



The following supposed 15 contradictions of the Holy Bible were anonymously submitted to the Coptic Orthodox Diocese of the Southern United States website attempting to dispute the validity of the Holy Bible.

Propaganda or Sound Doctrine?

The verses of the Holy Bible should always be understood in light of the original language, by which the Holy Bible was written, and in perspective of the people, geography, customs and traditions, which existed at that time.



St Matthew

Contradiction #1

In pseudo-Mark [1:11], the so-called Christian god addresses mythical Jesus. In pseudo-Matthew [3:17], the so-called Christian god addresses the crowd.



St Mark

Response:

By reading the original version of the Holy Gospel of St Matthew (3:17), the Holy Gospel of St Luke (3:22) and the Holy Gospel of St Mark (1:11), you will observe that both Gospel writers, St Mark and St Luke used the subject pronoun in their mention of the story of The Lord Jesus baptism so they used the pronoun (you) after the quotation mark as they mention what occurred in the story (This is called addressing of idea by the same direct speech), for example when I say, the teacher said to his son (you are my son, in you I am pleased). While St Matthew used the object pronoun mentioned in the same story as he directed his story to the people to whom he wrote his Holy Gospel, he didn't use quotation marks as he mentioned the story by using the object pronoun (which is called addressing of idea by indirect speech) like when I say the teacher talked to his son saying he is a good son and in him he is pleased. In Hebrew language by which St Matthew wrote his Holy Gospel the signís noun (e.g., this) and object pronoun (e.g., he) are used interchangeably. So no contradiction is present between either of the verses.

Contradiction #2

In pseudo-Mark [1:12-13], mythical Jesus went immediately after His baptism into the wilderness where Satan tempted Him for forty days. Pseudo-John [1:35-51; 2:1] denies this by describing the call of the disciples

and the wedding at Cana, all of which take place immediately after the baptism.

Response:

There is no relation between the two incidents mentioned in the Holy Gospel of St Mark (1:12-13) and what is mentioned in the Holy Gospel of St John (1:35-51; 2:1).



St Mark

First, St Mark (1:12-13) mentioned the baptism of the Lord Jesus Christ and immediately after the baptism the Spirit drove Him into the wilderness where He was tempted by Satan for forty days so the relation here is between the baptism and immediate temptations.

While in the Holy Gospel of St John (1:35-51; 2:1) there is no mention at all of the baptism of the Lord Jesus Christ but only the Baptistís response to a question from the people sent by the Pharisees asking the saint (Why then do you baptize?) and as it appears clearly from the text, there is no relation between this incident and the baptism of the Lord Jesus Christ. Further, this appeared to have happened a long time following the baptism of the Lord Jesus Christ as evidenced by the next day following this incident St John the Baptist saw the Lord Jesus Christ and mentioned in his testimony to the Lord Jesus what he saw during the baptizing of the Lord Jesus Christ (And St John bore witness, saying; *I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and He remained upon Him.* John 1:32). Emphasizing that this incident surely happened after the baptism of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The first meeting of the three disciples (St John, St Andrew, and St Peter) with the Lord Jesus Christ happened on the next day from the Baptistís testimony to the Lord Jesus Christ and on the next day following this meeting of St John, St Andrew, and St Peter with the Lord Jesus Christ, St Philip and Nathaniel met the Lord Jesus Christ. And on the third day from the



testimony of St John the Baptist to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord Jesus, His mother and His disciples were invited to the Wedding of Cana of Galilee.

According to this there is no relation between the baptism of the Lord Jesus Christ and His temptations by Satan which happened immediately after His Baptism to the first meeting with the Disciples and the invitation to the Wedding of Cana which happened after the Baptist's testimony to the Lord Jesus Christ which happened a long time after the Lord Jesus Christ's baptism. So there is no contradiction between the Holy Gospel of St Mark 1:12-13 and the Holy Gospel of St John (1:35-51; 2:1).

Contradiction #3

In pseudo-Mark [1:14-16], John the Baptist is imprisoned before Peter and Andrew are called. †In pseudo-John [1:40; 3:22-24], the order is reversed.



St John

Response:

As I explained in the contradiction # 2 the first meeting between the Lord Jesus Christ and 3 of His disciples (St John, St Andrew and St Peter) happened on the next day of the Baptist's testimony to the Lord Jesus Christ and it is well known that 2 out of these 3 disciples (St John and St Andrew) were disciples of the Baptist prior to being disciples for the Lord Jesus Christ (John 1:35-42 and 3:22-24). For sometime, these disciples followed the Lord Jesus Christ but at the same time were involved in their jobs as well (not completely following the Lord Jesus Christ).

Later on, after the imprisonment of St John the Baptist, while the Lord Jesus was in the boat of St Peter, He performed the miracle of catching too much fish and so St Peter confessed to the Lord Jesus (iDepart from me, for I am a sinful man.î Luke 5:8), the Lord Jesus Christ called St Peter, St Andrew, St John, and St James the Less for service and complete following (Mark 1: 14-16, Luke 5:1-11, and Matthew 4:18-22). So St Luke said in 5:11 iSo when they had brought their boats to land, they

forsook all and followed Himî which meant they were totally devoted to following the Lord Jesus Christ.

In conclusion, the first meeting of the chosen disciples with the Lord Jesus Christ happened before imprisonment of St John the Baptist (John 1:35-42 and 3:22-24) but the complete call for the service and total following of the Lord Jesus Christ happened after imprisonment of St John the Baptist (Mark1: 14-16, Luke 5:1-11, and Matthew 4:18-22). Therefore, there is no contradiction between the Holy Gospel of St Mark 1:14-16 and the Holy Gospel of St John 1:40 and 3:22-24.

Contradiction #4

In pseudo-Mark [2:26], mythical Jesus says the high priest is Abiathar. In pseudo-1 Samuel [21:1], the high priest is Abimelech.



St Mark

Response:

A careful examination of the Holy Gospel of St Mark 2:26 reveals that the Lord Jesus Christ did not actually imply that Abiathar was already the high priest at the time of David's visit. He simply said, iEpi Abiathar archiereosî, which means isooner or following in the time of Abiathar who became the high priest.î As things turned out, bloody King Saul soon had Abimelech and the entire priestly community of Nob massacred by Doeg the Edomite (1 Sam 22: 18-19); and Abiathar the son of Abimelech was the only one fortunate enough to escape. He fled to join David and served as his priest all through David's years of wandering and exile. Naturally he was appointed high priest by David after David became king, and he shared high priesthood with Zadok, Saul's appointee, until David's death. Under these circumstances it was perfectly proper to refer to Abiathar as the high priest ñ even though his appointment as such came somewhat later, after the incident at Nob ñ just as it would be proper to introduce an anecdote by saying; iNow when King David was a shepherd boyî, even though David was not actually a king at the time he was a shepherd boy.



Again the statement *ìEpi Abiathar archiereosì* means at that time Abiathar who very shortly afterward became the high priest was actually present. Also, it is well known that Abiathar shared his father's, Abimelech, priesthood. In conclusion; the Holy Book of 1 Samuel 21:1 refers to the actual high priest at that time while the Holy Gospel of St Mark 2:26 refers to actual presence of Abiathar at the occurrence of the incident and shortly thereafter became the high priest. The most important evidence which supports this is the Pharisees when hearing the Lord Jesus didn't argue or make known a mistake as they understood His statement technically and logically right according to the language's grammar and sentence structure as I mentioned in this explanation. So no contradiction is present between either of the verses.



St Mark

Contradiction #5

In pseudo-Mark [3:11], the spirits who confess mythical Jesus as Son of God are unclean. †In pseudo-1 John [4:2], all such spirits are of god. The god makes unclean



St John

spirits, the kinds who were unfairly driven into the 2000 pigs and ran off a cliff to drown [Mythical Jesus unjustly took away the livelihood of the herder without paying for the pigs.]

Response:

By careful examination of the Holy Gospel of St Mark (3:11), the word *ìspiritsì* refers to demons or devil spirits which were first created by God in a state of holiness and purity with high power and a high state of spiritual knowledge but because of the sin of pride they didn't keep their rank and fell down and became demons who tempted man every time to have him away from God, so it was not surprise that these spirits knew their Creator (because of their sin they lost their ranks but not their knowledge nor power) and confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is THE Son of God which is one of the evidence

of Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. While in the Holy Book of 1 John (4:2) the word *ìspiritsì* doesn't mean spirits as creation but it means spirit of teaching, in another word the doctrines of teaching. The Apostle said (Don't be led by every spirit of teaching), and also St Paul in the Holy Book of 1 Timothy 4:1 (In latter times some will depart from faith, giving heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines of demons). So now it is clear there is difference in the meaning of spirits in both verses, in the Holy Gospel of St Mark (3:11) it means demons who are one of God's creations, while in the Holy Book of 1 John (4:2) it means doctrines of teaching, so if this doctrine of teaching agrees that the Lord Jesus Christ is THE Son of God it means that teaching is from God while if it disagrees with this fact it means it is not from God. You should know also, the word *ìspiritì* in Greek (the language of most of the New Testament writings) can refer to the Spirit of God, spirit of man, soul, wind, and doctrine of teaching, and its meaning can be understood from its position in the verse. According to this no contradiction is present between both verses.

In the story of permission given by the Lord Jesus Christ for the unclean spirits and death of the pigs by drowning in water, several points should be understood. The pigs according to the Law of Moses are unclean animals and the spirits also were unclean so it is no surprise that the spirits went into the pigs. According to the Law of Moses, the herdsmen were sinners as they disobeyed the Law and raised these pigs so they deserved this punishment. The Lord Jesus Christ cared first about the demonized men who were certainly valued more than pigs. The Lord Jesus Christ wanted to give a practical explanation for the work of demons in the life of man, demons want to destroy the life of man and put him to death, so it was a practical explanation for the end of those who follow demons. The Lord Jesus Christ didn't order the demons' spirits to kill the pigs, but only permitted them to enter the pigs but what was to happen later was only due to the devil work of demons and not due to the Lord Jesus' non-mercy and severity.



St Mark

Contradiction #6

In pseudo-Mark [4:31], mythical Jesus claims the mustard seed is the smallest. We know the smallest seed is that of the orchid. †Why did the so-called god incarnate not know that?

Response:

By careful examination of text (Mark 4:31) you should observe that the adjective is in the second order (smaller) and not in the third order (smallest) and so as it is smaller, this means that there are other seeds smaller than mustard. Second, you should know that mustard seeds were very common at the time of the Lord Jesus in the land of Israel as it grew abundantly there, so Jews were very familiar with these seeds and at that time were the smallest seeds known, while orchid seed (yes, it is smaller than mustard seed) only known 1500 years after the Lord Jesus Christ in South and North Americas and of course, were not known at the time of the Lord Jesus Christ in the East nor in the land of Israel. So, it was not logical that the Lord Jesus Christ mentioned orchid instead of mustard because Jews would not know what He meant as they didn't know orchid seeds and so everyone at that time would have thought He was crazy, exactly like it is not logical and plausible that the president of USA in 1970 discuss the internet with his audiences, for sure they would think he was crazy. The value of illustration (as that given by the Lord Jesus Christ expressing the faith like a mustard seed) was to give an example the audiences know and understand otherwise it loses its meaning and value and becomes useless. Third, the Lord Jesus Christ in this verse didn't address all the plants on the earth; He just spoke about the plants in His environment at that time. So no contradiction is present.

Contradiction #7

In pseudo-Matthew [12:3-4], mythical Jesus says David and others ate the showbread. †In pseudo-1 Samuel [21:1], David is alone.



St Mark

Response:

By careful examination of the Holy Book of 1 Samuel (21:1), you will observe that this verse mentioned only the visit of David to Abimelech and he was alone during this visit where he took the showbread. While in the Holy Gospel of St Matthew (12:3-4), the Lord Jesus Christ mentioned that David and his men ate the showbread and of course, there is a significant difference in both incidents where David made his visit alone to Abimelech but he ate this showbread with his men. When you read the Holy Book of 1 Samuel 22:2 you will know that there were about 400 men with David and to those our Lord Jesus Christ mentioned. So no contradiction is present between both verses as 1 Samuel 21:1 mentioned only the visit of David to Abimelech and he was alone, while St Matthew (12:3-4) mentioned that David and his men ate the showbread, in addition to the difference in both incidents, we knew that about 400 men were with David and followed him and the Lord meant them in the Holy Gospel of St Matthew 12:3-4.



St Matthew

Contradiction #8:

In pseudo-Matthew 1:21, Joseph is told in a dream to name the son of Mary, iJesusi. †In pseudo-Isaiah [7:14-16], the son of the ialmahî is to be named iImmanueli AND pseudo-Matthew [1:22-23] quoting Isaiah can't make up his mind.

Response:

iJesusi is derived from the Hebrew Joshua which means isaviori as the angel proclaimed to St Joseph (and you shall call His name Jesus, for He will save His people from their sins), so this verse declares the human nature of the Incarnated Son of God and His work as a Savior and Redeemer of His People. In the Holy Gospel of St Matthew 1:22-23 and the Holy Book of Isaiah 9:6, the word iImmanueli is the same as the iMighty Godi (el gibbor in Hebrew), which means iGod with us.i Immanuel expresses the Divine nature of God the Son, He who is conceived within St. Mary the Virgin, is not a new person coming into existence



but He is the eternal Son of God, using her womb as His throne. The virginal conception through the Holy Spirit and the name of the Incarnate Son, Immanuel, iGod with us, are clear declarations of the Lord Jesus Divinity. In conclusion, the name iJesusi is the declaration of human nature of the Incarnate Son of God and his role as a Savior and Redeemer while the name iImmanueli is the declaration of the Divine nature of the Incarnate Son of God who is God, One essence with the Father, and the Holy Spirit. So there is no contradiction between both verses but they appear like two faces for one coin.



St Mark

Contradiction #9

In pseudo-Mark [3:18], Thaddeus is listed as one of the twelve apostles. In pseudo-Luke [6:14-16], Thaddeus is NOT listed and in pseudo-Acts [1:13], Judas the brother of James is listed.



St Luke

Response:

It was known, in the East especially in Israel and particularly in Galilee (because different people and different languages were in Galilee), that any person could have more than one name, e.g. nickname in our days. So Thaddeus whose name is a Greek name, which means wakeful or watchful, has the Aramaic name Lebbeaus, which means, i belovedi and Jewish name Judas, which means, i Thank His God. So the same person had three names and as I mentioned before the surname was very common in the East. So there is no contradiction between the two verses.



St Matthew

Contradiction #10

In pseudo-Matthew [1:16], the father of Joseph is listed as Jacob. In pseudo-Luke [3:23], the father of Joseph is listed as Heli.



St Luke

Response:

You should know that St Matthew wrote his Gospel to the Jews while St Luke wrote his Gospel to the Gentiles. St Matthew focused on the physical lineage regarding flesh and blood while St. Luke was concerned about the religious lineage, which refers to our childhood to God. In the Holy Book of Deuteronomy (25:5-6), The Lord ordered the Israelites when the male married and died without having children, his brother must marry his wife and the first-borne child should carry the name of the dead brother to ensure his name continues to be present among Israelites. This is exactly what happened, when Heli died without having children, his brother Jacob married Heli's wife and the first son was Joseph who carried the name of Heli officially as his father but according to physical flesh and blood, he is the son of Jacob. So there is no contradiction between both verses.

Contradiction #11

In pseudo-John [10:30], mythical Jesus claims he and his iFatheri are one. In pseudo-John [14:28], mythical Jesus claims his iFatheri is greater than him.



St John

Response:

In the Holy Gospel of St John (14:28) Our Lord Jesus Christ was speaking, not in His Divine nature as God the Son (as spoke in John 10:30), but in His human nature, as the Son of Man. The Lord Jesus Christ came to suffer and die, not as God, who can do neither, but as the second Adam, born of St. Mary. Only as the Son of Man could He serve as Messiah, or Christ (the Anointed One). Unless He could take to Himself a true and genuine human nature, He could never have represented Adam's race as Sin-Bearer at the Holy Cross. But as the Son of Man, He certainly was lower in station than God the Father. As the Holy Book of Isaiah 52:13-53:12 makes clear, He could only become our Savior by becoming the Servant of Yahweh. The servant by definition can never be as great as His Master. Hence it was as the death conquering Redeemer, the God-man, which the Lord Jesus would



enter into the presence of the Father, who of course would be greater in dignity and station than the Son of Man. But as for God the Son, apart from the Incarnation, Holy Scripture never mentions any contrast in glory as between the Father and the Son. The following passages make this abundantly clear: (John 1:1,18; 8:58; 10:30; 14:9; 17:5; Romans 9:5) (Christ.. who is God over all); (Colossians 2:2; Titus 2:13; Hebrews 1:18; 1 John 5:20.) In conclusion the Holy Gospel of St John 10:30 speaks about the Divine nature of God the Son which is the same as that of the Father as God the Father and God the Son are of One essence, while, the Holy Gospel of St John 14:28 speaks about the human nature of the Son of Man who is lower than the Father regarding the Divine nature in Station. God the Son left His Glory in His Incarnation to be Our Redeemer. So there is no contradiction evidenced between both verses.



Moses

Contradiction #12

In pseudo-Genesis [1:25-26], the so-called god makes the beast, cattle, and everything that creepeth BEFORE man. In 2:18-19, man is made BEFORE beast and fowl.

Response:

The Holy Book of Genesis 1: 20-25 described the process of creation of beast, cattle, birds and everything before creation of Adam but 2:18-19 didn't mention any new creation after Adam but it mentions only how God brought all animals and birds from the earth before Adam to let Adam call each one by its name so there is a difference between creation and bringing or gathering of animals and birds before Adam as the creation was before Adam while the bringing and gathering from the earth was after Adam and so no contradiction exists between the two verses.

Contradiction #13

In pseudo-1 Kings [4:26], Solomon owns 40,000 stalls and 12,000 horsemen. In pseudo-2 Chronicles [9:25], Solomon owns 4,000 stalls.

Response:

The Holy Book of 1 King (4:26) mentioned the number of pits in all the stalls of King Solomon which were (40,000) as each stall contain 10 pits while the Holy Book of 2 Chronicles 9:25 mentioned only the number of the big stalls which were 400 stalls. So as each big stall contained 10 pits from them 10 horses ate so 400 stalls X 10 pits = 40, 000. So there is no contradiction between both verses.



St Matthew

Contradiction #14

In pseudo-Acts [2:30], so-called god physically (according to the flesh) impregnated the mother of iChristi. †In pseudo-Matthew



St Luke

[1:18], Mary is found with child of the iHoly Ghosti.

Response:

The verse of the Holy Book of Acts 2:30 is as follows: iTherefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his body, according to the flesh, He would raise up the Christ to sit on his throne.† As it is clearly apparent there is no relation between this verse and the issue of contradiction mentioned here.

However, we should know that God is simple and not compound so also His essence is simple and not compound. So the essence of God cannot be understood in terms of the physical parameter used to describe man (who is compound and not simple) and his world as we know the word person is referred to physical existence of one person, so person A is different from person B and John is different from Peter. This is not true regarding the theological description / definition of God as God is simple and can not be divided into compartments and if we accept the contrary way of thought, we accept that God is liable for change and so as He is liable for change He is not God. So God The Father, God The Son, and



God The Holy Spirit are of One essence, however, still have different works in the same essence. So the differentiation is based on the specialization of work in the ONE essence. One example from the nature, is man: he wants by his will, thinks by his mind, and makes what he wants and in which he thinks by his body (hand), so although man is one essence, three different hypostasis share in doing one action in which differentiation is based on their different roles although they are still present in one essence. In conclusion **NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GOD THE FATHER, GOD THE SON, GOD THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE ESSENCE BUT ONLY IN THEIR ROLES.**



Contradiction #15

In pseudo-Leviticus [11:13-19] and in pseudo-Deuteronomy [14:11-18], the bat is listed as a bird. †We know that the bat is a mammal. †Why did the so-called god not know the difference?

Moses Response:

When you look up the Hebrew word which is translated as bird in both verses you will find that this word precisely meant the verb *ito flyi* and did not mean the noun *ibirdi* and it is commonly known that the bat flies although it is classified as a mammal. So the base here is the exact meaning of the word in the original language (Hebrew) not in the translation. However, it is known in the sentence structure in English and all other languages that it is possible to use the name to describe the verse and vice versa which is known as eloquence of the language. Therefore, there is no contradiction between the verses in the Holy Book of Leviticus 11:13-19 and the Holy Book of Deuteronomy 14:11-18.

Responses are written by Dr Medhat Ibrahim, Seminarian Deacon, Theological College, El-Mina, Egypt ✚

The Monks In The Desert Of Nitria (Egypt)

"But of their humanity, their courtesy, their lovingkindness, what am I to say, when each man of them would have brought us into his own cell, not only to fulfill the duty of hospitality, but still more of humbleness, wherein they are indeed masters, and from gentleness and its kindred qualities which are learned among them with diverse grace but one and the same doctrine, as if they had come apart from the world for this same end. Nowhere have I seen love so in flower, nowhere so quick compassion, or hospitality so eager. And nowhere have I seen such meditation upon Holy Writ or understanding of it, or such discipline of sacred learning: wellnigh might you judge each one of them a doctor in the wisdom of God."

Faith is the Key to Heaven by Helen Steiner Rice

***Oh, Father, grant once more to men
A simple, childlike Faith again,
Forgetting color, race and creed
And seeing only the heart's deep need . . .
For Faith alone can save man's soul
And lead him to a higher goal,
For there's but one unflinching course-
We win by Faith and not by force.***