

INERRANT OR INSPIRED?

by Avram Yehoshua

<http://SeedofAbraham.net>

Inerrant is defined as ‘incapable of being wrong’¹ and ‘free from error.’² Most people would agree with that definition. Those who link this concept to the Bible base their belief on either the original manuscripts (what were actually written by Moses, Isaiah, Matthew, Mark, Peter and Paul, etc.), or speak of their own definition of inerrancy. The problem with the former is insurmountable. No one has the original manuscripts.³ No one can check the originals against the manuscripts that we have today to see if they line up, word for word, letter for letter, and that of course, in Greek, not English.⁴

The trouble with the latter view is that although Scripture’s major teachings are established (e.g. Israel as His people; the deity of Messiah; and salvation for both Jew and Gentile; etc.), things like discrepancies in the Gospels or misinformation are also present in today’s Greek (and Hebrew) manuscripts, and therefore, English (and other) Bibles. These, though, don’t seem to count for those who hold to their definition of inerrancy, which generally only includes the major doctrines, but not all the words of Scripture. Inerrancy, though, means *absolutely free from error* or *without error*—period, and the Bible is a whole unit. To say that only a certain part of it is inerrant, while other parts contain errors means that the Bible is not inerrant.

The concept of the Bible being inerrant is a man-made teaching. The Word of God doesn’t say that about itself. The Scriptures say that they are the *inspired* Word of God, and they are. This allows for some things to be inaccurate—there are errors or mistakes in the Bible. If there’s only one error in the entire Bible it cannot be claimed as inerrant. As we’ll see, there are a number of errors in Scripture, both Old and New Testaments.

The Gospels are four accounts of the life of Yeshua 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., of them. Here are some errors in Scripture that dismantle the concept of inerrancy:

1. How *many* Gerasene demoniacs did Yeshua set free, one or two?
 - a. Matthew 8:28-34 says two.
 - b. Mark 5:1-20 says one.
 - c. Luke 8:26-39 says one.
 - d. Either way, the case for inerrancy fails.
2. How *many* blind men did Yeshua heal on the road to Jericho, one or two?
 - a. Matthew 20:29-34 says two.

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. The oldest New Testament manuscripts go to about to more than 200 years *after* the death of the Jewish Apostles.

⁴ The New Testament was originally written in Greek, not Aramaic. Also, many scholars believe that the Gospel of Matthew and half the Book of Acts were originally written in Hebrew. For more on that ask for the PDF *Yakov Spoke Hebrew* (referring to James, the half brother of Yeshua). For why the New Testament wasn’t written in Aramaic ask for the PDF *Aramaic vs. Hebrew*.

- b. Mark 10:46-52 says one.
 - c. Luke 18:35-42 says one.
 - d. Again, the concept of inerrancy fails and we haven't left the Gospels, yet.
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?
 - a. Matthew 9:18-26 states that Jairus knew his daughter was dead when he came to Yeshua.
 - b. Mark 5:21:-43 says Jairus found out about his daughter being dead as he was following Yeshua back to his home.
 - c. Luke 8:40-56 says Jairus found out about his daughter being dead as he was following Yeshua.
 - d. These three points are not major issues, but they do demolish the position that the Bible is inerrant, without *any* error.
 4. The *temptations* of Messiah Yeshua. Which was the second temptation?
 - a. 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).
 - b. 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).
 1. Satan tempted Yeshua—that's obvious, but just as obvious is the position of inerrancy isn't biblical. The order of the temptations is 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 destroy the concept of inerrancy—without *any* error.
 5. What did Yeshua say to Peter? How many times would the rooster crow
 - a. Matthew 26:34 records that Yeshua said *before* the rooster crows Peter would deny Him three times (see also vv. 74-75). Luke (22:60) and John (13:38; 18:37) agree with Matthew, but
 - b. Mark 14:30 has Yeshua saying *before* the rooster crows *twice*, Peter would deny Him three times (see also vv. 68-72).
 - c. Again, a minor discrepancy, but this, too, nullifies Scripture from being inerrant.
 6. The Book of Hebrews states that the Rod (Branch) of Aaron and the Jar with the Manna in it were actually *in* the Ark of the Covenant. Were they or were they laid before (in front of) the Ark?
 - a. 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 as being inside the Ark.
 1. 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 has the jar of Manna and the Rod of Aaron being placed in the Ark of the Covenant, but again, the problem of inerrancy arises. Were the two items in front of the Ark or inside the Ark?⁵
 7. 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 Pharaoh wanted to kill him* for murdering the Egyptian (Ex. 2:11-13).

⁵ The Septuagint was the official Greek translation of the Old Testament Hebrew Bible for all the Jews living outside the land of Israel. It was written about 250 BC.

8. 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 lore.⁶
9. 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:
 - a. Abram was born when Terah was 70 years old (Gen. 11:26).
 - b. 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 dies at 205 years of age.
 - c. Abraham would be in the land of Canaan *for 60 years* before his father Terah died.
 - d. Is Scripture inerrant at this point? If not, and it’s obvious that it isn’t inerrant, then the doctrine of inerrancy fails again.
10. In Stephen’s speech he mentions the god Remphan (KJV, Acts 7:42-43; Rompha, NASB), a reference to Amos 5:26, but as C. F. Keil points out, there was no such god, the name actually was a translation error in the Septuagint. Keil writes that the name “owes its origin simply to the false reading of the unpointed כַּיִן (*kay’vahn*) as רַיִן (*ray’vahn*) inasmuch as in the old Hebrew writings, which was the basis for the Septuagint, not only is כַּ *kaf* similar to רַ *raysh*, but וַ *vav* is also similar to פַּ *fay*... There was no god Rephan or Rempha; for the name never occurs apart from the LXX”⁷ version of Amos 5:26.
11. Stephen also 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 Yahveh confirms this (Ex. 4:14).
12. Paul’s Pharisaic training comes to the forefront in ‘the Rock that followed Israel’ in the Wilderness (1st Cor. 10:1-4). It’s not found anywhere in the Bible, but the Rabbis taught that a literal rock actually followed Israel.
13. Paul thought and wrote that Yeshua was going to return *in his lifetime*, and he said *the Lord had given that to him*:
 - a. 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.
 - b. Paul also speaks in 1st Cor. 15:51-52, saying “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.
 - c. Romans 16:20: “The God of peace will shortly crush Satan under your feet. The grace of our

⁶ Lore is ‘a body of traditions and knowledge on a subject.’

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.

Lord Jesus Christ be with you.” Romans was written about 54-58 AD.

- d. Philippians 4:5: “Let your gentleness be known to everyone. *The Lord is near.*” Philippians was written about 60-62 AD.
- e. Compare those earlier writings with 2nd Tim. 4:6-8: “As for me, I am already being poured out as a libation, and the time of my departure has come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith. From now on there is reserved for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, will give me on that day, and not only to me but also to all who have longed for his appearing.” Second Timothy was written about 64-67 AD.
- f. Paul wasn’t the only one who thought Yeshua would return in his lifetime. James 5:8, written about 48 AD, says, ‘the coming of the Lord *is at hand.*’
 1. Peter, too, says, ‘for the end of all things *is at hand*’ (First Peter 4:7; written about 60-64 AD).
 2. Hebrews 1:1-2 speaks of it being the ‘last days’ (written about 66 AD).
 3. The Apostle John writes, ‘it’s the last hour’ (First John 2:18; written about 90-95 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.

The concept of inerrancy cannot be maintained because there are numerous errors of understanding and misinformation in the Scriptures.

13. Paul 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. It has no basis in reality.
14. Jude (Judah) writes that the Devil contended for the body of Moses (Jude 1:9; see Dt. 34:5-6). Nowhere in Old Testament Scripture, 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*.

These are some instances of ‘misunderstanding’ from the first century when Paul and Judah (a half brother of Yeshua) lived. They come into the New Testament ‘as fact,’ but in reality they’re only a reflection of what some rabbis, or others, thought.

15. 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 a hundred years before Judah (Jude) lived.
16. The Ten Commandments were written on Stone Tablets, and speaks of the 7th day Sabbath. In Scripture the writing out of Ten Commandments appear twice (Ex. 20:8-11 and Dt. 5:12-15), but speaking of the Sabbath are different in both places:
 - a. Exodus 20:8 has the Hebrew word ‘remember’ and Deuteronomy 5:12 has ‘observe.’ Which did Yahveh speak? The Rabbis say that God spoke both words simultaneously, but even if that is so, *why weren’t both words written down in both places?* Which word was actually on the Stone Tablets?
 - b. 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 Yahveh speak? What words were actually on the Stone Tablets (see also Deuteronomy 5:22; 10:1-4)?⁸

⁸ 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

17. Genesis 35:23-26 lists the *twelve* 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’ (Syria; NASB). Yet, in the same chapter (vv. 16-18) it has the birth of Benjamin in Ephrath (Bethlehem, *Israel*) and in Gen. 32:22 it specifically states that Yakov came from Syria (Paddan-Aram) with (only) *eleven* sons (not Benjamin who was the 12th son).
18. In Numbers 3:23, 28, 34 there were 7,500 sons born to Gershon over one month old; 8,600 sons born to Kohath; and 6,200 sons born to Merari, respectively. The total for this is 22,300, but *Scripture lists it as 22,000* in Numbers 3:39 (see also v. 43). The correct figure is 22,000, which is confirmed in Num. 3:46. It speaks of the 22,373 first-born of the other Tribes of Israel as being 273 more than the Levites. This means that the Levitical count should only be 22,000.
 - a. Keil suggests that ‘possibly in v. 28 we should read *שלש shelosh* ‘3’ for *שש shays* ‘6,’ which would make it correct (8,300 sons for Kohath instead of 8,600).⁹ This is a scribal error, but one that certainly disqualifies Scripture as inerrant.
19. Who killed King Saul?
 - a. Did Saul die due to him falling upon his own sword, as Scripture says (1st Sam. 31:4-6), or
 - b. Did the Amalakite kill him? (2nd Sam. 1:1-10)
 - c. Yes, it’s most probable that 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 cannot be both.
20. Another two problems are seen in First Chronicles 3:5:
 - a. It speaks of Bathshua (KJV, NASB, NRSV) as the mother of Solomon, when it should be Bathsheba (2nd Samuel 12:24-25). This is another scribal error.
 - b. 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. 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 seventh day (2nd Samuel 12:18) and Solomon, who is obviously the next born son for Bathsheba).

These 20 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 around to compare the texts. With errors in the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, and of course, also in 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.

is it that the passages in Exodus and Deuteronomy are different? Inerrancy fails at this point, too.

⁹ C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary On The Old Testament*, vol. 1: *The Pentateuch* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001), p. 664.

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 has chosen to work through man, who is not perfect. The writings about 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, His Son, Israel and us, despite obvious errors and misinformation.

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 Yeshua, but they aren't His lambs, anyway (John 10:25-29). The fact is that Yeshua healed people possessed by demons, and all the sick, blind, maimed and lepers, etc., who came to Him, and He died to set us free from sin and our sinful nature, and to give us eternal life. 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 belongs to 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) can only create confusion in those truly seeking to understand it, while offering ammunition to those who are its 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 Bible.

The Scriptures declare themselves to be inspired. This allows for errors of discrepancy and misinformation without destroying the divine Truth 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.’ Amen!, and truly, glory to Messiah Yeshua!

“The grass withers, the flower fades, but the word of our God stands forever.” (Is. 40:8)¹⁰

There is one more error or serious doctrinal consequence that needs to be addressed. This heretical error 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. 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,’ in terms of making disciples. The original verse mentioned 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)

¹⁰ “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 original 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.

This is the most serious error in the New Testament because it changes the baptismal formula from what we read of in the Book of Acts (baptizing them in the name of Yeshua),¹¹ to baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, something that has no second witness in Scripture, and that Church History reveals 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.*¹²

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

'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.'¹³

'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 panegyric 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)¹⁴

The King James Version of Scripture

Some Christians believe that the King James Version Bible is inerrant, but as we've seen, it cannot be inerrant when the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts have errors in them. The KJV a great Bible, but it's not inerrant. I've found the New King James Version to be the best 'all around' Bible for accuracy and also readability.

No Bible, though, 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, though, the NKJV and the KJV do not properly bring out the meaning of the Greek in Hebrews 4:9, which speaks of Mosaic Law still being valid many years after the resurrection. 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 texts¹⁵ that are at fault—it's the bias of

¹¹ Every place in 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).

¹² F. C. Conybeare, *Textual Criticism of the New Testament*.

¹³ *Hibbert Journal*, 1902, Conybeare.

¹⁴ Conybeare (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 translators against Torah (Mosaic Law) in general, and the 7th day Sabbath in particular.¹⁶ Most other Bibles have ‘a *Sabbath rest* remains for the people of God,’ which is the way it reads in most every other Bible:

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

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

In Acts 12:4 the King James Version speaks of *Easter* (a pagan holy day 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)

Aside from the fact that Easter never comes *after* the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the NASB, as well as the ASV, HCSB, NASB, NET, NIV and NKJV, etc., has Passover.

There are basically two sets of Greek texts and they both have the same Greek word: *Pascha*, which is Greek for Passover. Did Passover and Easter mean the same thing to the KJV translators in 1611? Hardly. The KJV translators were trying to hide the Hebraic understanding of the passage, as they did with Hebrew 4:9. They were anti-Torah. 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, the *Textus Receptus* wasn’t at fault, the KJV was, but there is no English translation of the *Textus Receptus* other than the KJV. It is good for Bible students to have a few English Bibles to compare texts with, as well as the NU and *Textus Receptus* texts if they can read Greek. Having said all that, the KJV is a solid Bible—it’s just not inerrant.

¹⁵ The *Textus Receptus*, which is the basis for the KJV, 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 Bibles use, stems from the Alexandrian texts of the 4th century (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, about 331 AD). Just because the NU rests upon an older text does not mean that it’s a better text.

¹⁶ The Greek word *sabbatismos* is a technical term found in ancient literature for a *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 Haeereses* 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 believers. The KJV failed to bring that out with its ‘rest’ instead of *Sabbath rest*.

Revised on 17 June 2015.