

TRUTH AND TRIMM
By Andrew Gabriel Roth

Over a long period of time, James Trimm has made a series of mis-statements regarding the Aramaic language and the Peshitta text that is derived from it. The purpose of these essays is to show those errors clearly for people who are interested in investigating his claims and who wish to judge his level of Aramaic understanding. Let us take these errors one at a time.

#2: Mis-statements about Crawford Revelation

Trimm:

The Crawford Aramaic version of Revelation is a very rare, little known version. How this manuscript made its way to Europe is unknown. What is known is that the manuscript was purchased by the Earl of Crawford around 1860. In the Earl of Crawford's possession the ms. Became catalogued Earl of Crawford's Haigh Hall, Wigan, no. 11. It has since come into the possession of the well-known John Rylands Library of Manchester, England. The manuscript contains the complete Peshitta text supplemented by the extra-Peshitta epistles, and this unique version of Revelation.

HRV, xxx

Truth:

- 1) Evidence of the actual age and provenance of Crawford is not unknown.
- 2) Trimm's methodology deliberately obscures several essential facts against his thesis that he clearly does not wish his readership to know about.
- 3) Certain errors Trimm makes cast doubt on the extent of his ability to translate Aramaic.
- 4) Some readings are taken verbatim out of Peshitto Revelation and are not unique to Crawford at all. Other "unique" Crawford readings that Trimm alleges are merely different ways of expressing the same thought, or the key word that Trimm alleges as primacy proof over the Greek is shared in both Aramaic versions.

Here we go on each point in their proper order:

Evidence of the actual age and provenance of Crawford is not unknown

Trimm begins his essay quite nicely, and does so in a style that seems open and honest. However, as with many things, it is what is *not said* that sometimes holds the key to true understanding. Take the statement "How this manuscript made its way to Europe is unknown" as an example. There is nothing untruthful in that fact at all. We don't know, as Trimm says, the exact year the manuscript found its way out of the Middle East. Nor do we know if it went to any intermediary countries before settling in Britain.

Although, my point is this: It is still possible to present even a series of facts in a deceptive manner. We can all, I'm sure, remember a certain powerful man of the recent past debating the definition of "is" or what constitutes "sexual relations", and it is in this spirit that Trimm's statement was crafted. It also takes a bit of work to unravel as well, as we will see right now.

You see, Trimm neglects to include any reference to known history about the environment that gave birth to Crawford. Instead, he simply leaves his statement hanging which, while being accurate on its face, nevertheless presents a false impression that Crawford is so mysterious that it could be close to an original autograph of Revelation, or at least an ancient copy of one. I mean, gee, we don't know how it got to Europe! Oh my! Why, it could have taken a steam ship in April (or was it October, since that could change our perspective of the facts)? The point then seems to be that, since it's a MYSTERY, it must therefore be so ancient as to come from the pen of Yochanan himself!

Instead, why not focus on what we do know about the manuscript, not the itinerary it may have taken in the 19th century? First of all, Revelation was one of five books never included in the Eastern Peshitta canon, and so the Aramaic copies that have come down to us are translations from Greek sources. In the year 508, Philoxenus of Madbug did the first translation of Revelation into Aramaic for his Syrian Orthodox Church, an ancient body that had just aligned itself with Rome and changed their canon to reflect their new allegiance. However, Philoxenus' work was hated and very quickly fell out of favor, resulting in the Harkalean revision of 616, which is the current accepted version of the Syrian Orthodox Church to this day. Also, due to the Syrian Orthodox Church's alteration of their Aramaic dialect, the name of their New Testament is "Peshitto", so as not to confuse it with the older "Peshitta" preserved in the East.¹

As a result, no Aramaic manuscript of Revelation existed before the sixth century, and this is according to the records of the Church that actually changed their canon to include it in the first place! We know why it was done, when it was done, and who did it.

Now Trimm will no doubt argue that Crawford is different, the "unique and little known version" as he says, tucked away like the seventh seal awaiting the Lamb to open it up. Well James, I've got news for you,. Crawford is different, but not the way you want it to be. In fact, Crawford is LATER than the earliest copies of Peshitto Revelation.

This is what the John Rylands Library had to say about the manuscript:

Fol. 250b has a colophon also not all legible, in a Serto hand...

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, p. 119

Let's stop here for the moment so I can relate two key facts. First, the *colophon* is a kind of a bookmark that is kept with the manuscript, and it is used to tell us the author, age, and location of the document it is attached to. Now, while Rylands says it is not completely legible, what follows will be what they can clearly read from it.

However, a second key point is the notation that the colophon is in serto script, a vowel-pointed system not developed until at least the fifth or sixth century. While this is also about the time of the split of the Church of the East and the Syrian Orthodox Church due to the Councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451), an older script, called Estrangela, was also used in colphons and special headings on religious documents. Therefore, the Syrian Orthodox Church still sometimes uses Estrangela, the script the Eastern Peshitta is preserved in. Although, the fact that even the colophon was then put in Serto shows it to come from a later time, when that script had more influence.

With this basic foundation established, we can now continue:

The scribe was Stephen, a monk of the monastery of Mar Jacob the recluse of Egypt and Mar Barshabba near Salah in Tur 'Abdin. He mentions the names of some of his relatives and his teachers...

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, p. 119

So, while we don't know exactly when the manuscript came to Europe, we sure as heck know a lot about where it came from and can check the history and circumstances of its production. These facts, along with internal evidence in the text itself, caused the Rylands Library to conclude:

On the date of the manuscript see Gwynn, *Apocalypse*, where it is argued to be the end of the 12th century.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, p. 119

Now let us go on to the next related point.

Here is what Trimm wrote in his free textual criticism book about his "method of analysis".

Chapter 6, page 1 "Free Textual Criticism Book"

Certain errors Trimm makes cast doubt on the extent of his ability to translate Aramaic

Footnote to Revelation 1:11 in HRV, 536

1. **အသုံးပြုသူများ၏ အသုံးပြုမှုကို စောင့်ကြည့်ခြင်း**
 2. **အသုံးပြုမှုကို စောင့်ကြည့်ခြင်း**

The highlighted word tells the answer in no uncertain terms. It is transliterated as W'L'ZMORNA, otherwise known as "and to Smyrna".

Why did James miss it? I believe that two factors were involved in his error. First, the use of two proclitics preceding the word may have thrown him off. In this case, the letters W and L are not really part of the word but instead are those prepositional phrases I mentioned before, meaning "and" and "of", respectively. However, if the translator does not account for this the words can look strange, even unintelligible, as it appears to have been in this case.

The second issue may have to do with the spelling of the word itself. You see, if James was thinking in Hebrew, he would have expected to see "Smyrna" spelled with a *samekh* (ס) at the beginning. Now however, with two proclitics "blocking" his view, the next letter is not a *samekh* but a *zayin* (ז) instead. The substitution of the letter then had more to do with differences between the Hebrew dialect Trimm was fairly familiar with and the Aramaic dialect of Crawford, which he clearly was not. It is simply an error that no Aramaic scholar should ever make. Finally, of course, Peshitto Revelation contains the exact same reading.

Also I have to note here that Trimm says "and OF Smyrna" is not in the text, when what Crawford really reads is "and TO Smyrna", meaning that even if he did see the proclitics he still would have gotten one of their meanings wrong!

Another reading that showcases a lack of Aramaic understanding is found here:

Trimm:

10:11

Crawford: ...the nations and peoples and the tongues of many **kingdoms**...(ܡܠܟܐ)

The Aramaic word **ܡܠܟܐ** usually means "kings" but less often means "kingdoms". The Greek translator mistakenly took the most common meaning mistranslating here with "kings" while the Aramaic in context clearly means "kingdoms".

Truth:

Here is yet another basic error Trimm makes, and on one of the most common words in the entire New Testament yet! However, again the heart of his theory is that only Crawford has this reading, so first let's see if this idea is correct and then we will look at what the text says:

ܐܡܪ ܠܝ ܙܕܩ ܠܢ ܬܒ ܠܡܬܢܒܝܝܐ ܐܝܠ ܐܝܡܡܐ ܐܝܠ ܐܡܪܬܐ ܐܝܠܝܫܢܐ ܐܝܠܡܠܟܐ ܣܓܝܝܐ

Amar li **zadaq** lan tob l'matanabiyo **ail aimma w'ail amorta** w'lishana w'malka sagiya
(Peshitto Revelation)³

ܐܡܪ ܠܝ ܝܗܝܒ ܠܢ ܬܒ ܠܡܬܢܒܝܝܐ ܐܝܠ ܐܝܡܡܐ ܐܝܠܡܠܟܐ ܐܝܠܝܫܢܐ ܐܝܠܡܠܟܐ ܣܓܝܝܐ

Amar li **yehib** lan tob l'matanabiyo **ail aimma w'amorta** w'lishana w'malka sagiya
(Crawford)

These readings, once again, are almost identical. The only differences in fact between them are a substitution of one synonym for another and a variant grammatical structure that means the exact same thing either way. That meaning, is also well reflected in the basic NIV rendering:

Then I was told, "You must prophesy again about many peoples, nations, languages and kings."


Now notice this construction in the Aramaic, which closely parallels the above reading: people AND nations (aimma w'amorta) AND languages (w'lishana) AND kings (w'malka). The W proclitic can only

mean "and", although admittedly sometimes a translator will elect to render it as a few other things to improve syntactical flow and avoid almost every phrase starting with "and". In any case, it does not mean what Trimm says it does in his reading, "the nations and peoples and tongues of **many kingdoms**"!

The fact is, "of"--there's that pesky Dalet Clause again!--does not appear in either version of the text! Neither does the word "many", which is simply inserted for effect. Granted the verse is in the plural, so it could be "many", but that is Trimm's reading into the text with that assumption. My rule is this: If you don't see it, don't say it. Or, if you do, at least have the decency to put implied meanings like "many" in parentheses or italics.

But perhaps the most troublesome error is what I alluded to at the beginning, getting wrong the meaning of a very common word, *malika*. I almost cringe at having to refute at such a basic level, to be honest, as it is akin to telling a world class mathematician that he is wrong in his assertion of $2 + 2$ equaling 5. However, if this is what it takes to find the truth, so be it.

Here is the word for "king", according to Aramaic Lexicon done by Dr. George A. Kiraz at the Syriac Computing Institute:

Word:  Lexeme:  Root:  Word Number: **11956** Meaning:
king **Pronunciation:** (Eastern) B'MaLK'eA
(Western) B'MaLK'eA **Part of Speech:** Noun **Gender:** **Masculine** **Person:** Number: Plural
State: Emphatic **Tense:** Form: Suffix **Gender:** Suffix **Person:** Suffix **Number:** Singular
Lexeme Form: PEAL

And here is the word for "kingdom" according to the same source:

Word:  Lexeme:  Root:  Word Number: **11982**
Meaning: kingdom **Pronunciation:** (Eastern) B'MaLK'uOT,
(Western) B'MaLK'uOT, **Part of Speech:** Noun **Gender:** **Feminine** **Person:** Number: Singular
State: Construct **Tense:** Form: Suffix **Gender:** Suffix **Person:** Suffix **Number:** Singular
Lexeme Form: PEAL

Now let me draw your attention to the "Word" section. The reader may notice there that the example given for both words starts with a B (ב), but this is because the Lexicon shows all the places where the word appears, and this just happens to be one of those conjugations. In other words, that section simply shows how the word is altered in a passage of text, whereas the "Lexeme" shows the "neutral" form of the word, without a conjugation.

Notice also that while the roots are the same, meaning "to rule", the gender of the two words is different. So *malika* (king) will always be masculine and *malikuta* (kingdom) is always feminine.⁴ Hence, there is no way to interchange the two, and Trimm's claim that *malika* can sometimes mean "kingdoms" is patently false and absurd.⁵

The fact is, Aramaic has ways of taking an object (kingdom), only to "strip it down", or reduce it down to its root, and finally re-conjugate it into a form that means a person (king). The two forms then that separate a root turned into a person and one turned into an object could not be more discernible, assuming of course that person is aware of these basic rules to begin with! English of course does this as well, as we understand that "king" refers to a person and "kingdom" literally is contracting "king's domain". Similarly, we can see throughout the Peshitta text hundreds of examples that show us this difference easily, such as this one:

Word: ܠܚܡܐ Lexeme: ܠܚܡܐ Root: ܠܚܡ Word Number: 15019 Meaning:

servant **Pronunciation:** (Eastern) D'EaB,D'aA
(Western) D'EaB,D'oA **Part of Speech:** Noun **Gender:** Masculine **Person:** Number: Singular
State: Emphatic **Tense:** Form: Suffix **Gender:** Suffix **Person:** Suffix **Number:** Singular
Lexeme Form: PEAL

Here is the same pattern, indicating that this is a person, a servant or slave. Now, if I were to then reduce it to its root and then conjugate it upwards to a term or object like "slavery" or "bondage", this is how it would come out:

Word: ܠܚܡܐ Lexeme: ܠܚܡܐ Root: ܠܚܡ Word Number: 15088

Meaning: bondage **Pronunciation:** (Eastern) D'EaB,D'uOT,aA
(Western) D'EaB,D'uOT,oA **Part of Speech:** Noun **Gender:** Feminine **Person:** Number:
Singular **State:** Emphatic **Tense:** Form: Suffix **Gender:** Suffix **Person:** Suffix **Number:**
Singular **Lexeme Form:** PEAL

Now I think the reader understands why I said it's painful to have to point something so elementary out, and it horrifies me to think that such a person has endeavored to translate the entire New Testament while being unaware of these forms!

Some readings are taken verbatim out of Peshitto Revelation and are not unique to Crawford at all. Other "unique" Crawford readings that Trimm alleges are merely different ways of expressing the same thought, or the key word that Trimm alleges as primacy proof over the Greek is shared in both Aramaic versions.

Trimm:

2:22

Crawford: ...I will cast her onto a *coffin* (ܥܪܨܐ)...

Greek: ...I will cast her into the *bed*...

The Aramaic word ܥܪܨܐ is ambiguous. It can mean "bed" as the Greek translator mistakenly took it, or it can mean "coffin" (as in the Aramaic of Luke 7:14 and Targum Jonathan 2 Samuel 3:31). Here it actually means "coffin".

Truth:

Trimm is correct about the word in question. However, here is what he does not say:

Crawford:

ܠܚܡܐ ܠܚܡܐ ܠܚܡܐ

Haw rama ana leh b'airsa

Peshitto Revelation:

ܠܚܡܐ ܠܚܡܐ ܠܚܡܐ

Haw rama ana leh b'airsa

These are identical! As a result, it is clearly to his advantage that James does not include Peshitto Revelation. If he did, then the reader might think Crawford was also a translation from the Greek!⁶

Trimm:

4:8

Crawford: ...six wings filled round about, and from within, with eyes...
(שתא נפין הודרנאית ומן לנו מלין עינא)

The Greek translator mistranslates the passage:

"...six wings about [him]; and [they were] full of eyes within..."

Truth:

Let's see what Peshitto Revelation says, and this time I will use Hebrew letters:

שתא נפין הודרנאית ומן לנו מלין עינא

Once again the two sources are identical. Also, the variance between the Greek and the Aramaic is so minor as to make it impossible to posit one as an original reading over the other. Instead, the variance more closely resembles the slightly different ways that two languages will express the same thought.

Trimm:

5:5

Crawford: ...the root of David, *is worthy* (זכא) ...

The word זכא is ambiguous and can mean "is worthy"; "is innocent" or "has overcome/conquered/been victorious". The Greek translator misunderstood the word to mean "has conquered" (ἐνίκησεν).

Truth:

Again, I am willing to acknowledge that this word means what Trimm says it does. I also think, given the context of Revelation 5:2, that "worthy" is possibly the better reading.

However, having said that, I still have to turn to what the translated Peshitto Revelation text says:

הא זכא אריא דמן שרבתא דיהודא דהו עקרא דדויד

Notice that it is the exact same thought, with זכא, used in the exact same context with the tribe of Judah and the root of David. So, is Peshitto Revelation, with this reading, supposed to be superior to the Greek? Again, I don't think so, and what is true for that document then must also be true of Crawford.

Trimm:

10:1

Crawford: ...*and his legs* like pillars of fire... (ורגלודי)

Greek: ... his *feet* like pillars of fire...

The Aramaic רגל can mean "foot" but less often "leg" but in this case the context demands "legs" (being like "pillars") The Greek translator was apparently unaware of this less common meaning and took the phrase to refer to "his feet".

Truth:

Again, it is possible Trimm is correct. On the other hand, the other side also has a good argument. We could say, for example, that the base of these fiery pillars actually does look like feet, as opposed to looking up at the whole structure, which could resemble legs. The fact that the shape is outlined by fire would tend to support the Greek reading, with jets of flame resembling extremities in the feet.

Also, if the Greek were the original text, we could easily see how "feet" would get translated into רגליוהי, rather than the other way around, since the Aramaic word means both "feet" and "legs", as Trimm also stated.

Finally, Peshitto Revelation again has the same reading:

ורגליוהי איך עמודא דנורא (Crawford)
ורגליוהי איך נמורא דנורא (Peshitto)

As the reader can see, the only difference is a scribal error in Crawford, which has עמודא rather than נמורא. The Hebrew fonts I am using don't really showcase the confusion well. However in Aramaic script the difference between a *gimel* (ג) and an *ayin* (א) is a lot subtler. Allowing for variations in individual scribes, it is easy to see how one might be mistaken for the other.

Now though let's move on to Trimm's favorite proof:

Trimm:

18:5

Crawford: Because her sins *have reached* (רדבקן) up to heaven...

Greek (literally): Because her sins *have stuck* (εκολληθησαν) (?!?!?!?) to heaven...

This may well be the plainest and most obvious evidence that the Greek Revelation is a translation from the Crawford Aramaic.

The Hebrew/Aramaic word רבך usually means "stick to" and is generally rendered in the LXX with Greek κολλασηαι. However, the word רדבקן has a much broader meaning than its Greek counterpart, and can also mean "overtake" or "reach". Similarly we read in Zech. 14:5:

Hebrew: the valley of the mountains *shall reach* (רבך) to Azel

LXX Greek: the valley of the mountains *shall stick* (εγκολληθησεται) to Azel

Thus the translator of the LXX makes the same mistake by translating רבך with κολλασηαι even though its meaning is not "stick" but "reach".

Truth:

It is at this point that Trimm reveals his true colors and says outright that he believes that Crawford is the original source for a mistranslated Greek Revelation. He does this because, again, he does not think his readership will check on the facts related in this essay concerning the origin, antiquity (or lack thereof) and circumstances behind Crawford's creation. If statements like "how it came to Europe is unknown" are allowed to stand, then Trimm generates the mystery to the level required to make the rest of what he is saying plausible.

Remember though what Rylands said, **Crawford is a thousand years younger than the Greek manuscripts that it is supposed to pre-date**. The other consistent and vexing piece of evidence that Trimm continually ignores is this:

ⲙⲓⲧⲓⲗ ⲉⲃⲉⲃⲁⲕⲁⲱ ⲕⲁⲧⲉⲧⲓⲕⲓⲁ ⲁⲓⲉⲙⲁ ⲓⲥⲙⲁⲱ ⲱⲁⲧⲉⲕⲁⲣ Ⲁⲗⲁⲏⲁ ⲓⲁⲓⲟⲗⲓⲕ

Mittil d'debaqaw khatehah aidma l'shmaya w'atdekar Alaha laioliḥ

(Peshitto Revelation 18:5)

ⲙⲓⲧⲓⲗ ⲉⲃⲉⲃⲁⲕⲁⲱ ⲕⲁⲧⲉⲧⲓⲕⲓⲁ ⲁⲓⲉⲙⲁ ⲓⲥⲙⲁⲱ ⲱⲁⲧⲉⲕⲁⲣ Ⲁⲗⲁⲏⲁ ⲓⲁⲓⲟⲗⲓⲕ

(Crawford Revelation)

Mittil d'debaqaw khatehah aidma l'shmaya w'atdekar Alaha laioliḥ

(Crawford Revelation 18:5)

So, once again we have identical readings in Peshitto and Crawford Revelation. And yet, once again, Trimm acts as if this is not the case and posits that while Peshitto Revelation is translated from Greek, Crawford is the source of the Greek! If so, it is most interesting that identical word for word agreements exist from "original Crawford" and into Peshitto Revelation even after the latter had to go through the prism of a Greek version in order to get there!

The other part of Trimm's argument is also deeply flawed, as we will see from the Hebrew text of Zechariah 14:5:

וְנִסְתָּם יָאֵר הָרִי כִּי־יָגִיעַ גִּי־הָרִים
 אֶל־אֶצֶל וְנִסְתָּם כְּאֲשֶׁר וְנִסְתָּם מִפְּנֵי הָרָעַשׁ
 בַּיּוֹם עֲזִיָּה מֶלֶךְ־יְהוּדָה וּבָא יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי
 כָּל־קְדָשִׁים עִמָּךְ

Notice anything missing? How about Trimm's word דָּבַק? Instead, this is what Strong's Exhaustive Concordance had to say about the word in this verse that does mean "reach":

Hebrew Word: נָגַע

Transliterated Word: **naga`**

Book to Display: **Zechariah**

Zechariah 14:5: And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall **reach** unto Azal: yea, ye shall flee, like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah: and the LORD my God shall come, and all the saints with thee.

Definition

1. to touch, reach, strike
 - a. (Qal)
 1. to touch
 2. to strike
 3. to reach, extend to
 4. to be stricken 1a
 - b. stricken (participle)
 - c. (Niphal) to be stricken, be defeated
 - d. (Piel) to strike
 - e. (Pual) to be stricken (by disease)
 - f. (Hiphil) to cause to touch, reach, approach, arrive
 1. to cause to touch, apply

2. to reach, extend, attain, arrive, come
3. to approach (of time)
4. to befall (of fate)

To be absolutely fair though, let us just chalk this one up as a simple error, since maybe James meant another verse. Here is one place where the word he intends does appear:

וְנָתַתִּי חַחִיִּים בְּלַחֲיֶיךָ וְהִדְבַּקְתִּי דָגַת־יָאֲרֵיךְ
בְּשִׁשְׁשִׁתֶּיךָ וְהֵעֲלִיתִיךָ מִתּוֹךְ יָאֲרֵיךְ וְאֵת
כָּל־דָּגַת יָאֲרֵיךְ בְּשִׁשְׁשִׁתֶּיךָ תִּדְבֹּק

But I will put hooks in thy jaws, and I will cause the fish of thy rivers to **stick** unto thy scales, and I will bring thee up out of the midst of thy rivers, and all the fish of thy rivers shall **stick** unto thy scales.

Ezekiel 29:4

And yes, it does have these meanings:

Strong's Number: 01692 [Browse Lexicon](#)

Original Word	Word Origin
דבק	a primitive root
Transliterated Word	TDNT Entry
Dabaq	TWOT - 398



Phonetic Spelling	Parts of Speech
daw-bak' /cgi-bin/lexicon.pl?id=1692h/cgi-bin/lexicon.pl?id=1692h	Verb

Definition

2. to cling, stick, stay close, cleave, keep close, stick to, stick with, follow closely, join to, overtake, catch
 - a. (Qal)
 1. to cling, cleave to
 2. to stay with
 - b. (Pual) to be joined together
 - c. (Hiphil)
 1. to cause to cleave to
 2. to pursue closely
 3. to overtake
 - d. (Hophal) to be made to cleave

However, this is far from proving that Crawford has the original reading! Again, Peshitto Revelation also has this word, and we know it was translated from the Greek, so where does that leave us?

Well, according to the [Greek-English Interlinear New Testament, UBS 4th Edition, Nestle-Aland 26th Edition](#), page 897, the verse should actually read in Greek word order this way:

ὅτι ἐκολλήθησαν αὐτῆς αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἄχρι

Because were **piled up** her sins (reaching) up to heaven.

After that, I think it is easy to see how everything Trimm said could also work in reverse. That is to say, "piled up" rather than "stuck to" was the original and intended meaning in the Greek, and this got rendered

into the best equivalent in Aramaic there was, ܕܒܩ, on two separate occasions. It is surely not the smoking gun Trimm alleges it to be. The fact is, even if he is right here, which I sincerely doubt, the best he can show is that ܕܒܩ might have been an original Aramaic reading to the lost Nazarene Revelation, that just happened to get preserved in the Peshitto and Crawford versions anywhere from five to ten centuries after the fact. Reason being, the very same markers that make it crystal clear that Peshitto Revelation is translated from the Greek exist in copious amounts in the Crawford text as well! That is why he does not want to compare them, because the evidence against him will hit too close to home.

Conclusion:

There are other lines of evidence that Trimm proffers in his Crawford Revelation essay as proof of its originality, but I believe the ones given here are sufficient to keep this article to a manageable length. The ones that I have left out of this analysis are either those which speak well to a principle well-covered here by another series of passages, or are simply too ridiculous to take the time and effort to discuss.

In general though, what I believe can be stated with certainty is that Trimm has engaged in methods that either ignore the basics of the Aramaic language, or exclude key details to leave a false impression on the reader. He has not bothered to check his facts, and has simply gravitated to either the explanation or potential definition that suits him, regardless as to whether such a choice fits in with other rules relevant to the issue at hand. All in all, I find such tactics deceptive and reprehensible. For these reasons, and many others, I concur with the opinion of my friend and colleague Paul Younan, who is also a native Aramaic speaker. Paul wrote:

To be completely honest with you, I find it very annoying to argue with someone who can't even speak Aramaic, about Aramaic. James Trimm is a student. He learned whatever little he knows from reading books. That's not a bad thing. What is bad is when he sets himself up as some sort of authority on the topic, which he is not. What's worse is that he insists on arguing with me about the meaning of words he has no clue about, about a language that is completely foreign to him and that he can't even hold a 30-second discussion in, face-to-face.

James Trimm is a person of Scottish lineage. His family background is deep southern U.S. Protestant Christian, not Jewish.

Furthermore, James Trimm has absolutely no credentials to be calling himself a "Dr.", and you shouldn't address him as such, either. That gives people the wrong impression, but that's your choice.

Nobody who really knows a spit of Aramaic pays any attention to him, as Dr. Kiraz will attest to you. I will be here to answer any questions you need me for, but realize that I have serious qualms about giving him any more undeserved attention than he already gets.

"Dr. Trimm on AramaicNT.org", June 8, 2003

Peace and blessings,

Andrew Gabriel Roth

¹ For a full accounting of this see Lamsa, The Modern New Testament from the Aramaic, (1998, Aramaic Bible Society reprint), p. v-xvi.

² All Crawford Revelation citations are from The Apocalypse of St. John in a Syriac Version Hitherto Unknown, by John Gwynn (1897).

³ The source for all Peshitto Revelation quotes is The New Covenant Aramaic Peshitta Text with Hebrew Translation (Aramaic Scriptures Research Society in Israel), Jerusalem: 1986.

⁴ In every instance of the word for "kingdom" the gender is listed as feminine in the Lexicon previously mentioned. The reader is encouraged to check this assertion of mine out for themselves by going to www.peshitta.org, clicking on "Tools", and then "Lexicon". A blank rectangular window will come up, and from there all anyone has to do is type "kingdom". Now in some cases another category, called "suffix gender" will list the word as masculine, but this is a separate issue from the word and the root that I am discussing here. While these Aramaic rules can get a bit confusing, the gist for our purposes here is that a word which is considered grammatically feminine can be given a masculine ending to indicate possession by a male. Since kings are men, their kingdom is given a masculine ending to match their gender. In any case, my original point stands, in that no one who knows Aramaic is going to confuse "king" for "kingdom" nor allege that one can mean the other.

⁵ In fact, the only way "king" becomes feminine is by attaching the ending ܐܬܐ (-ta), which would in effect turn it into another word, meaning "queen"!

⁶ To be fair to James however, let me say that I agree that this evidence may point to an earlier Aramaic version. The difference is though I do not believe Crawford is that version. Rather, it seems that the Nazarene Aramaic Revelation, if it did exist at one time, may have passed small evidences of its presence on to both the Aramaic and Greek renditions that managed to survive after it. This reading in particular has always been one of the best examples found, but the reader must still bear in mind that it is not unique to Crawford, as James would like them to believe.