




Original Aramaic proves beyond ANY doubt that Jesus is God

When reading the New Testament, one may become confused. There seems to be 'two people' who have divinity and both are called 'Lord'. Usually, 'LORD' and 'Lord' are used, to distinguish these 'two people'. True Christians who have the Holy Spirit (I will explain this later on, from Scripture), know that Jesus IS God, they know that these 'two people' are really just ONE, that Jesus is a manifestation of God, not a separate God/person/Lord.

Is this differentiation of 'LORD' and 'Lord' to refer to "God the Father" and "Jesus the Son" respectively, justified? It may well be in the Greek, as different words may be used in the Greek. But this is irrelevant, as the Greek texts are merely translations from the Peshitta. So we look to the Lamsa Bible, one of the more popular translations of the Peshitta. Unfortunately, the same distinction is there, 'LORD' and 'Lord' are used, to differentiate God from Jesus. However! Often the same word is used for 'LORD' as 'Lord'! Unfortunately, Lamsa, who was against the trinity and who tried to keep his version in line with the KJV, chose to translate the word for 'LORD' as 'Lord' (which is disastrous!) in verses where Jesus is being discussed. So basically, there are verses in the original New Testament, where no distinction is made between God and Jesus.

Jesus is MarYah

This word is 'MARYAH'. MarYah literally means Mar (Lord) Yah (name of God in the singular). YHWH, arguably Yahweh, is one of the names of God.  (MarYah) is a compound name made from  ("Lord") and  ("Yah", the accepted Aramaic shortened form of YHWH). YHWH is plural, while Yah is singular. Different groups of Judeans and other Semites in the time of Jesus, called God by different names/titles, and one of those was 'MarYah'.



In the Gospels of the original Aramaic Scriptures, 'MarYah' is often used to describe God. We know it refers to God, as historically that is one of the names He was called by, and in the Gospels, before Jesus' birth, we see often that God is referred to as 'MarYah'. Later on in the New Testament, 'MarYah' is used to describe God also.

Here's the crucial key omitted in the Greek: So is Jesus! In many verses of the New Testament, Jesus is called 'MarYah', a name ONLY used for God. These many verses are spread throughout the Scriptures too, not just centralised and caused by misunderstanding or some such. All the writers of the New Testament KNEW that Jesus is God, so it is not surprising to find Him being called 'MarYah' in many different books.

The Peshitta leaves NO DOUBT that Jesus was God Himself, manifest in the flesh. Now that you have had time to understand that 'the LORD' and 'the Lord' are the same 'person', the same God, let us examine some of the verses that call Jesus, 'MarYah', a name undisputedly used ONLY for God.

Luke2:11 of the Peshitta boldly declares that Jesus is Lord-Yah or LORD.

"For today in the city of David there has been born for you a Saviour, who is Lord-Yah the Messiah"

Other versions keep you guessing as to who the 'Lord' is. Even the Lamsa Bible which I find tremendously helpful and superior to the Greek-based Bibles, is not free from corruption. As stated above, when describing 'God the Father', Lamsa consistently translates the Aramaic word for LORD,  (MarYah), as 'LORD'. However, when the word refers to Jesus, he translates it as 'Lord', trying to show that they are two separate entities. The original Peshitta however states that Jesus is , the LORD.

Lamsa: "For this day is born to you in the city of David, a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord."

1Corinthians 8:6 To us there is one God, the Father, from whom comes every thing and by whom we live; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.

Examples (from the Lamsa translation) where Jesus is “d’MarYah”

The ‘d’ in “d’MarYah” is a proclitic, which is a prepositional phrase that attaches to the beginning of a word. It looks like it is part of the word, but it really isn't. The ‘d’ in “d’MarYah” can mean ‘of’, ‘that’, ‘which’, ‘who’ etc, based on the context. This is already accounted for in the translation, so as above, just replace the word ‘Lord’ with ‘LORD’ or even better (and more accurate), replace it with Lord-Yah. As ALL these verses refer to Jesus, when corrected, these verses have a whole new meaning!

Matthew 3:3 For it was he of whom it was said by the prophet Isaiah, The voice which cries in the wilderness, Prepare the way of the Lord, and straighten his highways.

Luke 3:4 As it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet, The voice which calls in the wilderness, Prepare the way of the Lord, make the paths of our God straight in the plain.

Acts 2:36 Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God has made this very Jesus, whom you have crucified, both Lord and Christ.

Acts 2:38 Then Simon said to them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of sins, so that you may receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

1Corinthians 11:27 Therefore whosoever shall eat of the Lord’s bread and drink of his cup unworthily shall be guilty of the blood and body of the Lord.

1Corinthians 11:29 For he who eats and drinks unworthily eats and drinks to his condemnation; for he does not discern the Lord’s body.

1Corinthians 12:3 Therefore I want you to understand that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calls Jesus accursed; and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Spirit.

Philippians 2:11 And every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is the Lord, to the glory of God his Father.

Jesus is Alaha

As if this revelation of MarYah were not enough, there is yet more. Ancient Hebrews often called God, “Elohim” (plural) or “Eloha” (singular). The Aramaic-speaking people often call God “Alaha”, the equivalent of the Hebrew Eloha.

Romans 9:5

KJV: “Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.”

NIV: “Theirs are the patriarchs, and from them is traced the human ancestry of Christ, who is God over all, forever praised! Amen.”

Note: Notice the irony here that the “trinity Bible” (it contains the Comma Johanneum), the KJV, plays with the grammar of the Greek, changing the meaning, while the NIV (often seen as opposing Jesus’ divinity) is true to the Greek and proclaims Jesus’ divinity.

From the Greek in Romans 9:5 (both Byzantine and Alexandrian), we get the impression that Jesus is God, as the word is θεος (theos). Groups like the Jehovah's Witnesses like to point out that theos/theon does not mean "the God", but "a god", thereby "proving" that Jesus is not God. This opens up a whole can of worms that is beyond the scope of this article (such as there being "one god"). The Aramaic sheds light on this verse, as always.

ܐܠܗܐ ܘܥܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܥܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܥܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܥܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ

The word translated as "theos" in the Greek, is ܐܠܗܐ, "Alaha". Once again, the Peshitta makes it clear that Jesus IS God.

Romans 9:5 (Peshitta, translated): "And from among them is seen/revealed the Messiah in the flesh, who is Alaha"

The Aramaic version of the book of Jude, is not as direct as Romans, but still shows that Jesus is Alaha. Here is the latter part of the verse:

ܐܠܗܐ ܘܥܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܥܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܥܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܘܥܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ

While talking about Alaha, it says that they: "deny he who is alone Lord Alaha and Lord Yeshua Messiah."

This clearly talks of one being who is "Lord Alaha" and "Lord Yeshua Messiah". This verse makes it clear that Jesus is Alaha.

The translations by Etheridge and Murdock agree:

Etheridge: "For certain men have obtained entrance, who from the beginning were proscribed in this condemnation; depraved men, who the grace of Aloha turn unto lasciviousness, and him who is the only Lord GOD, our Lord Jeshu Meshiha, deny."

Murdock: "For some have obtained entrance, who from the beginning were registered beforehand under this condemnation: wicked men, who pervert the grace of God to impurity, and deny him who is the only Lord God and our Lord, Jesus the Messiah."

Does the Greek make it so clear? No, the Greek allows for ambiguity (with the Alexandrian text omitting "God" altogether).

KJV: "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ."

NIV: "For certain men whose condemnation was written about long ago have secretly slipped in among you. They are godless men, who change the grace of our God into a license for immorality and deny Jesus Christ our only Sovereign and Lord."

Byzantine Greek: ...

και τον μονον δεσποτην θεον και κυριον ημων ιησουν χριστον αρνουμενοι

It approximately reads "... and denying the only master God and our Lord Jesus Christ"

Alexandrian Greek: ... και τον μονον δεσποτην και κυριον ημων ιησουν χριστον αρνουμενοι

It approximately reads: "... and denying the only master and our Lord Jesus Christ"

The Byzantine isn't as clear as the Aramaic in showing that Jesus is God. It is inescapable from the Aramaic. But the Alexandrian is even more guilty in omitting "God" altogether, leaving no possibility for an interpretation that Jesus is God.

The trinity and the Miltha

As for the topic of the trinity, like the oldest Greek texts, the Peshitta lacks the famous phrase (the Comma Johanneum) from 1John 5:7 of the KJV, "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." This was a later addition, as the earliest Greek and Aramaic NT manuscripts testify.

But there are far more intriguing ways in which the Peshitta deals with "trinity issues".

John 1:1 is probably one of the most misunderstood verses of the Bible.

John 1:1

KJV: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

NIV: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

Both trinitarian and "Oneness believers" claim this as proof that Jesus is God. This is clear in the Greek as well as the Aramaic. Both groups have markedly different interpretations of this verse which they use as support for their doctrine. Trinitarians believe that the verse shows that Jesus is another person from "God the Father", as the "Word" was WITH God, while also BEING God. A challenge faces the trinitarians though, in the rendering of "God". Both instances of "God" in the verse are the same word, "theos" in the Byzantine and Alexandrian Greek texts, and "Alaha" in the Peshitta. If they replace "God" with "God the Father", then John 1:1 states that Jesus (undisputedly, "the Word", as believed by both camps) is the Father, which would totally nullify the trinity doctrine. So, they can avoid that and replace "God" with "the trinity". This causes its own problems, as then you have "Jesus was with the trinity". This could mean that now there are four persons to the Godhead. You also would have "and Jesus was the trinity", meaning that Jesus is not only the Son, but also the Father and the Holy Spirit.

"Oneness believers" explain that the verse does not speak of different persons of God, rather of different manifestations of God. They hence avoid the problems that a trinitarian has, when faced with this verse. In reference to "and Jesus was the trinity", many Oneness believers have no problem, as they believe that Jesus is the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Their belief can be explained in detail by such passages as Christians being told the baptise in the name (one name, not two or more names) of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, while the Apostles in Acts, baptise in the name of Jesus so many times.

How does the Aramaic original affect this verse? While the Greek says "logos", "the Word", the Aramaic says "Miltha". Miltha is one of those words that are best left untranslated, as it has no equivalent in English. Some of its possible meanings include "Word", "substance" or "manifestation". The latter reading would seem to support the theory of the Oneness believers, as a manifestation can be "separate" and "same", simultaneously.