

## Aramaic English New Testament (AENT) 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Errors and Suggestions

if the former is chosen then the text could more accurately read - "and of whom swore he, that they should not enter into his rest, but of those who were not persuaded? So we see that they could not enter, because they were not faithful"

- **Hebrews 8:7** - "first (covenant)."
  - *Suggestion:* Something to consider and look into is that instead of referencing "covenant", looking at the context, we could consider priesthood as being more appropriate. This would require a footnote change.
- **Hebrews 8:13** - "a Renewed (Covenant), he made the first \_\_\_ old"
  - *Suggestion:* I've discussed this passage quite substantially with a couple scholars and referenced some other work, and while they were of the opinion that covenant should be taken out completely, I somewhat disagree because we just quoted Jeremiah 31. However, some additional clarification should be added. What was made old? The scholars I discussed this with are of the opinion that it is the Temple System and Priesthood, and that this is prophetically referencing the destruction of the temple. Personally I like to expand that to include the entire "order" of things - not just the a change in priesthood and how we enter into His presence, but a change in the order of the world in that the sinful nature is passing away and by being born from the beginning we are approaching that time when everything will be made new again; as in the time before there was sin. Word insertion suggestion is therefore order - " a Renewed (Covenant), he made the first (order) old" – with an extra footnote explaining this choice.
- **Ya'akov 1:26** - "And if any one thinks that he worships Elohim and does not subdue his tongue, but his heart deceives him; his worship is desolate"
  - *Suggestion:* Poor syntax on Murdock's part. The passage would be much more clearly rendered "but deceives his own heart" - "And if any one thinks that he worships Elohim and does not subdue his tongue, but deceives his own heart; his worship is desolate".
- **Ya'akov 3:9** - "we bless Master YHWH and Father;"
  - *Suggestion:* Since Marya is not referring to just any Master but THE Master, I suggest adding in the definite article (which in Aramaic is represented by the alap suffix anyways) which would help this passage to flow a lot better. Same with Father, which has the alap on the end. Both Ethridge and Lamsa translate these with the definite article. Therefore the passage could read – "we bless the Master YHWH and the Father".
- **Ya'akov 5:20** – Footnote 24
  - *Suggestion:* In the AENT there is always an emphasis on how it is a Renewed as opposed to a New Covenant. However, when Jeremiah 31 is quoted in this footnote, chadasha is written/translated as "New". This is a theological inconsistency and should be updated.
- **Romans 1:1** - "a servant of Y'shua the Mashiyach, called and sent and separated...;"

## Aramaic English New Testament (AENT) 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Errors and Suggestions

- *Suggestion:* Noun and verb confusion on Murdock's part. The word here is the noun Shilichim, sent one (Apostle), not the action of sending. If the reading is to be retained it should be footnoted as "Literally sent one, Shlichim" or else update the translation to read – "a servant of Y'shua the Mashiyach, called and a Shilchim, separated to the Good News of Elohim".
- **Romans 1:5** – "we have received grace and a mission among all the Gentiles"
  - *Suggestion:* This is a noun, not a verb, which Murdock got mixed up on. Literally it denotes the office of apostleship - being a Sent One/Shlichim. Although the word "apostle" is often shied away from, so I'm not sure how this would be translated. Perhaps "we have received grace and the office of being Shlichim among all the Gentiles".
- **Romans 1:16** – "of the Jews, or whether they are of the Arameans"
  - *Suggestion:* Compare with 2:12 and 10:12. There is an inconsistency in translation with Armaya. Although this is addressed in a footnote, the majority of opinion is that Aramean is being used as Gentile/Heathen as Magiera and others correctly translate. Jews should also be Yehudeans as translated elsewhere in AENT. Otherwise it should be switched to Judeans and Yehudeans in the Gospels should be made to say Judeans as well.
- **Romans 1:17**
  - *Suggestion:* Compare with Romans 9:33 (this is just one example). I've noticed that sometimes when Tanach is quoted, there are quotation marks used, and other times, there are not. This should be cleaned up whenever and wherever possible.
- **Romans 1:24** – "to the fill your lusts of your heart"
  - *Suggestion:* This is a translation or typographical error and should read filthy or unclean - "to the filthy lusts of your heart"
- **Romans 2:3** – "And what thinks you O man"
  - *Suggestion:* This is a poor update of Murdock's old English and should properly read - "And what do you think O man"
- **Romans 2:12** - "and those under Torah"
  - *Suggestion:* The Aramaic actually does not read "under Torah" but rather "in the Torah" which gives a different theological connotation. I also disagree with the attempted theological explanation of this term. Both Tim Hegg and J.K. McKee explain this in much clearer terms that it refers to being under the condemnation of the Torah, not a strict halachic interpretation of it. But as for the passage, it should correctly read - "and those in Torah"
- **Romans 3:19** - "who are under Torah"
  - *Suggestion:* Again, like Romans 2:12 this should correctly read "in the Torah". This is the same in Greek as well. For an explanation of these passages with their correct translation, please read J.K. McKee's article entitled "What does under the law really mean?".
- **Romans 5:14** – "Your death reigned from Adam until Moshe"

## Aramaic English New Testament (AENT) 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Errors and Suggestions

- *Suggestion:* There is no Aramaic manuscript which contains the 2 person possessive suffix on death. Therefore it should be - "Death reigned from Adam until Moshe".
- **Romans 5, Page 471** – Formatting Typographical Error
  - *Suggestion:* the line separating the footnotes from the main text is missing and should be added in.
- **Romans 8:22** – "all the creatures are groaning and labors"
  - *Suggestion:* Labors should be singular, not plural - "all the creatures are groaning and labor"
- **2 Corinthians 8:8** - "I do not actually command you, but by I am prompted by the devotion of your fellow believers"
  - *Suggestion:* Get rid of the first "by" - "I do not actually command you, but I am prompted by the devotion of your fellow believers" OR change the sentence order as such to combine the two "by" into one - "I do not actually command you but by the devotion of your fellow believers I am prompted"
- **2 Corinthians 13:5** - "And if he is not, you are despised and against Torah"
  - *Suggestion:* These words were originally in brackets and should have been left that way as they are added for clarity - "And if (he is) not"
  - *Maslaha:* Although maslaha means "despised, rejected, reprobate, contemptible" etc. and from just a basic standpoint could perhaps be interpreted for being against Torah (reprobate = unprincipled person. Principles = Gods instructions/principles = Torah) this is an interpretive paraphrase as the text does not directly state this. Therefore it would be best left to the footnotes, and not in the text, even if the contrast between YHWH's righteousness through Mashiyach and the illicit behaviour of the Corinthians culture is bang on.
- **Galatians 1:4** - "Who gave his nefesh (soul, self) so our sins that are delivered from this world (that is) evil, as (according to) the will of Elohim our Father"
  - *Suggestion:* Put simply, a translation error. For simplicity sake I will just offer Ethridge's translation - "who gave himself for our sins to deliver us from this evil world, according to the will of Aloha our Father: (Ethridge) AENT could therefore read – ""Who gave his nefesh (soul, self) for our sins to deliver us from this world (that is) evil, as (according to) the will of Elohim our Father"
- **Galatians 1:1** – "who raised him from the house of the dead"
  - *Suggestion:* Although beyt is here in the construct form, it is the contracted form of house. Compare with Matthew 13:7 where it should be translated as "between, among, etc." Therefore the passage should read - "who raised him from the dead"
- **Galatians 1:18, 2:7-9, 11, 14** – "Peter"
  - *Suggestion:* Kifa in the AENT is always translated as Keefa, not Peter. Petros is translated as Peter, but in the Aramaic of the above passages the Aramic reads Kifa. This is a translation inconsistency.
- **Galatians 3:7** – "those who trust in faith are the children of Awraham"

## Aramaic English New Testament (AENT) 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Errors and Suggestions

- *Suggestion:* This is a mistranslation. The passage, as correctly rendered in the literal word order of the translation found on aramaicnttruth.org should be "are of faith". The plural "sons" is also not translated in the Gender neutral children anywhere else in the AENT. This is a translation inconsistency. The passages should therefore read - "those who are of faith are the sons of Awraham".
- **Galatians 5:22-23** – "Love, joy, peace, \_\_\_\_\_, kindness, goodness, faith, Meekness, self control."
  - *Suggestion:* Patience or long-suffering is missing where I underlined, and meekness should not be capitalized as it is not the start of a new sentence. Therefore the passage should read - "Love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faith, meekness, self control."
- **Galatians 6:18** - Footnote 78
  - *Suggestion:* There is an inconsistency with terms and names. Sometimes it's Paul and Peter, sometimes it's Rav Shaul and Keefa; sometimes it's Apostles, sometimes Shlichim. Although the point is always gotten across, a little more consistency would be good here as well.
- **Ephesians 2:15** - "that in himself (an occurrence of the divine name, or qnoma), he might make the two into one"
  - *Suggestion:* Two things: the explanation of "himself" should be moved to footnotes as it clutters the text, and "new man" is missing after "one" when it is in the Aramaic. Thus the passage should read - "that in himself, he might make the two into one new man"
- **Colossians 1:1, 1 Timothy 1:1, 2 Timothy 1:1, Titus 1:1** - "Apostle"
  - *Suggestion:* Throughout the AENT, Apostle is always rendered as Shlichim, yet in these passages is not. Also compare with Romans 1:1 where it is rendered "and sent". This is a translation inconsistency which should be corrected.
- **Colossians 2:16** – “Therefore let no (pagan) judge you”
  - *Suggestion:* Switch the word back to the original: “man”. Reason? I, as well as the majority of other scholars, disagree with Michael Roods episode “Let no pagan judge you” and think that this was an issue between Jews and Gentiles, as Paul commonly addresses. However, where I take issue with some scholars is when they say that this has to do with Jewish Believers trying to get Gentiles to keep these things. That is a theological bias that is totally incorrect when we consider the context. Rather, I believe Gentiles were being judged by them FOR keeping these things. When we consider Acts 10 and Ephesians 2:14 in light of the man made commandments being references in Colossians 2:8 and 22, we can see clearly that this is the same issue brought up in Acts 15. Gentiles shouldn't be doing these things and fellowshiping with us until they ritually convert and bear the full weight of the oral laws of the sages. Think Noachide!! And compare with verse 21 and 22 of Colossians 2 for confirmation of this as those verses speak very clearly in regards to these man-made ordinances about fellowshiping with Gentiles which became the figurative dividing wall of Ephesians 2:14. This doesn't mean that we



## Aramaic English New Testament (AENT) 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Errors and Suggestions

should let pagans judge us either, but the context isn't speaking about that, so I would change the text back and revise the footnotes.

- **Colossians 2:17** – “but the body of Mashiyach”
  - *Suggestion:* Now that we have the context addressed for the above, we can add in the missing last word in the line of the Aramaic text: is (hw) – “but the body is the Mashiyach”. The reason some translations paraphrase this as something along the lines of “but the reality is Messiah” is because He is the reality of all that we celebrate and keep. Therefore no one should judge Gentiles for keeping these things because they are celebrating HIM and shouldn't worry about ancient halacha that says that Gentiles shouldn't do these things because they're unclean and must ritually convert via circumcision beforehand. Or, that they aren't doing it according to oral tradition but just want to celebrate Mashiyach. This was the whole big issue Paul was always addressing and as was revealed to Peter in Acts 10. Compare with verse 21 and 22 of Colossians 2 for confirmation of this as those verses speak very clearly in regards to these man-made ordinances which became the figurative dividing wall of Ephesians 2:14. I would change and explain this within the footnotes.
  - *Additional note regarding verse 16:* The Greek has this verse in future tense (are shadows of things to come), and Magiera, Ethridge and Lamsa all translate it this way as well. Only Murdock is different, translating in the past tense (were shadows of things to come). Andrew, you have explained this by citing that the Eastern reading puts AYTII as past tense, as it is used in John 8:58 (Eastern version, 8:47). This is still theologically correct of course since the feast days were shadows of the first coming as well, but I do know some people who, when they check out "key passages" within a translation, go to this one to check theological bias (NIV for example purposely changes the Greek tense). So one suggestion I have is maybe briefly addressing this in a footnote so that people will understand why it's different from what they may be looking for.
- **1 John 2:13-14** - "I have written to you, you young men, because you have vanquished the evil one. 14. I have written to you, you little ones, because you have known the Father"
  - There is a verse numbering mistake on the part of Murdock. "I have written to you, you little ones, because you have known the Father" should be part of verse 13, not verse 14.
- **Revelation 1** - page 667
  - *Suggestion:* Footnotes on this page are incorrectly labelled as 4 and 5 when they should be 5 and 6.
- **Revelation 5:13** - And I heard him who sat on the throne say: "To the Lamb be given blessing and honor..."
  - *Suggestion:* Every other Aramaic translation besides AENT/Murdock read something like "And I heard them say to Him who sat on the throne and to the Lamb be given blessing and honor..." so I would double check.
- **Revelation 8:13** - "while it said with a loud voice: Woe, woe, \_\_\_ to them who dwell on the earth"

## Aramaic English New Testament (AENT) 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Errors and Suggestions

- *Suggestion:* There are only two "woes" in the English text when there should be three as in all the Aramaic texts - ""while it said with a loud voice: Woe, woe, woe to them who dwell on the earth"
- **Revelation 14:10** - "the wine of the wrath of Elohim"
  - *Suggestion:* Although the Mosul text reads Alaha, the Aramaic text of the AENT (Crawford?) reads Marya. Either the English or the Aramaic text needs to be updated so that they match.
- **Revelation 14:13** - "Blessed are the dead that died in Master YHWH"
  - *Suggestion:* The Mosul reads "d'bAlaha" where as the Aramaic text of the AENT reads "B'maran. In either case, it should not be Master YHWH. The best translation choice would be to line up with the Aramaic text provided, thus - "Blessed are the dead that died in the Master". As per AENT rules, this should also read "Master (Y'shua)".
- **Revelation 17:1** - "Then came one of the seven Messengers who have the seven cups"
  - *Suggestion:* change Tense mistranslation. "Have" should be "had" - "Then came one of the seven Messengers who had the seven cups"
- **Revelation 21:24** - "And the nations that were saved will walk by means of his light, and the kings of the earth will bring their glory and the wealth of the nations into it."
  - *Suggestion:* In the Aramaic script it has the Crwaford reading: "And the nations walk in his light, and the kings of the earth bring it praise." So either the Aramaic script or the English should be updated because this is one of those "major differences" that is not simply a spelling or grammar variation.
- **Revelation 22:20** - "Come, Master Y'shua"
  - *Suggestion:* "Master" (changed from Lord in the 1st edition) is actually "Marya" in the Aramaic text so the passage should read - "Come, Master YHWH-Y'shua". The Mosul Edition from the Aramaic Scriptures Research Society, the 1905 found in the AENT, and the Khabouris all read like this. Only Trimm, editing from Crawford, renders it Adon/Master, but even he got it wrong because I checked Crawford as well and it is written exactly the same in Estrangela (hence why Bauscher has it in his translation). As for the significance of this verse, like in Acts 2 (or 1 Corinthians 8), I think it is very noteworthy that these appear next to one another. I feel it deserves a footnote because in this passage there may be a couple things indicated: 1) When Mashiyach comes back, then YHWH will be there in the flesh once again as before (so really, it's YHWH coming via His arm; the "vehicle" by which salvation/deliverance is brought forth) and 2) If we translate the names we would get something like "The Eternal Ones (YHWH) Salvation (Yeshua)" which we indeed are waiting for and desire for it to come.
- **Pg. 1067** - Parasha 51 (Nitzavim) the Haftarah is listed as Isaiah 61:1 when it should be 61:10. There may be one or two others (although I see Acharei mot was updated from previous editions) but this is the only one I made note of.

## Aramaic English New Testament (AENT) 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Errors and Suggestions

- **164/165 CE Claim for Khabouris** – This is severely incorrect. Not only is the 165 CE date a misinterpretation of the colophon, the colophon states that the Khabouris is a COPY of the manuscript from that time. The Khabouris itself is not the manuscript from 100 years after the great persecution but was written centuries later as a faithful copy of the old manuscript that we no longer have. This is why it carbon dates to the 10<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> century CE, because that's when it was written as a copy of the older manuscript from around that great persecution. Paul Younan clarifies this in saying "I went back and re-read the colophon and I don't find any reference at all to "100 years" - I think somebody is making that part up. It simply refers to the original copy being made during the Great Persecution, which would make the Khabouris an 11th-century copy of a well worn 4th century manuscript, which was most likely a copy of the very original 1st-century manuscripts."  
(<http://www.peshitta.org/forum/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=889&p=5113&hilit=khabouris#p5113>) Younan continues to explain in detail this Church of the East persecution stating that it "began on Good Friday, 344 AD with the martyrdom of the Patriarch Mar Shimon bar-Sabbae, with 5 bishops and 100 elders of the church in the city of Susa....Mar Shimon being the last to die."  
(<http://www.peshitta.org/forum/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=3213&p=19906#p19907>) But regardless, The Khabouris is not itself from the 4<sup>th</sup> century (let alone the 2<sup>nd</sup>) - it is rather a copy of a 4th-century manuscript when that manuscript had fallen apart and needed the Khabouris to replace it, which happened around the 11-12th century.

### FEATURE RECOMMENDATIONS

There are a number of formatting features that could be done to help improve the text/clarity or presentation and be relatively easy to accomplish (although perhaps time consuming or tedious). All of these would be big selling features for a future edition.

#### 1) Paragraph Formatting:

Although I know that in the original codex's there was no paragraph formatting as we have them in certain printed versions of our Scriptures today, they are a tremendous help for finding certain portions of Scripture quickly and/or putting them into proper context. Although it may be a tight squeeze in some places, if the AENT could adjust the text block to paragraph formatting without too much trouble or rearranging, that would be a tremendous benefit for textual clarity.

#### 2) Subject Headings:

This one is a little less realistic since the margins aren't big enough, but subject headings in the margin similar to the Stone Edition Tanach/Chumash would also be a big selling feature and help to find certain places within Scripture a lot easier. Some people debate the subject headings because they are not found in the original text, but neither are the chapter divisions and we certainly find those very useful.

#### 3) Different size/font for verse numbers:

## **Aramaic English New Testament (AENT) 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Errors and Suggestions**

From an aesthetic point of view, looking at making the verse numbers within the text of a different size and font (since the footnote ones are already small) might be something to play around with.

### **4) Bolding / Changing Font of Tanach Quotes**

Something really helpful that we see in the 2009 ISR version of the Scriptures, the Complete Jewish Bible, and the NASB is bold print (ISR/CJB) or copperplate bold font (NASB) of Tanach quotes within the Renewed Covenant. It's helpful and aesthetically pleasing to the eye as well.

### **5) Book Introductions**

Upon reading "Signs of the Cross" I was struck by how much information could be compiled for informative Aramaic specific book introductions for the Peshitta NT. This could be an excellent selling feature and once again be something to set the AENT aside from all other "Hebrew Roots Bibles" (with the exception of the mainstream Messianic "Tree of Life Bible", which also has book introductions).

### **6) The True Peshitta Text**

Although not public domain like the 1905 Critical Edition, getting a hold of the true Eastern Peshitta text for the Aramaic side would be much better. Perhaps seeing how much it would cost to acquire the transliterated text of the Mosul edition that the Aramaic Scriptures Research Society has would be a worthwhile endeavour. The translation could then be checked against this and updated to be a more accurate bilingual edition rather than being a vast compilation of various sources translated from various source manuscripts and then placed together with a lightly edited critical edition.