

NOT GREEK BUT HEBREW

Documentary Evidence That The
Original Language of the
New Testament Was
Not Greek But Hebrew

By A. B. Traina

Scripture Research Association

First Printing 2007

Reprinted by:
Assembly of Yah
2695 N 2409th Rd
Marseilles, IL 61341
E-mail askyah@pcwildblue.com
Internet: Assemblyofyah.com

Documentary Evidence That The
Original Language Of The
New Testament was

**NOT GREEK
BUT HEBREW**

Many people who oppose the Sacred Scriptures make much of their slogan, "The Bible is full of contradictions."

It is true that the King James version of the Bible does contain many contradictions; but, if we go back from the King James translation to the original source, we will rejoice to find that the so called contradictions disappear, and the Word of Yahweh stands out in its Majestic Grandeur, the Monument of truth.

Our Saviour, Yahshua the Messiah, in teaching His Parables in the Gospels, pointed out that after the Apostolic Age the enemy would go over the same field in which He had sown the wheat (the Word of Truth), and would sow tares among the wheat. (See Matt. 13:24 to 30, and 37 to 43.) The tares are symbolic of lies and deceit.

The Prophet Isaiah prophesied that men would mistranslate the Scriptures, thus transgressing the Word of Yahweh, as recorded in Deut. 4:2 and 12: 32, for Isaiah said, "Thy first father hath sinned and thy interpreters (translators) have transgressed against Me." Isaiah 43:27. (See marginal reference.)

The prophet Jeremiah is more explicit, for he says, "What! You say you are wise, and you have the law of Yahweh; when, lo, your scribes have falsified them and written them wrong.? " (See Jer. 8:8, Moffatt's translation, also Leeser's translation of the Hebrew Text, or even in the margin of the King James translation.) No wonder that Jeremiah cries out again in the next verse, saying, "The wise men are ashamed, they are dismayed and taken; lo, they have rejected the Word of Yahweh, and what wisdom is in them?" Jer. 8:9.

Surely these warnings should be heeded by those who claim the Holy Scriptures as the foundation of their hope, and they should investigate, not take for granted the theological hodgepodge handed out to them by the conventional preachers as the Word of the Most High.

In order to bolster the theory that the New Testament was written in Greek, the theologians have put forward the idea that at the time of our Saviour, the Palestinian Jews spoke the Greek language, and that the Saviour Himself spoke the Greek in order to make Himself understood.

The lame alibi falls to the ground when confronted with the actual evidence found within the New Testament, and by contemporary writers of the New Testament times.

Here I shall offer repeated statements of Josephus Flavius the Hebrew historian who lived in that so-called Hellenic Age, and prove that the Hellenic (Greek) culture did not contaminate the Palestinian language.

In "The Antiquity of the Jews," Book 20, chapter XI, Section 2, we read the following: "And I am so bold as to say, now I have completely perfected the work I proposed to myself to do that no other person, whether he were a Jew, or a foreigner, had he ever so great an inclination to do it could so accurately deliver these accounts to the Greeks, as is done in these books. For those of my own nation freely acknowledge that I far exceed them in the learning belonging to the Jews. I also have taken a great deal of pains to obtain the learning of the Greeks, and understand the elements of the Greek language, although I have so long accustomed myself to speak our own tongue, that I cannot pronounce the Greek with sufficient exactness, for our own nation DOES NOT ENCOURAGE THOSE THAT LEARN THE LANGUAGES OF MANY NATIONS, and so adorn their discourses with the smoothness of their period; because they look upon this sort of accomplishment as common, not only to all sorts of freemen, but to as many of the servants as please them to learn them. But they give him the testimony of being a wise man who is fully acquainted with OUR LAWS, and is able to interpret their meanings; on which account as there have been many who have done their endeavors with great patience to obtain this learning, there have yet hardly been so many as two or three that have succeeded therein who were immediately rewarded for their pains.

In the "Wars of the Jews," Josephus in his preface, Section I, says, "I have proposed to myself for the sake of such as live under the Roman Government, to translate those books into the Greek tongue, which I formally composed in the LANGUAGE OF OUR COUNTRY...(the common Hebrew, otherwise known as Aramaic.)

See also Ibid Book 5, chapter 9, Section 2, also Book 6, chapter 2, Section I, where Titus used Josephus to address the Jews in the Hebrew language, in an effort to dissuade them from rebelling against the Romans, and thus save the Holy City.

Herein follows the testimony of investigative scholars, who have not gone along with the myth of the Greek origin of the New Testament. Dr. H. J. Schonfield, in translating an old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel, in his 1927 Edition, says, "My opinion is that the canonical Gospel of (Matthew) is an abridged edition of a larger work, of which fragments still survive, and which contained all and more of the acts and sayings of Christ (Messiah) than is now found in the four accepted Gospels put together. I believe this Protevangel WAS WRITTEN IN HEBREW, NOT ARAMAIC, (the Emphasis is ours) and was intended for Judean Christians (believer) who produced it, to become the last book of the Old Testament canon, such a collection as the New Testament not have at that time been thought of." Preface, page 6.

Bar-Hebrews, the famous Eastern historian of the Twelfth Century, noted the fact that the Greeks Hellenized many Aramaic-Hebrew names, and stated that they

changed the form of many nouns, and did not pronounce them as given in the originals.

“In the Johannine Gospel the terms ‘Bethesda’, ‘Gabbatha,’ ‘Golgotha,’ ‘Rabbouni’ are called ‘Hebrew’.” John 5:2; 19:13; 20:16. “Words of Jesus.” Page 6.

The Aramaic was the mother tongue of the Galileans as of the people of the Gaulonites, and natives of Syria, according to Josephus (Bell Jud. 4:1,5) were able to understand it. Idem, page 10.

“From all the considerations must be drawn the conclusions that Jesus (Yahshua) grew up speaking the Aramaic tongue, and that He would be obliged to speak Aramaic to His disciples and to the people in order to be understood.”

“That this (the writings of the Gospels) was done in the Greek by three out of four Evangelists has long been an accepted TRADITION; though it is NOW ON PHILOLOGICAL EVIDENCE DISPUTED,” (the emphasis is ours) “Light on the four Gospels from the Sinai Palimpsest,” Prelim. P. 4 by Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis, Hon. D. D. (Heidelberg) Ph. D. (Halle) L. L. D. (St. Andrews) Litt. D. (Dublin) F. N. A. B. A. Published in London by Williams and Norgate.

Prof. D. S. Gregory, quoted in Smith’s Bible Dictionary, Article, “Gospel of Matthew,” says, “The Jewish Historian Josephus furnishes an illustration of the fate of the Hebrew original of Matthew, Josephus informs us that he wrote his great work, “The History of the Jewish Wars,” originally in Hebrew, his native tongue, for the benefit of his own nation, and he afterwards translated it into Greek. No notices of the Hebrew originals now survive.”

The following is quotation from Renan, the famous French scholar and archeologist, who spent many years in the East in research work for the Imperial Government of France: “It is not probable that Jesus (Yahshua) knew Greek. This language was very little spread in Judea beyond the classes who participated in the Government, and the towns inhabited by the pagans, like Caesarea...Neither directly nor indirectly, then did any element of Greek culture reach Jesus (Yahshua). He knew nothing beyond Judaism; His mind preserved that free innocence an extended and varied culture always weakens. In the very bosom of Judaism He remained a stranger to many efforts of ten parallel to His own.” “The life of Jesus,” by Ernest Renan, as quoted in “Gospel Light,” by Lamsa. Page 25, Introduction.

In the same introduction to “Gospel Lights,” page 24, Dr. Lamsa says, “Greek culture, philosophy and religion had no influence on Jesus (Yahshua) and His disciples or the early Christians (disciples). The Jews resisted every influence not Semitic. Greek customs and manners were forbidden. During the reign of Trajan and Hadrian, the Jews were not permitted to learn Greek or use Greek ceremonies. The first part of the Talmud, ‘The Mishna,’ EMPHATICALLY declared IT WAS WORSE FOR A JEW TO LEARN GREEK THAN EAT SWINE’S FLESH. These laws were strictly observed, with few exceptions, by the Palestinian Jews who jealously preserved their religion, customs

and language from contamination.”

Dr. F. C. Burkitt of Cambridge says, “But our Lord (Yahshua) and His first disciples spoke Aramaic; there is nothing to suggest that they were acquainted with the current Greek version (the Septuagint.) In the Synagogue they would hear the Scriptures read in the original Hebrew, followed by a more or less stereotyped rendering into the Aramaic of Palestine, the language of the country, itself a cousin of the Hebrew. A faithfully reported saying therefore of Jesus (Yahshua) or Peter ought to agree with the Hebrew against the Greek, or at least ought to acquire its point and appropriateness from a peculiar rendering in the Greek.” Quotation by Dr. Lamsa in “The Gospel Light,” Introduction Page 30.

So far I have quoted from a few of the modern scholars who were not satisfied to accept blindly the popular theory of the theologians, and investigated for themselves, not for their personal curiosity, but for the sake of truth, and for the benefit of the truth seekers. That the New Testament was written in Hebrew and Aramaic is attested by authentic historical evidence, plus internal evidence found in the New Testament itself. In this study I propose to prove without fear of successful contradiction, that the claims of the Christian theologians, to the effect of Greek originals of the New Testament are absolutely baseless.

I will now continue the array of evidence by quoting ancient authorities, and begin by listing a number of the early church leaders and writers who either possessed, or had access to, the Hebrew and Aramaic Gospels: Papias, Hegesippus, Justin Martyr Symmachus, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Pamphilus, Epiphanius and Jerome.

Now I shall proceed to quote from their words, giving documentary evidence that the New Testament was written in the language in which it was inspired, the language which the Apostles spoke and that language was Hebrew and Aramaic.

“Matthew, who also is Levi, and who from a publican became an apostle, first of all the Evangelists composed a Gospel in the Hebrew language and characters, for the benefit of those of the circumcision who had believed; who translated it into the Greek is not sufficiently ascertained. Furthermore, the Hebrew itself is preserved to this day in the library at Caesarea which the Martyr Pamphilus so diligently collected. I also was allowed by the Nazarenes, who use this volume in the Syrian City of Beroea, to copy it, in which, it is to be remarked, that, whenever the Evangelist makes use of the testimonies of the old Scriptures, he does not follow the authority of the Seventy Translators, (the Septuagint) but that of the Hebrew.” Jerome, Catal Script. Eccl.

From a later testimony of Jerome, it is evident that he too, undertook to translate it, for in, Hieronymus: (Jerome) Comment, to Matthew, in Book 2, chapter 12 and 13, he states, “The Evangel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, which I translated into Greek, and which is called by most persons, the Genuine Gospel of Matthew.” In Hieronymus De Virus, Book 3, chap. 36, again Jerome says, “Pantaneus found that

Bartholomew, one of the twelve Apostles, had there preached the advent of our Saviour...according to the Gospel of Matthew which was written in Hebrew letters and which, on returning to Alexandria he brought with him.”

From the above, it must be evident not only that the Gospel of Matthew was originally written in Hebrew, but that it must have been copied in Hebrew, for the evidence here is plain that there must have been more than one copy of the Hebrew Matthew. Also please note, the very fact that Jerome states that Matthew did NOT follow the translation of the Seventy (the Septuagint) is evidence that he was not versed with the Greek language, nor was the Septuagint in anywise used by the Saviour or His disciples, for they knew that the Septuagint had been corrupted, and that the Names of the Elohim of Israel had been substituted in it by the names of Zeus, Theos, and Kurios, the appellations of the Greek deity.

In fact it has lately been discovered that the original translators of the Old Testament into the Greek by the Seventy Jewish scholars at the request of Ptolomy-Philadelphius, did not translate, nor transliterate the Name of Yahweh, but in every place where the Sacred Name was written, they blocked off a space, and then in gold, they inscribed the Tetragrammaton (the four lettered word Y. H. W. H., which in Hebrew is pronounced Yahweh. The Greek copyists not being able to make out the Name which was written in Hebrew letters, they read it as PiPi, which made no sense to them, so they inserted the names of their chief deities, mainly Theos, and Kurios (which are the evolvments of Zeus and Horus), and used these names indiscriminately.

Now let us return and continue with further testimony of the early church fathers, who because of their having had contact with, and in many cases actual possession of the original apostolic documents (Gospels and Epistles,) were in a better position to know the truth than the modern Christian Theologians who upheld the theory of the Greek origin of the New Testament Scriptures.

Eusebius, in his “Ecclesiastical History,” Book 4, chapter 22, says of Hegesipus, “In his history he states some particulars of the Gospel of the Hebrews, and from the Syriac, and particularly from the Hebrew language, showing that he himself was a convert from the Hebrews. Other matters he also records as taken from the unwritten traditions of the Jews.”

Eusebius in his “Ecclesiastical History,” Book 3, chapter 4, says, “That Paul preached to the nations and established churches from Jerusalem around as far as Illiricum, is evident from both his own expressions and from the testimony of Luke in the book of Acts, and in what provinces Peter also proclaimed the doctrine of the Messiah, the doctrines of the New Covenant appear from his own writings, and may be seen from that epistle we have mentioned as admitted in the Canon, and that he addressed to the Hebrews in the dispersion, throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bythinia.”

Of the preceding Eusebius says, “We may mention as an instance what Ignatius

has said in the epistles we have cited, and Clement in what is universally received by all, which he wrote in the name of the church of Rome to that of Corinth, in which after giving many sentiments taken from the Epistle to the Hebrews, and also literally quoting the words, he clearly shows that this work was by no means of late production: when it is probable that this was also numbered with other writings of the Apostle's; for Paul addressed in the language of his country (HEBREW). Some say that the Evangelist Luke, others say that Clement, translated the epistle; which also appears like the truth, as the epistles of Clement and that to the Hebrews preserve the same style and phraseology, and because the sentiments in both of these works are not very different."

Eusebius' "Ecclesiastical History," Book 3, chapter 38, reads: "Papias, a disciple of John, says, And John the Presbyter also said this: Mark being the interpreter of Peter, whatsoever he recorded, he wrote with great accuracy, but not however in the order in which it was spoken by our Saviour, but as before said, he was in the company of Peter, who gave him instruction such as was necessary, but not to give a history of our Saviour's discourses wherefore Mark has not erred in anything by writing some things as he recorded them; for he was carefully attentive to one thing, not to pass by anything that he heard, or to state anything falsely in these accounts."

Such is Papias' account respecting Mark's Gospel. As concerning Matthew, we read in Eusebius "Eccl. Hist." Book 3, chapter 39, that he said, "Matthew composed his History (Gospel) in the Hebrew dialect, and every one translated it as he was able."

Of Irenaeus, in Eusebius' "Eccl. Hist." Book 5, chapter 8, we read, "Since we have promised in the outset of our work to give extracts occasionally when we refer to the declarations of the ancient presbyters and historians of the church, in which they have transmitted the traditions that have descended to us respecting the Sacred Scriptures, among who Irenaeus was one, let us now give his words: Matthew produced his Gospel, written among the Hebrews, in their dialect, whilst Peter and Paul proclaimed the Gospel and founded the church at Rome. After the departure of these, Mark, the disciple and interpreter also transmitted to us in writing what had been preached by him."

Of Pantaneus, Eusebius, "Eccl. Hist." Book 6, chapter 10, says, "Of these Pantaneus is said to have been one of them, and to have come as far as India. And the report is, that he there found his own arrival anticipated by some who were acquainted with the Gospel of Matthew, to whom Bartholomew one of the Apostles had preached, and had left them the same Gospel in Hebrew, which was preserved until this time."

"Eccl. Hist.," Book 5, chapter 14, Eusebius, writing of Clement, says, "But the epistle to the Hebrews, he asserts, was written by Paul to the Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue: but carefully translated by Luke and published among the Greeks, whence also, one finds the same character of style and phraseology in the epistle as in Acts. But it is probable that the title 'Paul the Apostle' was not prefix to it; for, as he wrote to the Hebrews who had imbibed prejudices against him and suspected him, he wisely guards against diverting them from perusal by giving his name. But now as the Blessed

Presbyter used to say, 'since Yahshua was the Apostle of the Almighty sent to the Hebrews, Paul by reason of his inferiority, as if sent to the Gentiles (nations), did not subscribe himself as the Apostle to the Hebrews.'

Concerning the Gospels, he (Clement) says that those which contain the Genealogies were written first: but the Gospel of Mar was occasioned in the following manner, "When Peter had proclaimed the word publicly at Rome and declared the Gospel under the influence of the Spirit, as there was a great number present, they (Jews in Rome) requested Mark, who had followed him from afar, and remembered well what was said, to reduce these things to writing, and after composing the Gospel he gave it to those who had requested it of him: which, when Peter understood it, he directly neither encouraged it nor hindered it."

Eusebius, "Eccl. Hist.," Book 16, chapter 16, speaking of Origin, says, "So great was the research which Origin applied in the investigation of the Holy Scriptures, that he also studied the Hebrew language; and those original works (the Gospels and Epistles), written in Hebrew and in the hands of the Jews, he procured them as his own. He also investigated the editions of others, who beside the Seventy had published translations of the Scriptures, and some differences from the well known translations of Aquilla, Symmachus and Theodocian, which he traced up and traced to. I know not what ancient lurking places where they had lain concealed from remote times, and brought them to light."

Here follows Origin's statement, as found in Eusebius Eccl. Hist. Book 6, chapter 16, "As I have understood from tradition respecting the four Gospels, which are the only undisputed ones in the whole church of God (Elohim), throughout the world. The first according to Matthew, the same that was once a publican, but afterwards an apostle of (Yahshua the Messiah) who having published it for the Jewish converts, wrote it in Hebrew. The second is according to Mark, who composed it as Peter explained it to him; the third according to Luke commanded by Paul, which was written for the converts from the Gentiles; and last of all, the Gospel according to John."

Jerome, "Nicean and Post Nicean Fathers," Vol. 3, chapter 1, in his "Lives of Illustrious Men," says, "Simon Peter the son of John (Jona) from the village of Bethsaida in the province of Galilee, brother of Andrew the Apostle, and himself chief of the apostles, after having been Bishop of Antioch and having preached to the dispersion, the believers in circumcision, in Pontus, Galatia, Capadocia, Asia and Bithynia...He wrote two epistles which are called Catholic (Universal, or General), the second of which, on account of its difference from the first in style, is considered by many not to be his, then too the Gospel according to Mark who was his disciple and interpreter is ascribed to him."

These writings directed to the Jews dispersed in many nations were certainly written in the Hebrew language.

Jerome, writing of Mark, in the same book, chapter 8, says, "Mark the disciple

and interpreter of Peter wrote a short Gospel at the request of the brethren at Rome, embodying what he had heard Peter tell. When Peter heard this, he approved it and published it to the churches to be read by his authority. 'Clement in the sixth book of his Hypocrites, and Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, record...' So taking the Gospel which he himself composed, he (Mark) went to Egypt; and, first preaching the Messiah at Alexandria, he formed a church so admirable in doctrine and continence of living that he constrained all followers of the Messiah to his example. Philo the most learned of the Jews, seeing the first church at Alexandria still Jewish in a degree, wrote a book on their manner of life as something credible to his nation, telling how, as Luke says, the believers had all things in common at Jerusalem, so he recorded what he saw was done at Alexandria, under the learned Mark."

The same Jerome, writing of Paul says, (the same book, chapter 5), "He wrote nine epistles to seven churches: to the Romans one to the Corinthians two to the Galatians one to the Ephesians one to the Philippians one to the Colossians one to the Thessalonians two and beside these to his disciples to Timothy two to Titus one to Philemon one. The epistle which is called 'The Epistle to the Hebrews' is not considered his on account of its difference from the others in style and language, but it is reckoned, either by Tertullian, to be the work of Barnabas; or according to others, to be by Luke the Evangelist, or Clement afterwards the Bishop of Rome, who they say, arranged and adorned the IDEAS of PAUL in his own language; though, to be sure, since PAUL was WRITING to the HEBREWS and was in disrepute among them, he may have omitted his name from the salutation on this account. He being a HEBREW wrote in HEBREW, that in his own TONGUE and most fluently, while the things that were written in HEBREW were more eloquently turned into Greek, and this is the reason why it seems to differ from other epistles of Paul."

In the same book, chapter 9, Jerome writes of John's Gospel, saying, "John the Apostle whom Yahshua most loved, son of Zebedee and brother of James, the Apostle whom Herod, after our Saviour's passion, beheaded most recently of all. The Evangelist wrote a Gospel at the request of the Bishop of Asia, against Corinthus and other heretics and especially against the then growing dogma of the Ebionites, who assert that the Messiah did not exist before Mary. On this account he was compelled to maintain His Divine nativity. But there is said to be yet another reason for this work, in that when he had read Matthew, Mark and Luke, he approved indeed the substance of the history and declared that the things that they said were true, but they had given the history of only one year, that is which follows the imprisonment of John, and in which he was put to death; so passing by this year the events which had been set forth by these, he related the events of the earlier period before John was shut up in prison, so that it might be manifest to those who should diligently read the volumes of the four Evangelists. This also takes away the discrepancy which there seems to be between John and the others."

The very fact that John wrote his Gospel on the instance of the growing dogma of the Ebionites, (who were a group of Samaritan believers) whose language was Aramaic gives added evidence that it was written with an eye single to reach the Aramaic

speaking people. Epiphanius (Against heresies, chapter 30:3) says, "Others again have asserted that the Gospel of John is kept in a Hebrew translation in the treasury of the Jews, namely at Tiberias, and that it is hidden there, as some converts from Judaism have told us accurately." Ibid (chapter 30:6) says, "And not only this alone, but also the "Gospel of Matthew" which was originally written in Hebrew."

That the Gospel of John was translated into Hebrew can be understood, as the original was written in Aramaic. See C. F. Burney, in his "Aramaic origin of the Fourth Gospel."

In Addressing Justin Martyr, (In his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, chapter 10) Trypho says, "Moreover I am aware that your precepts in the so-called Evangelion are so wonderful and so great that I suspect no one can keep them; for I have carefully read them."

Surely, in the above, one can see that the Jew Trypho refers to the Sermon on the Mount, which he had read in his own language. The date of this dialogue was about A. D. 140, and the reference undoubtedly to the Hebrew Matthew. T. B. Shabb, 116 A. B., states that Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Jochanan called it, (the history of Matthew) Evangelion. In the same book B. T. Shabb 116 A. B. the author tells a story that bears out the fact that the Aramaic and Hebrew Gospels were well known and read by many. Now for the story: "Imma Shalom was the wife of Rabbi Eliezer, and sister of Rabbi Gamaliel. There was in her neighborhood a 'philosoph' who had got a name for not taking a bribe. They sought to make fun of him. She sent him a lamp of gold. When they came before him, she said to him, 'I desire that they divide to me the property of the woman's house.' He said to them, 'divide it.' They said to him, 'For us it is written, where there is a son, a daughter does not inherit.' He said to them. 'From the days when ye were exiled from the land, the law of Moses has been taken away, and the law of the Evangelion has been given; and in it is written. A son and a daughter shall inherit alike.' The next day Rabbi Gamaliel sent him a Lybian ass. He said to them, 'I have looked further to the end of the book, and in it is written, I am not come to take away from the law of Moses, and I am not come to add to the law of Moses, and in it is written, 'Where there is a son, a daughter does not inherit'."

The above was written in Aramaic, proving that this Jewish 'philosoph' had access to the New Testament writings, for the quotation is purely Matthewan, and the date of this is about A. D. 80.

Origin against Celsus, Book 2, chapter 13 says, "This Jew of Celsus continues after the above, in the following fashion: Although he could state many things regarding the events in the life of Jesus (Yahshua), which are true, and not like those which are recorded by the disciples, he willingly omits them."

Undoubtedly there is more evidence than I have been able to dig up, and any one interested may find more evidence, because I firmly believe that we are living in that age of which the Saviour said of the Angels (Messengers), He was going to send

them to separate the wheat (The Word) from the chaff (the tares, the corruptions that Satan has sown. Note, He did not say Angel, as of one, but Angels, that is many. So I expect that many of Yahweh's children will take up the cause and get busy on the work of searching, finding, and restoring that which was taken away, picking out and casting out that which was added, in order to fulfill that which was spoken by the prophet Isaiah, when he said, "And they that shall be of thee (meaning faithful Yahwists) shall build up the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in" Isaiah 58:12.

There is beside the above an abundance of internal evidence in all the Gospels, with the exception of the Gospel of Luke, which was expressly written to the Greeks by a Greek, for the Greeks that were coming into the churches of the Jews. But even this is but an editing into the Greek language, the traditions taken directly from the Semetic source material available to Luke (see Luke 1:2 to 4), then translating and transliterating into the Greek language for the Greeks who were coming into the church, at the instigation of the Apostle Paul. See Origin's statement found in Eusebius "Eccl. Hist." Book 6, chapter 16. Even the Acts of the Apostles, which bears the name of Luke, shows evidence that the early part of the book was originally written in Hebrew, by some Hebrew author, and when Luke joined with Paul (see Acts of the Apostles 20:5), from there on it seems that Luke took the account of the Acts of the Apostles which had been kept by some Jewish scribe, and translated it into Greek; and from then on, he kept the record. The first part of the Acts show abundant evidence of having been translated, while the last part gives evidence of having been composed in Greek.

This explains what has been puzzling the theologians for so long, when they could not understand the difference in the grammatical construction between the first part and the last part of the Book of Acts.

Now as to the Epistles, James writes to "the twelve tribes scattered abroad," for even those living in Greece could still understand the Hebrew as well as those who lived in India, Persia, and in Lybia, or any other part of the globe, where Israel was to be found. As for proof, I place the entire contents of the epistle as evidence, for the epistle is loaded with quotations from the law in a way that only those acquainted with the law could understand it.

Peter's two epistles were also definitely addressed to the "sojourners of the dispersion." And they were the dispersed Israelites, who had been scattered in the Assyrian and Babylonian dispersions, as well as the Roman. He too in his epistles, makes much use of the Old Testament as proof that the recipients of his epistles were people who were acquainted with the law as well as the language he wrote in. Note also his reference to Paul's epistles, when he says, "Even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given to him, hath written UNTO YOU." II Peter 3:15.

Now, if Peter wrote to the scattered Israelites (and he said he did), in the aforesaid quotation, he distinctly states that Paul wrote his epistles to the same people who were the recipients of Peter's epistles; and if so, then Paul also must have written

to them in their language, THE HEBREW. Please do not misunderstand me, IF there has been such a thing as a purely Greek congregation. I believe that Paul would have written to them in Greek, even if he had to get Luke to translate it for him; but I do not know from the epistles now in our present text, which one of them might have been purely Greek. From the first verse of the fifth chapters of I Corinthians, I gather that Paul wrote to Hebrew believers; for he says, "It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as names among the GENTILES." Here Paul shows the contract between the Gentiles and Hebrews. As for the epistle to the Romans that too is full of evidence that the most part of the congregation of the church at Rome were Hebrews. Anyone with a sharp eye can go through the epistle and find plenty of evidence of its Hebrewism; for example, read carefully the second chapter in its entirety, especially verses 14, 17, 24 and 25. The third chapter also in its entirety is full of Hebrewism. The fourth chapter, particularly the first verse, the ninth chapter, especially verses 24 to 29, also the tenth chapter; and as for the eleventh chapter, read the thirteenth verse to the end, and you will find that it is an exhortation to Gentile believers who had joined the congregation which was in the main Jewish, telling them, they there were not to boast as if they were better than the Jews, for their (the Gentile) salvation was dependent upon the fact that the Gospel was to the Jew first, and then to the Gentile.

The book of Revelation is so full of Old Testament zymology that to the Gentile mind, which has no knowledge of the Old Testament apocalyptic message, the book that is intended to be a Revelation of the culmination of the glories to be revealed, he (the Gentile) sees nothing more than the ravings of a mad-man impossible to be understood.

The Holy Scriptures were written in Hebrew, by Hebrews, for Hebrews, particularly for the Israelite branch to whom pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the services of Yahweh, and the promise. The Covenanted Israel is more than the Jew, but it takes in the so-called Ten Tribes of Israel, which the Christian Church calls Gentiles (the Caucasian Race) in their blindness.

In closing let me remind you of the incident in the life of the Saviour; When the Greeks came to Philip, and said unto him, "We would see Yahshua," then Philip tells Andrew, and both of them came and told Yahshua. Reader mediate on what Yahshua said, "The hour IS COME that the Son of Man is to be crucified." In other words when the Greeks came to look for Yahshua, it did not auger good but evil. The Saviour knew that the Greeks were going to bring corruption into the Holy Seed which he had sown (the Word of Yahweh); and, in His messages to the seven churches, in the second and third chapters of Revelation, He warned against the Nicolatians (Greek worshippers of Zeus), the synagogue of Satan. Through them the Scriptures have been perverted, the doctrines paganized, and the people confused. No wonder the Holy Spirit is calling loud to them that have ears to hear, "Come out of her, my people that ye be NOT partakers of her sins, and receive not her plagues." The Roman church and apostate Protestantism is the direct outgrowth of Greek infiltration into the early Jewish Apostolic

Church.

All of the Christian feasts are nothing else, but glorified ancient pagan festivals, even to the making into a saint of the Nicolaitans that the Saviour said He hated.

Awake, O Israel, Awake, O Children of the Most High, it is time to work while it is yet day; for the night cometh when no man can work