

INERRANT OR INSPIRED?

by Avram Yehoshua

The SeedofAbraham.net

The position of many people who usually call themselves, “KJV only” people, believe that the King James Version of the Bible is ‘inerrant.’ It seems to be only the English KJV (and its subsequent Greek text known as the Textus Receptus) that these people present as inerrant; not any other Bible. As John Wesley once said, upon realizing that the KJV had errors in it, ‘There’s enough in it to get a man saved and keep him saved.’ Of course there is, but the position of the KJV being *inerrant* is a man-made position. In other words, the Bible never refers to itself or its words as inerrant, but inspired. In this article I am not coming against the Bible itself, which is inspired by the Holy Spirit.

Inerrant is defined as ‘incapable of being wrong’¹ and/or ‘free from error.’² Most people would agree with those definitions. Christians who link this concept to the Bible base their belief on either the original manuscripts, in other words, the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts that were actually written by Moses, Isaiah, Matthew, Mark, Peter and Paul, etc., and/or they speak of their own *contrived* or *fabricated* definition of inerrancy. The problem with the former is insurmountable. No one has any of the original manuscripts of any book of the Bible, let alone the whole Bible, so arguing from ‘the original manuscripts’ position is an argument ‘from silence’ that holds no merit for them.³ No one can check the originals against the manuscripts we have today to see if they line up, word for word, and letter for letter, and we are speaking, of course, of the Hebrew and Greek texts, not an English Bible such as the KJV.⁴ In other words, those who hold this position on ‘the original manuscripts’ being without error must concede that what they now possess has errors in it (and that’s why they double back to ‘the original manuscripts’). It’s a preposterous stance.

The trouble with the latter view, of offering one’s stilted definition of inerrancy, is that although Scripture’s major teachings are established under the *inspiration* of Scripture (e.g. Israel as God’s chosen people; the deity and humanity of Messiah Yeshua;⁵ the 7th day Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel for all Christians,⁶ and salvation for both Jew and Gentile, etc.), things like discrepancies in the Four Gospels, or diametrically opposed information are present in the various Hebrew and Greek manuscripts we do have, and therefore, are in all our English Bibles, including the KJV.

Other ‘KJV only’ people hold to a definition of inerrancy which doesn’t include all the words of the Bible, but just the major doctrines. Inerrancy, though, means *absolutely free from error* or *without error*—100% perfect, and the Bible is a whole unit. To say that only certain parts of it are inerrant, while other parts contain errors, means that the Bible is not inerrant.

¹ <https://www.google.com/search?q=Inerrant&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8>.

² Merriam-Webster.com at <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/inerrant>.

³ The oldest Old Testament manuscripts, found in 1948 and called The Dead Sea Scrolls, only go back to about 200 BC. (Moses wrote the first five books of the Bible around 1400 BC.) The oldest New Testament manuscripts go to about to more than 100 years *after* the death of the Jewish Apostles, and are mostly fragments of Gospels, not written by the Apostles nor Luke, but copies of copies.

⁴ The New Testament was originally written in Greek, not Aramaic, but many scholars believe that the Gospel of Matthew and half the Book of Acts were originally written in Hebrew. For more on that see [The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21](#) p. 17, note 71. For why the New Testament wasn’t written in Aramaic ask for the PDF *Aramaic vs. Hebrew*.

⁵ See [Messiah’s Deity and Micah 5:2](#), [Yeshua—God the Son](#) and [Yeshua—His Deity and Sonship](#).

⁶ See [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#), [Seven Reasons Why The Church is Wrong](#), [The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#), [The Two Triangles of the NT](#), [Grace, Holiness and the Pharisaic Church](#), and [Law 102](#).

The problem with the theology of inerrancy is that it's a man-made doctrine. The Word of God does not say that about itself. Scripture says that it is the *inspired* Word of God, and it is. This allows for some things to be inaccurate or even false—there are obvious errors and mistakes in the Bible, and if there's only one error in the entire Bible it cannot be called inerrant. There are a number of errors in Scripture, both Old and New Testaments.

The Gospels are four accounts of the life of Yeshua (Jesus) by four different men. All the Gospels were *inspired* by the Holy Spirit, but what we have aren't the original manuscripts the four men actually wrote. They are copies of copies of copies, etc. That doesn't mean that the originals would have 'lined up' with one another, but if we had them we could say without qualification that 'this is what Matthew actually wrote,' etc.

The following presents just a few of the simple errors in Scripture that dismantle the man-made, Greek-Western concept the the KJV is inerrant. It's Greek-Western *thinking* that says that, God is perfect and so *the Bible has to be perfect, too*. As logical (Greek) as that seems it's not the reality. God is perfect, but He has allowed mistakes to permeate His Word, perhaps, among other reasons, for those who think that way and are turned away from Jesus because of it?

When Yeshua spoke of being the Bread of Life, and that those who wanted to attain Heaven had to eat of His flesh and drink of His blood (John 6:26-59), He knew that many would leave Him over their perception of what He said. And many left Him (Jn. 6:60-66f.).

Also, Yeshua is the God of Redemption and He redeems all the mistakes (sins) of Man who believe in Him. It's not the Bible that we are to worship, but Yeshua. Scripture is not inerrant, but inspired by God the Holy Spirit (2nd Timothy 2:16).

THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. How *many* Gerasene demoniacs did Yeshua set free, one or two?
 1. Matthew 8:28-34 says two.
 2. Mark 5:1-20 says one.
 3. Luke 8:26-39 says one.
 4. Either way, the case for inerrancy fails.
2. How *many* blind men did Yeshua heal on the road to Jericho, one or two?
 1. Matthew 20:29-34 says two.
 2. Mark 10:46-52 says one.
 3. Luke 18:35-42 says one.
 4. Again, the concept of inerrancy fails and we haven't left the Gospels yet, unless one wants to take the unreasonable position that Mark and Luke only wrote of one demoniac and blind man, when there were actually two in both cases.
3. When *Jairus* came to Yeshua, did he already know that his daughter was dead or did Jairus learn of it on his way back home?
 1. Matthew 9:18-26 states that Jairus knew his daughter was dead when he came to Yeshua.
 2. Mark 5:21-43 says Jairus found out about his daughter being dead as he was following Yeshua back to his home.
 3. Luke 8:40-56 says Jairus found out about his daughter being dead as he was following Yeshua.

4. These first three points are minor issues, but they derail the position that the New Testament is inerrant, without *any* error.
4. The *temptations* of Messiah Yeshua: what was the second temptation?
 1. Matthew's second temptation speaks of the angels 'bearing Him up' if He fell (Mt. 4:5-7), with number three being Satan saying to Yeshua to fall down and worship him (Mt. 4:8-10).
 2. Luke's second temptation is the worship of Satan (Lk. 4:5-8), while the third has the angels catching Messiah if He fell (Lk. 4:9-12).
 3. It's obvious that Satan tempted Yeshua, but just as obvious is the position that inerrancy isn't biblical. The order of the temptations are reversed. Yeshua only went through the temptations in the Wilderness once—there weren't two different times that Satan tempted Him with the same temptations, so one can't say that Matthew recorded Yeshua's first temptations by Satan and Luke recorded the second set of temptations. Again, minor points, but these minor points overturn the man-made concept of inerrancy projected onto Scripture.
5. What exactly was written on the crucifixion plaque, which identified Yeshua's crime? Although all of them have 'King of the Jews,' two have His name and one has where He came from (Nazareth). We have four different sets of words for this one plaque. Which one was it? This too dismantles inerrancy:
 1. Matthew 27:37 states that it readThis is Jesus, the King of the Jews
 2. Mark 15:26 has onlyThe King of the Jews
 3. Luke 23:38 has a pinch more than Mark ...This is the King of the Jews
 4. John 19:19 hasJesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews
 5. Which was it? Not one aligns with another.
6. In Acts 7:4 Stephen says that Abraham came to Canaan *after* the death of his father Terah, but Genesis reveals that Terah lived to be 205 years old (Gen. 11:32). This means that Terah was still alive when Abram (his name wasn't changed to Abraham until Gen. 17), left his father Terah for Canaan:
 1. Abram was born when Terah was 70 years old (Gen. 11:26).
 2. Abram came into Canaan when he was 75 years old (Gen. 12:4), which would have made his father Terah 135 years old at the time. Terah lives for another 70 years and dies at 205 years of age.
 3. Abraham would be in the land of Canaan *for 60 years* before his father Terah died.
 4. Is Scripture (Stephen) inerrant at this point? It's obvious that it isn't. Inerrancy fails again.
7. Also in Stephen's speech he mentions the god Remphan (KJV, Acts 7:42-43; Rompha, NASB), which is a reference to Amos 5:26, but as C. F. Keil points out, there was no such god. The name is actually a translation error in the Septuagint (the official Greek version of the Hebrew Old Testament Bible for Jews living outside the land of Israel in Stephen's day). Keil writes that the name "owes its origin simply to the false reading of the unpointed כײן (*kay'vahn*) as רײן (*ray'vahn*) inasmuch as in the old Hebrew writings, which was the basis for the Septuagint, for כ *kaf* is similar to ר *raysh*...There was no god Rephan or Rempha; for the name never occurs apart from the LXX"⁷ version of Amos 5:26.
8. Stephen speaks of Moses being 'a mighty man of word and deed' growing up in Egypt (Acts 7:22), but Moses says that he was *never* eloquent, but rather 'slow of speech and slow of tongue (Ex. 4:10), and God confirms this (Ex. 4:14).

⁷ C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary On The Old Testament*, vol. 10: *Minor Prophets* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001), p. 196 note 1. Also distorted in Acts 7:43 is the mention of the god Moloch, a distortion from the Septuagint. Keil's comments on Amos 5:26 should be read; pp. 195-198.

9. The Apostle Paul's Pharisaic training comes to the forefront when he writes that 'the Rock that followed Israel' in the Wilderness was Jesus (1st Cor. 10:1-4; cf. Ex. 17:6; Num. 20:8; the last two cites happened 40 years apart and there is nothing in the Old Testament that says that any rock followed Israel all those years). The Rabbis though, taught that a literal rock actually followed Israel, and *this* is where Paul gets that from. The New Testament is not inerrant. It's Paul speaking and making a point.
10. Paul thought and wrote that Yeshua was going to return *in his lifetime*, and Paul said *the Lord had given that to him*:
 1. In 1st Thess. 4:15-17; 5:4, Paul writes: "For this we declare to you **by the word of the Lord**, that ***we who are alive, who are left until the coming of the Lord***, will by no means precede those who have died. For the Lord himself, with a cry of command, with the angel's shout and with the sound of God's trumpet, will descend from Heaven, and the dead in Christ will rise first. *Then we who are alive, who are left*, will be caught up in the clouds together with them *to meet the Lord in the air*; and so we will be with the Lord forever...But you, beloved, are not in darkness, for that day to surprise you like a thief." First Thessalonians was written about 50 AD.
 2. Paul also says in 1st Cor. 15:51-52, "Listen! I will tell you a mystery! *We will not all die*, but we will all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we will be changed" (see also 1st Cor. 1:7; 7:29-31; 8:29). First Corinthians was written about 52 AD.
 3. Romans 16:20: "The God of peace will *shortly* crush Satan under *your* feet. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you." Romans was written about 54 AD.
 4. Philippians 4:5: "Let your gentleness be known to everyone. *The Lord is near.*" Philippians was written about 61 AD.
 5. Paul wasn't the only one who thought Yeshua would return in his lifetime.
 - a. James 5:8, written about 48 AD, says, 'the coming of the Lord *is at hand*.' (James was a half brother of our Lord.)
 - b. Peter too says, 'for the end of all things *is at hand*' (First Peter 4:7; written about 62 AD).
 - c. Hebrews 1:1-2 speaks of it being the 'last days' (written about 66 AD).
 - d. The Apostle John writes, 'it's the last hour' (First John 2:18; written about 92 AD).
 - In Revelation, John also writes that Messiah's return was imminent (Rev. 1:1-3; 22:20), and that the things he wrote about would take place *shortly* (Rev. 22:6-7, 10, 12). Revelation was written about 95 AD.
11. Paul also writes that 'Jannes and Jambres opposed Moses' (2nd Tim. 3:8), but there's no mention in the Old Testament about those two. Paul is stating that these two were the head magicians of Pharaoh's court, but this is a rabbinic fairy tale created a generation or two before Paul was born. It has no basis in reality, yet it's in Scripture and those who call the Bible inerrant have to believe those two magicians were the ringleaders of Pharaoh's court.
12. The author of Hebrews declares that the *word* (from Mt. Sinai; i.e. the Ten Commandments and all the other words or commandments and laws given to Moses on Mt. Sinai for Israel; cf. Ex. 20:18f.), was given by angels. Yet Torah (the first five books of Moses; i.e. Mosaic Law) states that God Himself gave all those words. There are no angels mentioned having given 'the word' to Israel.⁸
13. The Book of Hebrews also states that the Rod (Branch/Staff) of Aaron and the Jar with the Manna in it were actually *inside* the Ark of the Covenant. Were they or were they laid before (in front of) the

⁸ Exodus 19:7-9; 20:1ff.; 24:3-4, 8, 12; 34:1-2, 27-28; 35:1; Num. 11:24; 12:6-7; 14:39; Dt. 4:5-10, 36; 5:22; 9:10; 10:1-2; 11:18; 12:28; 33:3; Joshua 3:9.

Ark?

1. Exodus 16:33-34 states that the Manna was placed in a jar *before* (in front of) the Ark, and Num. 17:10 has the Staff being placed *before* (in front of) the Ark. 1st Kings 8:9 speaks of only the Stone Tablets being inside the Ark.
2. This mistake, on the part of the writer of Hebrews, is understandable as all his quotes from the Old Testament are from the Septuagint. It's the Septuagint that places the jar of Manna and the Rod of Aaron being placed *inside* the Ark of the Covenant, but again, the problem of inerrancy arises with two different places for the holy items in the New Testament.⁹
14. Hebrews 11:24 says that Moses 'refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter,' but there's nothing in Scripture to support that. In other words, if it's not in Exodus, or somewhere else in the *Tanach* (Old Testament), where did this understanding come from? It's rabbinic lore¹⁰ that was around in the time when Hebrews was written and the writer incorporated it.
15. Hebrews 11:27 speaks of Moses leaving Egypt and 'not fearing the wrath of the king,' but Exodus 2:14-15 speaks of Moses *fleeing* from Egypt *expressly because he was afraid because Pharaoh wanted to kill him* for murdering the Egyptian (Ex. 2:11-13).
16. Jude (Judah, a half brother of our Lord) writes that the Devil contended for the body of Moses (Jude 1:9; see Dt. 34:5-6). Nowhere in Old Testament, though, is that spoken of. Judah most likely got this understanding from an apocryphal book of the first century BC called *The Assumption of Moses*.
17. Judah (1:14-15) also speaks of Enoch coming with 'ten thousands of the saints,' but this too is nowhere found in Scripture, but is attributed to the apocryphal book of Enoch, written about 100 years before Judah lived.

These are some instances of obvious errors in the New Testament. The concept of inerrancy cannot be maintained because there are a number of errors of understanding and misinformation in the Scriptures.

THE OLD TESTAMENT

There are also numerous places in the *Tanach* (Old Testament) where there are errors. The Book of Numbers chapter three is one of them. In Num. 3:39 the census of the male Levites one month old and older is listed as **22,000**, and this number is confirmed in Num. 3:43 when the number of firstborn sons in Israel is listed as 22,273 and the 'extra' 273 Israelis have to give a ransom of 5 shekels each (which totals and is listed as 1,365 shekels, which is $273 \times 5 = 1,365$; Num. 3:46-50).

The problem with inerrancy arises when we add up the actual Levites that are listed. Their number is 22,300, not 22,000:

1. Numbers 3:22, from the family of Gershon7,500
2. Num. 3:28, from the family of Kohath8,600
3. Num. 3:34, from the family of Merari6,200
4. **Total Levites one month and older****22,300**

If there were **22,300** Levites then the figures for Num. 3:39, 43, 46f., are wrong. If there were **22,000** Levites then the number of Levites listed in Num. 3:22, 28, 34 is wrong. Either way, Scripture cannot be said to be inerrant—without error. Noted 19th century theologian C. F. Keil suggests that v. 28 "should read

⁹ The Septuagint was the official Greek translation of the Old Testament Hebrew Bible for all the Jews outside the land of Israel. It was written about 280 BC.

¹⁰ Lore is 'a body of traditions and knowledge on a subject.'

שלוש (*shelosh* ‘3’) for שש” (shays ‘6’) for Kohath’s sons; 8,300 instead of 8,600, which would match the number 22,000 for Num. 3:39, 43 46f.¹¹ It appears to be a scribal error, but one that certainly disqualifies Scripture as inerrant.

1. Genesis 35:23-26 lists the **12** sons born to Yakov (Jacob) and then says in v. 36b, “These are the sons of Jacob who were born to him **in Paddan-Aram**” (i.e. Syria; NASB). Yet, in the same chapter (vv. 16-18) it has the birth of Benjamin in Ephrath! (i.e. Bethlehem, **Israel**) and in Gen. 32:22 it specifically states that Yakov came from Syria (Paddan-Aram) with (only) **11** sons (not Benjamin who was his 12th son).
2. The Ten Commandments were written on Stone Tablets and Scripture enumerates what was on the Tablets twice (Ex. 20:1ff.; Dt. 5:1ff.), yet the reason for keeping the fourth commandment changes (Ex. 20:8-11; Dt. 5:12-15), as well as what word God actually spoke to begin the commandment:
 1. Exodus 20:8 has the Hebrew word ‘remember’ and Deuteronomy 5:12 has ‘observe.’ Which did God speak? The Rabbis say that God spoke both words simultaneously, but even if that were so, *why weren’t both words written down in both places?* Which word was actually on the Stone Tablets?
 2. Also a problem for those who hold to inerrancy is the *reason* for Israel to keep the Sabbath day holy. The Exodus passage refers to God as Creator, while Deuteronomy speaks of God as Redeemer and they both have different sets of wording. Which one did God speak? What words were actually on the Stone Tablets (see also Deuteronomy 5:22; 10:1-4)?¹²
3. Who killed King Saul?
 1. Did Saul die due to him falling upon his own sword, as Scripture says in 1st Sam. 31:4-6, or did the Amalakite kill him? (2nd Sam. 1:1-10)
 2. Most probably the Amalakite’s story is true, that he came upon Saul, who had fallen upon his spear, but hadn’t died, and the Amalakite, at Saul’s behest, killed him, but Scripture also says that Saul *died* when he fell upon his own sword (1st Sam. 31:4-6). Which was it? It can’t be both.
4. In First Chronicles 3:5 it speaks of Bathshua (KJV, NASB, NRSV) as the mother of Solomon, when it should be Bathsheba (2nd Samuel 12:24-25). This is a scribal *error*.
 1. The verse also declares that Bathshua is the mother of three other sons *before* Solomon (Shimea, Shobab and Nathan). According to 2nd Sam. 12:1-25 there weren’t any other sons Bathsheba bore to David before Solomon (except the un-named son who died on day 7, as a result of David’s adultery).
 2. In 1st Chron. 3:5 the scribe took liberty and assigned those three sons to Bathshua (Bathsheba) when they most likely were sons born to David from other wives that he took when he was in Jerusalem *before* he knew Bathsheba (2nd Sam. 5:13). It states in 2nd Sam. 5:14 that ‘Shammua (Shimea? another error?), Shobab, Nathan, and Solomon’ were born to David in Jerusalem, but doesn’t give the names of their mothers. 1st Chron. 3:5 ascribes it to Bathshua, which is a double mistake (wrong name for Solomon’s mother and incorrect in assigning any sons between the death of the son that dies on the 7th day (2nd Samuel 12:18) and Solomon, who is obviously the next born son of Bathsheba).
5. 2nd Chron. 3:15 states the 2 pillars of Solomon’s Temple were 35 cubits high, but 1st Kings 7:15 has

¹¹ C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary On The Old Testament*, vol. 1: *The Pentateuch* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001), p. 664. What Keil’s suggestion means is that somewhere along the line one Hebrew letter was dropped; the ל (*lamed*), which changed *three* to *six* (8,300 to 8,600). It’s a great insight.

¹² It says in Dt. 10:2, 4 that the second set of Stone Tablets had the *same* words on them as the first set had, so, how is it that the passages in Exodus and Deuteronomy are different? Inerrancy fails at this point.

18 cubits (cf. 2nd Kgs. 25:17; Jer. 52:21).

6. 2nd Chron. 4:5 speaks of the Sea of Bronze containing 3,000 baths of water, but 1st Kings 7:26 says it only had 2,000 baths of water.
7. 2nd Chron. 4:17 has the city of Zeredah, but 1st Kings 7:46 speaks of it as Zaretan.

These 35 errors don't exhaust the errors in Scripture, but offer specific places where the doctrine of inerrancy (continually) fails. Believing that the Bible is inerrant is a false and misleading belief, not based on Scripture. Also, saying the original autographs (writings) of the Bible were inerrant is a position in futility. There are no original autographs that anyone has. With errors in the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, and of course, also the English translations, most who hold to inerrancy say that the Bible is inerrant in its major doctrines, but this is not an honest definition of inerrancy for Scripture because it separates parts of the Bible from itself. Also, even if the original manuscripts were inerrant, neither the manuscripts nor the Bibles we have today are.

Inerrancy does not stand up to scrutiny. The *assumption* that God would have to give us a Bible today that is inerrant because He is perfect, fails to take into account that God chose to work through man, who is not perfect. The writings about Israel, Yeshua and His Father do not have to be perfect, in the Greek sense of the Word (without any error) because the Holy Spirit is able to use what *is* written and inspired to teach us about the Father, the Son, Israel and us, despite obvious errors.

The Bible is inspired by God and written by men. Whether there were one or two demoniacs is a minor point. Yes, some might use that as justification for not believing in Jesus, but they aren't His lambs anyway (John 10:25-29). The fact is that Yeshua healed all the sick, blind, maimed and lepers, and demon possessed who came to Him, and He died to set us free from sin and our sinful nature, and to give us eternal life, and the Bible, both Old and New speak of that. The Apostle Paul says the Scriptures are *inspired* (not inerrant):

“All Scripture is *inspired* by God and is useful for teaching, for reproof, for correction and for training in righteousness, so that everyone who is of God may be *fully* equipped for every good work.” (2nd Tim. 3:16-17; see also Ex. 24:4; Dt. 31:9)

It defies both reason and common sense to insist that the Bible is inerrant—without any error, when Scripture doesn't say that about itself, and obviously, there are errors in it. To use a less than honest definition of inerrancy (i.e. only the major doctrines are inerrant) only creates confusion in those truly seeking to understand God, while offering ammunition to those who are His enemies. It may also keep those seeking God, away from Him when they learn that inerrant really doesn't mean inerrant when speaking of the holy Scriptures.

The Scriptures declare themselves to be inspired. This allows for errors of discrepancy and misinformation without destroying the divine Truths therein, or playing with one's mind. As John Wesley, the 18th century man of God, said, 'There's enough in the Scriptures to get a man saved and keep him saved.' Truly, glory to Messiah Yeshua! “The grass withers, the flower fades, but the Word of our God stands forever.” (Is. 40:8)¹³

¹³ “The original documents of the New Testament no longer exist and *no two copies (manuscripts) agree completely*...As we know it today, there are around 138,000 words in the Greek New Testament. There are literally hundreds of thousands of variants where there is not uniformity of wording. On average, for every word in the Greek New Testament there are almost three variants. The large number is due to the large number of manuscripts. Are these differences capable in changing the meaning of the intent of the authors? No. An overwhelming majority of alterations are accidental and trivial...What are we to make of these variants? Should our faith be shaken? Absolutely not. ‘For more than two centuries, most biblical scholars have declared that no essential affirmation has been affected by the variants’ (Taylor, 2012). In their attempts to recover the originals, textual critics have recovered at least 95% of the inspired words. Some even go farther, placing the number as high as 99%.” From *The Earliest NT Manuscripts* at http://www.bible.ca/ef/topical-the-earliest-new-testament-manuscripts.htm#_ftnref2. Well worth reading.

In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit?

There are two doctrinal errors that need to be addressed. The first heresy finds its way into all Bibles, whether English, French, Russian or Swahili, etc. This is because every Greek New Testament text has it, but it can be proven that it wasn't in the original writing of the Apostle Matthew-Levi. Specifically, it's the phrase found in Matthew 28:19, 'baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit:

“Go and make disciples of all the nations, *baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.*” (Matthew 28:19)

About 320 AD the Roman Catholic Church added the phrase to Matthew 28:19, and also expunged the phrase 'in my (Yeshua's) name,' for making disciples. The original verse speaks nothing about baptizing. The verse should read,

‘Go and make disciples of all the nations, *in my name.*’ (Mt. 28:19 restored to its original wording)

This heretical perversion inserted by the Roman Catholic Church opposes the baptismal formula that is mentioned numerous times in the Book of Acts (baptizing them in the name of Yeshua).¹⁴ Baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is something that has no second witness in all of Scripture. Scholars and Church History reveal it was not in the original Gospel of Matthew. In Conybeare's, *Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, he writes:

‘It is clear, therefore, that of the manuscripts which Eusebius (270-340 AD) inherited from his predecessor, Pamphilus at Caesurae in Palestine, some at least preserved the original reading in which *there was no mention either of baptism, or of Father, Son and Holy Ghost.*¹⁵

Conybeare, in an article in the *Hibbert Journal*, also states:

‘It is evident that this was the text found by Eusebius in the very ancient codices collected fifty to a hundred and fifty years before his birth by his great predecessors. Of any other form of text he had never heard and knew nothing until he had visited Constantinople and attended the Council of Nice.’¹⁶

‘Eusebius cites this text (Matt. 28:19) again and again in works written between 300 and 336, namely in his long commentaries on the Psalms, on Isaiah, his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, his *Theophany*...in his famous history of the Church, and in his panegyric¹⁷ of the Emperor Constantine. I have, after a moderate search in these works of Eusebius, found *eighteen* citations of Matthew 28:19, and **always** in the following form:’

¹⁹‘Go and make disciples of all the nations, **in my name**,²⁰teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I commanded you.’ (Mt. 28:19-20)¹⁸

¹⁴ Every place in the Book of Acts where a ‘name’ is mentioned, baptism ‘in the name of Yeshua’ is seen (Acts 2:38-39; 8:12, 16; 10:47-48; 19:1-5; see also John 14:26; Acts 4:12; 22:16). There is no mention anywhere of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Romans 6:1f., states that it's into the death of Jesus that we're baptized. Neither the Father nor the Holy Spirit died for us, and so baptism must be in Yeshua's (Jesus') name, not all Three.

¹⁵ F. C. Conybeare, *Textual Criticism of the New Testament*.

¹⁶ *Hibbert Journal*, 1902, Conybeare.

¹⁷ Panegyric is, “a public speech or published text in praise of someone or something.”

¹⁸ Conybeare, *Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (no cite given). For an excellent article on Mt. 28:19 ask for the PDF, *Matthew 28:19—Baptism in the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit?*

The King James Version of Scripture

The second serious doctrinal error appears in what some Christians believe to be the inerrant English version of Scripture: the King James Version Bible. As we've seen, though, it cannot be inerrant when the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts have errors in them. The KJV is a great Bible, but it's not inerrant. I've found the New King James Version to be the best 'all around' English Bible for accuracy and readability, but it, too, has its problems.

No Bible is without faults, and even though the KJV is a solid Bible, the NKJV is easier to read and understand for most people, and is better, in terms of accuracy to the manuscripts than most other Bibles. Having said that, the KJV and the NKJV having a glaring error for Hebrews 4:9. They state:

“There remaineth therefore a *rest* to the people of God.” (Hebrews 4:9 KJV)

“There remains therefore a *rest* for the people of God.” (Heb. 4:9 NKJV)

The Greek word for *rest* is ‘*sabbatismos*,’ and as you can see from the Greek word, ‘*sabbath*’ is within it. The Greek word means, ‘a literal Sabbath observance or rest,’ and so the KJV, as well as the NKJV, do not properly translate the *meaning* of the word. It's not the Greek texts¹⁹ that are at fault—it's the bias of the translators against Torah in general, and the 7th day Sabbath in particular.²⁰ Most every other English Bible has, ‘a **Sabbath rest** remains for the people of God,’ which is the way it should read:

NASB: “There remains therefore a *Sabbath rest* for the people of God.” (Hebrews 4:9)

NRSV: “So then, a *sabbath rest* still remains for the people of God;” (Hebrews 4:9; see also ASV, HCSB, NET and NIV which also have Sabbath rest.)

A third error finds its way into the KJV's translation of Acts 12:4. The King James Version speaks of *Easter* (a pagan holy day in the time of Christ, originally known as *Ishtar*), which wrongly implies that *Easter* was celebrated by Herod and the Jews instead of Passover:

“And because he saw that it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to seize Peter also. Now it was *during the Days of Unleavened Bread*. And when he had apprehended him, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after *Easter* to bring him forth to the people.” (Acts 12:3-4)

The NASB, as well as the ASV, HCSB, NASB, NET, NIV and NKJV, etc., has Passover. There are basically two sets of Greek texts from which our English Bibles are derived from and they both have the same Greek word: *πάσχα Pascha*, which is Greek word for Passover. Because the Roman Catholic Church had replaced Passover with Easter in 120 AD,²¹ the KJV translators, unwittingly following Rome, were keep-

¹⁹ The *Textus Receptus* is the basis for the KJV and has its roots from Antioch and the Byzantine text of the 5th century. The NU text (the Nestle-Aland Greek Text of the United Bible Societies), which most all other English Bibles use, stems from the Alexandrian texts of the 4th century (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, about 330 AD). Just because the NU rests upon an older text does not mean that it's a better text.

²⁰ The Greek word *σαββατισμὸς sabbatismos* is a technical term found in ancient literature for *literal Sabbath observance*. Samuele Bacchiocchi, in *The New Testament Sabbath* (Gillette, WY: *The Sabbath Sentinel* magazine, 1987), says that the writer of Hebrews is teaching that a “‘*Sabbath keeping* is left behind for the people of God.’ The Greek word *sabbatismos* is found in ‘Plutarch, *De Superstitione* 3 (Moralia 166A); Justin Martyr, *Dialogue With Trypho* 23, 3; Epiphanius, *Adversus Hæreses* 30, 2, 2; *Apostolic Constitutions* 2, 36, 7.” Andrew Lincoln, a Sunday keeping Christian, admits that ‘in each of these places the term denotes the *observance or celebration of the Sabbath*. This usage corresponds to the Septuagint usage of the cognate verb *sabbatizo* (cf. Ex. 16:30; Lev. 23:32; 26:34f; 2nd Chron. 36:21), which also has reference to Sabbath observance.’ Hebrews 4:9, among other things, is speaking of a literal Sabbath observance and celebration for New Testament Christians in relation to, and paralleling the ‘rest’ or peace we have in Messiah Yeshua. The rest/peace we have in Yeshua is pictured in the Sabbath rest that God commanded Israel to observe. The one doesn't negate, but complements the other. The KJV fails to properly translate *sabbatismos* into a ‘Sabbath rest.’

²¹ For more on how Satan got into the Church through the Roman Catholic Church and changed the days and ways

ing Easter instead of Passover, and so they inserted ‘Easter’ where Passover should have been.

There are other errors in the KJV, especially when it comes to Mosaic Law, but on the whole, it provides a fairly accurate English text. I sometimes use the KJV as a reference, for it’s probably the most accurate of all the English Bibles, as well as the Greek *Textus Receptus*, along with the NU text. As you can see, with the two Scripture examples above pertaining to a Sabbath rest and Passover, the *Textus Receptus* wasn’t at fault—the King James’ translators were, but there is no English translation of the *Textus Receptus* other than the KJV. For Bible students who don’t know Hebrew and Greek it’s good to have a few English Bibles to compare texts with. Having said all that, the KJV is a solid Bible—it’s just not inerrant.²²

that God wanted Christians to keep, see:

1. [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#)
2. [From Sabbath to Sunday](#)
3. [God’s Way vs Church Way](#)
4. [Grace, Holiness and the Pharisaic Church](#)
5. [Hebrews and the Change of the Law](#)
6. [Law 102](#)
7. [Law and Grace](#)
8. [No Longer Under the Law?](#)
9. [Seven Ways Yeshua Fulfilled the Law](#)
10. [Take the Quiz! Five Quick Questions about the New Testament](#)
11. [The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#)
12. [The Feasts of Israel as Time Markers After the Resurrection](#)
13. [The Lifting of the Veil— Acts 15:20-21](#)
14. [The Lord’s Day—Sunday?](#)

²² Revised on Saturday, December 31, 2022.