

## Major Discrepancies in the New Kings Version vs. the 1611 KJB

Psa. 39:5; Mat. 11:29; Mat. 5:32; Mat. 4:24; Mat. 7:14; Exo. 9:32; 1 Ch. 5:26; 2 Ki 23:29; Mat 2:1; Mar 14:6; 2 Cor 2:17; Est 2:5-6; Ezk. 39:1-2; Zec. 1:8, 6:3 & 7; Phil 2:6; Acts 4:27; 1 Tim. 6:10; 1 Tim 6:20; Dan. 11:9; Heb. 2:16; 2 Ch. 36:10.

The New Testament of the New King James version is correctly founded on the Greek of the "*Textus Receptus*" (about 90-95% of all the Greek New Testament manuscripts agree with this text), as was the 1611 A.D. King James Bible. However, its Old Testament follows the Stuttgart edition (1967-77) of the *Biblia Hebraica* which reproduces the Leningrad Codex 19a (L).<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the NKJV is not even completely true to this text such that in a few places the LXX, Latin Vulgate, and other materials were utilized (see the preface of the New King James translation where they admit this).

The NKJV's general fidelity to the true text in both testaments is commendable (yet see fn. below), making it by far the most faithful of all the newer versions since 1881. That notwithstanding, the following sampling with explanatory comments depicts a few of its more glaring departures from the authentic text. Some verses have been weakened in comparison to the original work or even been rendered incorrectly. Sometimes this has been due to the translators having missed the point of the passage. Other times, new vogues such as archaeological finds or current trends in text critical scholarship have intimidated the translators to render an *interpretation* rather than a translation.

Psalm 39:5 Behold, thou hast made my days *as* an handbreadth; and mine age *is* as nothing before thee: verily every man at his best state *is altogether vanity*. Selah. (KJB)

[1]

Psalm 39:5 Indeed, You have made my days *as* handbreadths, And my age *is* as nothing before You; Certainly every man at his best state *is but vapor*. Selah (NKJV)

"Altogether vanity" compared to "vapor" – the whole point and meaning is lost. This is much weaker.

---

<sup>1</sup> This statement and the following material in this footnote which deal with the Old Testament text employed by the NKJV editors may be verified from comparing the data in: *The New King James Version, Reference edition*, (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Pub., 1983), preface, p. vi; Ira M. Price, *The Ancestry of Our English Bible*, 3rd rev. ed., (New York: Harper & Bros. Pub., 1956), pp. 20-21, 26, 34-39, (orig. pub. 1906); D.A. Waite, *ASV, NASV, & NIV Departures From Traditional Hebrew & Greek Texts*, (Collingswood, NJ: Bible For Today Press #986, 1981), pp. A-vi & A-vii, and *Defending the King James Bible*; (Collingswood, NJ: Bible For Today Press #1594-P, 1992), pp. 20-38; *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, James Orr (gen. ed.), Vol. V, (Chicago, IL: The Howard-Severance Co., 1937), pp. 2962-63; Henry Snyder Gehman, *The New Westminster Dictionary of the Bible*, (Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1970), pp. 683-684 (Old Testament). Of Rudolph Kittel (1853-1929), Dr. D.A. Waite states that he was "a modernist, German rationalist apostate who held to the Graf-Wellhausen documentary hypothesis of the Pentateuch" (*Departures, op. cit.*, p. A-vi).

Copied in Cairo from the Aleppo MS (reproduced in the time of Aaron ben Asher 900 - 940 A.D.) by Samuel ben Jacob in A.D. 1008, Codex 19a is considered by many text critics to be the oldest dated MS of the complete Hebrew Bible. The Codex (also called *Leningradensis*) is based upon the ben Asher Masoretic text which had become the standard authoritative text by c.900 A.D. Frequent consultation was made to the great "Rabbinic" Bible (i.e., the first containing all the vowel pointing, accents, etc.) of Jacob ben Chayim, a Jew of Tunis. The 2nd edition, published by Daniel Bomberg at Venice in 1524-1525 A.D. in 4 volumes, was the *editio princeps* of the Hebrew Bible and soon became the standard edition of the Masoretic text. As such, the text of Jacob ben Chayim (or Hayyim) became the basis of the King James O.T. (Waite, *Defending the King James Bible, op. cit.*, pp. 20-38) and all later editions of the Hebrew Bible such as that of Baer & Delitzsch (1869-1895), Ginsburg's 1924 London edition, and even Kittel's first two editions (printed at Leipzig, 1906 & 1912). Abandoning the ben Chayim (Hayyim) tradition, Rudolph Kittel's 1937 3rd edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* signaled a revolution in Hebrew Bibles. By instead printing the text of the Leningrad MS, Kittel (Paul Kahle et al.) produced a completely new work.

A striking example of the great accuracy attained by the Hebrew scribes may be seen by comparing the *British Museum Oriental 4445* Codex which was copied early in the 10th century by Aaron ben Asher (containing 186 folios - 55 being added in A.D. 1540 - on which the text of the Pentateuch is preserved) with that of recent Hebrew Bibles which are dependant upon the 1525 rabbinic Bible of Jacob ben Chayim. Dr. Ira Price relates that the text is "practically identical" [*Ancestry*, p. 20, cp. 34; John Owen agrees: "Of the Integrity and Purity of the Hebrew and Greek Text of the Scripture", *The Works of John Owen*, Vol. XVI, (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1968; rpt. of 1850-53 ed.), p. 359]. But although there is little material difference between the ben Asher and ben Chayim texts, it is the ben Chayim that is the true, infallible Word of the Living God. Price goes on to say (p. 274) that the AV translators had "no standard, or 'received' Hebrew text, hence were compelled to use the four current Hebrew Bibles" along with the Complutensian Polyglot (1514-1517, 3 parallel columns containing the Hebrew text, Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and the LXX), the Antwerp Polyglot, and previous versions such as the Bishops' Bible (1568, a slightly revised edition of Tyndale's translation) and the Geneva (1560). Yet this seems a strange statement as he admits the 1525 ben Chayim text had long since become the standard edition of the MT (p. 36; indeed, see Waite, *Departures*, p. A-58 for a list of 44 Hebrew editions available to the KJB translators).

Matthew 11:29 **Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls.** (KJB)

[2]

Matthew 11:29 **"Take My yoke upon you and learn from Me, for I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find rest for your souls.** (NKJV)

"OF me" compared to "from me". The Greek word here *could* be rendered either way, however, the **context** from verse 27 through verse 30 is unmistakably clear – all is centered on Jesus. There is a great difference between saying "here, let me teach you – let me be your teacher" – and..."learn all you can about me". As the KJB and the context render it, Jesus is saying **"I AM"** *the* important thing and person to know. Thus, this is a major doctrinal change and as such, represents an attack on **the person** of the Lord Jesus the Christ (cp. Isa. 26:3 & Phil. 3:10).

Matthew 5:32 **But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.** (KJB)

[3]

Matthew 5:32 **"But I say to you that whoever divorces his wife for any reason except sexual immorality causes her to commit adultery; and whoever marries a woman who is divorced commits adultery.** (NKJV)

"Fornication" which biblically covers BOTH physical and spiritual unfaithfulness (spiritual includes such things as idolatry, sorcery, witchcraft etc.) compared to "sexual immorality" which is ONLY a physical act. {Remember, God divorced Israel (as a nation though never did He divorce faithful Jewish followers such as Elijah, Jeremiah, etc.) for "spiritual" adultery & fornication.}

Matthew 4:24 **And his fame went throughout all Syria: and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatick, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them.** (KJB)

[4]

Matthew 4:24 **Then His fame went throughout all Syria; and they brought to Him all sick people who were afflicted with various diseases and torments, and those who were demon possessed, epileptics, and paralytics; and He healed them.** (NKJV)

"Lunatick", which is mental has been changed to "epileptic", which is physical.

Matthew 7:14 **Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.** (KJB)

[5]

Matthew 7:14 **"Because narrow is the gate and difficult is the way which leads to life, and there are few who find it.** (NKJV)

"Narrow" has been changed to "difficult" – this is doctrinal. Is it *hard* to become born again? The NKJV is not merely wrong here; its reading is heretical.

Exodus 9:32 **But the wheat and the rye were not smitten: for they were not grown up.** (KJB)

[6]

Exodus 9:32 **But the wheat and the spelt were not struck, for they are late crops.** (NKJV)

"Rye" to "spelt" – is that more clear? Is "they are late crops" more clear? Later than what? When? "They were not grown up" is a more clear statement than the new rendering.

1 Chronicles 5:26 And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul king of Assyria, **and** the spirit of Tilgathpileser king of Assyria, and he carried them away, even the Reubenites, and the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh, and brought them unto Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river Gozan, unto this day. (KJB)

[7]

1 Chronicles 5:26 So the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul king of Assyria, **that is**, Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria. He carried the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh into captivity. He took them to Halah, Habor, Hara, and the river of Gozan to this day. (NKJV)

This was done in the days of Menahem's reign over Israel (772-761 BC, See II Ki. 15:19-20). It is stated by most writers that in the Assyrian annals, Tiglath-pileser claimed to have received tribute from Menahem. This has led nearly all scholars to identify the Biblical "Pul" as being the same as Tiglath-pileser. The New King James translation alters this Scripture to read "So the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul king of Assyria, **that is**,"<sup>2</sup> Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria. ..." rather than the more correct word "**and**" as the King James faithfully records.

However, this assertion is false as the name "Menahem" appears in **brackets** meaning that the annal is unreadable and the word has been supplied by the translator, viz:

[As for Menahem I ov]erwhelmed him [like a snowstorm] and he ... fled like a bird, alone, [and bowed to my feet(?)]. I returned him to his place [and imposed tribute upon him, to wit:] gold, silver, linen garments with multicolored trimmings ... great ... [I re]ceived from him. Israel {lit.: "Omri-Land" Bit Humria} ... all its inhabitants (and) their possessions I led to Assyria. They overthrew their king Pekah {Pa-qa-ha} and I placed Hoshea {A-u-si} as king over them. I received from them 10 talents of gold, 1,000 (?) talents of silver as their [tri]bute and brought them to Assyria.<sup>3</sup>

Thus, this identification is pure conjecture. Moreover, only five lines down in these same Assyrian annals the name of Pekah (Pa-qa-ha), the King of Israel who began his reign only two years after Menahem's death, appears. The context indicates – the Biblical chronology demands – that the missing name in the damaged Assyrian records should be **Pekah**, not Menahem. Thus, there is no Assyrian historical text which says or even infers that Tiglath-pileser collected tribute from Menahem of Israel, although almost all sources proclaim that he so did.

Therefore, when the NKJV and nearly all other versions make Pul and Tiglath-pileser one and the same person, such is **not** a translation, rather it is an *interpretation* based on a faulty archaeological judgment. The word "Pul" is a *title* meaning Lord: it is **not** a name and could therefore refer to *any* Assyrian ruler.

This mis-identification is directly opposed to the actual translation and is absolutely shown to be false by the Biblical chronology of the Hebrew kings. Such an erroneous identification renders Biblical chronology impossible, unless one ignores many other Scriptures, as Edwin Thiele (the chronologist nearly all modern scholarship and theology blindly follow) has done. Because Thiele unquestioningly accepted the Assyrian documents as absolutely factual and he erroneously identified Pul as being Tiglath-pileser III, he forced the Biblical text to conform with secular history. The result of the chronological problem produced by this wrong association was the creation of a **third** Hebrew kingdom which Thiele entitled "Ephraim". Thus, he pretends that there was the kingdom of Judah to the south, with Israel and Ephraim as two distinct northern kingdoms. He portrays Pekah as the King of Ephraim ruling from Gilead, beginning his reign at the same time Menahem ascended to the throne of Israel, yet Isaiah 7:1 calls Pekah the "king of Israel". Second Kings 15:27 confirms this, adding that he reigned in Samaria. Thiele also has Pekah reigning during the dominion of Menahem's son, Pekahiah, but 2 Kings 15:23-27 clearly states that Pekah was a captain in Pekahiah's army, not a

<sup>2</sup> The NIV is similar; the NAS etc. renders "**even**". These rendering's are possible, but usually the grammar would call for "and".

<sup>3</sup> J.B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near East Text* [designated ANET] (Princeton: University Press, 1969), pp. 283-284.

King of "Ephraim". It further states that Pekah assassinated Pekahiah, becoming the King of Israel at that time.

This anti-Biblical scheme which Thiele calls "dual dating" also has the net result of Hoshea, King of Israel, being deposed at least 7 years *before* Hezekiah came to the throne of Judah. Such a scenario violates the plain teachings of II Ki. 17:1; 18:1, 9-10 which place Hoshea and Hezekiah as having overlapping reigns – thus laying bare for all to see the absolutely destitute and perverted nature of Thiele's system.

Actually, the name of the principal Assyrian god from their older works is Val (or Vul in its Hebrew form). The letter "V" is identical to the letter "P" in their language such that Pul is also the name of their god; he is identical to the Canaanite god, Baal, as our letters v and b are the same letter in Semitic languages. Hence, some man or men took the name or title of their god unto themselves or their position. Moreover, even a casual glance at I Ch. 5:26 reveals the obvious truth that Pul and Tiglath-pileser are not the same man but two different Assyrian monarchs. If they were one and the same ruler, why does the title "king of Assyria" follow after **both**? i.e., "So the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul *king of Assyria*, that is, Tiglath-Pileser *king of Assyria*." If they were the same, the verse would only have the title "king of Assyria" **once**, reading "So the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul, that is, Tiglathpileser king of Assyria." The redundancy, although not mentioned heretofore in the literature to our knowledge, is an unmistakable indication that we are dealing with two distinct monarchs – not one.

Finally, the context of this passage and the reference in the Assyrian Eponym List require that the Biblical "Pul", though not mentioned in any extant Assyrian document by that appellation, is a king **prior** to Tiglath-pileser. If the Assyrian records were accurate in this time period, Pul is Ashur-dan III. As Assyrian names usually consisted of compounds of two, three or more elements, his complete name may well have originally been Ashur-danin-pal. Pul is the Hebrew form of the Akkadian name Pal. It is known that this name was given to the eldest son of Shalmaneser III.<sup>4</sup> Shalmaneser III's son, Shamasi-adad V, was also known as Shamas-Pul (Vul = Pul as V and P are interchangeable). Moreover, Shamas-Pul was Ashur-dan III's "grandfather" and Ashur-dan III's "father", Adad-nirari III, was known as "Pullush". Thus the word "Pul" is firmly attached to his immediate lineage and is seen to fit with the Biblical narrative.

2 Kings 23:29 In his days Pharaohnechoh king of Egypt went up **against** the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates: and king Josiah went against him; and he slew him at Megiddo, when he had seen him. (KJB)

[8]

2 Kings 23:29 In his days Pharaoh Necho king of Egypt **went to the aid of** the king of Assyria, to the River Euphrates; and King Josiah went against him. And *Pharaoh Necho* killed him at Megiddo when he confronted him. (NKJV)

The phrase "went to the aid of" the king of Assyria as found in the NKJV is certainly not the same as "against" the king of Assyria in the KJB. The New International Version, Revised Standard Version, New English Version – indeed the majority of the modern translations – read similar to the New King James Version which strangely relegates to a footnote the alternative "or to attack". However, the old 1560 A.D. Geneva Bible along with all the old English translations prior to A.D. 1611 such as Wycliffe's, Coverdale's, Matthew's, The Great Bible, The Bishop's Bible, etc., as well as the American Standard, and Amplified are among those whose reading is "against" and thus are in agreement with the Authorized King James Bible. The highly touted New American Standard compromises stating simply "Pharaoh Neco king of Egypt went up *to* the King of Assyria to the river Euphrates" and thus one way or the other perverts the Scripture. What then is at the heart of this discrepancy? Did Pharaoh Neco go to help or fight against the king of Assyria and why cannot the various translators

<sup>4</sup> E.W. Faulstich, *History, Harmony & the Hebrew Kings*, (Spencer, IO: Chronology Books, 1986), pp. 130-134.

make up their minds? The forthcoming analysis reveals the tragic current state of affairs with regard to textual criticism and translation prevailing in today's academia.

First, the Hebrew word in question here is transliterated "al" (Hebrew = ayin-lamedh - אל Strong's Concordance number 5921). It is a preposition which occurs 1898 times in Scripture and has a wide variety of meanings depending upon syntax and context. According to computer analysis, the forty-seven King James translators rendered "al" as "against" 543 times, "over" 409, "on" 292, "at" 83, "concerning" 78, and "above" 68 times. Further, in descending order of usage it was translated as "off", "into", "thereon", "because", "according", "after", "toward", "beside", "about", "before", "therein", "under", "thereto", "within", "among", "than", "through", and the word "forward" bringing the study down to being so referenced but 3 times with quite a few other less frequent meanings having been recovered as well. However, *not one time* was it rendered "to the aid of" or even "together with" as the NKJV margin suggests. In fact, not once was a word found which bore any resemblance whatsoever to that meaning and neither Strong, Gesenius, nor Jay P. Green offers any support to such a translation. Keil and Delitzsch accepted unreservedly that the "against" rendering was correct.<sup>5</sup> So again the question must be asked: "Why this discrepancy between the various translations"?

This alteration in wording is not at all the result of a different translation of the Hebrew word "al" (אל). Actually the situation before us is that Hebrew Text has been *rejected* by most scholars as corrupt. The change which states that rather than opposing the King of Assyria, Pharaoh Neco (Necho) went to *join* the King of Assyria is based totally upon a conjectured restoration of a portion of the historical records of Babylon. Thus, an alteration has been made in the Biblical text based upon the assumption that some *other* nation's historical writings are correct, true, and have no "scribal blunders" or mis-stated facts rather than the God-inspired Hebrew Scriptures. As a matter of fact, the archaeological records upon which the reading in the NKJV (and many others) are based *do not even say* that the King of Egypt joined with the King of Assyria. With reference to the years of Nabopolassar's reign and recalling that the Babylonian records habitually refer to their various monarchs as "the king of Akkad", what they actually say is:

58 The sixteenth year: In the month Iyyar the king of Akkad (Babylon) mustered his army and  
marched to Assyria. From [...] until the month Marchesvan  
59 he marched about victoriously in Assyria. In the month Marchesvan the Ummanmanda, [...] had  
come [...]p the king of Akkad,  
60 put their armies together and  
61 marched  
60 to Harran [...]it (II) who had ascended the throne in Assyria.  
61f Fear of the enemy overcame Ashur-uballit (II) and the army of Eg[...] had come [...] and they  
aban[...] the city [...] they crossed.  
62  
63 The king of Akkad reached Harran and [...] he captured the city.  
64 He carried off the vast booty of the city and the temple. In the month Adar the kings of Akkad left  
their [...]  
65 He went home. The Umman-mamda, who had come to help the king of Akkad, withdrew.  
66 The seventeenth year: In the month Tammuz Ashur-uballit (II) king of Assyria, the large army of  
Egypt [...]  
67 crossed the river (Euphrates) and marched against Harran to conquer (it) [...] they [...]d (it).  
68 They defeated the garrison which the king of Akkad had stationed inside. When they had defeated  
(it) they encamped against Harran.

---

<sup>5</sup> C.F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*, Vol. 3, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1986), pp. 492 - 493.

This portion of the Babylonian Chronicles (Chronicle 3:58-68) has been interpreted by Albert Kirk Grayson<sup>6</sup> such that 61f. reads:

61f Fear of the enemy overcame Ashur-uballit (II) and the army of Eg[ypt *which*] had come [to help him] and they aban[doned] the city [...] they crossed.

However possible this rendering may be, it represents conjecture on the part of the translator. The words contained in brackets and parentheses are not found in this Assyrian document. The reader can also see for himself that the numbers have been arranged *out of order* to facilitate the translation as given. It is further most instructive to note that the Babylonian records are not nearly as complete, uninterrupted or flowing as the Hebrew Old Testament record.

We hasten to add that the letters which precede each of the brackets (i.e., in 61f - Eg[...] and aban[...]) may also be viewed as being of an extremely doubtful nature as letters from one language do not readily lend themselves to be translated unless one has the whole word before him. In many languages, the endings of many words make a great difference as to the correct meaning. Nearly always in such circumstances, all that can be done is to merely transliterate the letters into the other alphabet, the result of which is usually nonsensical. Such seldom results in the forming of a word or even part of a recognizable word in the other language. Thus the questions may be fairly asked, does Chronicle 3:61f. actually testify to and prove that the word "Egypt" is present in the text and/or to the fact that whatever army it may be, they have come to "help" the Assyrian King, Ashur-uballit (II)? Indeed, does 3:66-67 really state that the Egyptian army united with Ashur-uballit's Assyrian forces against the Babylonian army?

When taken alone, the truthful reply must be declared as "no, they do not so state". Donald J. Wiseman underscores this fact in his work by adding a question mark within the bracket, viz. "Eg[ypt(?)]"<sup>7</sup>. The Assyrian word for Egypt transliterates "mi-sir". It occurs frequently throughout the Babylonian records. Only the "mi" portion is legible in 61f., however as the context relates to an army, "mi" must be a portion of the word for some nation. Chronicle 3:66, referring to the following year (substantiated by the months mentioned from 58-69) contains the word "mi-sir" in clear un-mutilated condition<sup>8</sup> and as this study has found no other nation designated in the Chronicles as beginning with "mi" the matter would appear to be resolved. Therefore the restoration "Eg[ypt]" by Grayson seems justified yet Wiseman's question mark within the brackets still enjoins caution.

The second part of the problem as to whether the Egyptian army came to "assist" the Assyrian forces against the Babylonian's is not so straightforward. First, Chronicle 3:66-68 has been said to substantiate the interpretation rendered to 61f; however this testimony alone would not be truly sufficient for, due to its fragmented condition, the same data could have just as easily been rendered:

61f Fear of the enemy overcame Ashur-uballit (II) and the army of Eg[ypt stood firm which] had come [to assist the King of Akkad (ie: from the south)] and they aban[doned] the city [...] they crossed.  
 66 <The seventeenth year>: In the month Tammuz Ashur-uballit (II),king of Assyria, the large army of Egypt [having withdrawn,]  
 67 crossed the river (Euphrates) and marched against Harran to conquer (it) [...] they [...]d (it).  
 68 They defeated the garrison which the king of Akkad had stationed inside. When they had defeated (it) they encamped against Harran.

or some similar reading (i.e., 61f ... and the army of Eg[ypt arrived which] had come [to resist him] and they aban[doned] the city ... etc., etc.). Obviously, this approach has the advantage in that appeal for

<sup>6</sup> Albert K. Grayson, "Assyrian And Babylonian Chronicles", A. Leo Oppenheim, et al., eds. Texts From Cuneiform Sources. Vol. 5. (Locust Valley, New York: J. Augustine Publisher, 1975), pp. 95-96.

<sup>7</sup> D.J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaleaeen Kings (626-556 B.C.) in the British Museum.*, (London: 1956) BM 21901, Reverse side, p. 63.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 62-63. Cp. plates III and XI.

such a "speculative" interpretation could be made to the Hebrew Text for substantiation. Indeed, the overall historical setting would certainly seem against Egypt's coming to assist the Assyrian forces, and this fact has been appealed to over the years by more than a few. The Assyrian Empire had long held prominence in the area. Josiah died about the year B.C. 609. As recently as 671, Esarhaddon, the Assyrian Monarch, had conquered Egypt. Ashur-banipal, his son and successor, made a new conquest (667 or 666), advancing as far as Thebes. In his second campaign, Ashur-banipal took and sacked Thebes (the Biblical city "No"), the great capital of Upper Egypt (663). The Assyrians were infamous for their great cruelty as noted in profane history as well as the Biblical narrative (for example, Nahum especially Chapter 3). It seems almost inconceivable that only 54 years later and after the ensuing years of enduring these ruthless brutalities, suddenly these same beleaguered Egyptians would travel nearly 500 hundred miles over rugged terrain in an attempt to rescue the barbarous and hated Assyrians from the upstart Babylonians.

The Babylonians had successfully revolted from under the Assyrian yoke in 625 B.C. under the leadership of King Nabopolassar, founder of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. His son and commander of the army, crown prince Nebuchadnezzar, was to become King of Babylonia shortly after the Josiah confrontation with Neco. It had been hundreds of years since the Babylonians had been an Empire of distinction and might. Over these many years, the Babylonians had been no threat to Egypt, having several times become vassals to Assyria as far back as c.824 B.C. In view of all of this historical background between these two empires one is certainly justified to doubt, asking why the Egyptians would have feared or hated the Babylonians enough to put aside their recent viciously cruel persecutions at the hand of the Assyrians. Nevertheless, the Babylonian records declare that they so did. Chronicle 3:1 identifies itself as being the account of the tenth year of Nabopolassar and states:

- 10 In the month of Tisri the Egyptian army and the Assyrian army marched after the king of Akkad  
as far as the town of Qablinu but  
11 did not overtake the king of Akkad and then went back. ...<sup>9</sup>

Therefore we have an un-mutilated portion of Babylonian history linking the Egyptian and Assyrian armies as allies against the king of Akkad (Babylonia) only six years prior to the event in question.

As has been documented, the context and frequency analysis presented at the beginning justifies the King James rendering of the Hebrew word "al" in II Kings 23:29 as saying that Pharaoh Neco went up to the River Euphrates "against the king of Assyria". Yet at the same time it has been shown that one seems warranted in concluding that the Babylonian Chronicles possibly do testify that Neco joined with the Assyrian forces against Babylonia in the Euphrates area during both the 16th and 17th years of Nabopolassar. However, on the basis of the Hebrew Text (II Ki.23:29; II Chr.35:21-25), it must be conceded that at some point during the six years (from Nabopolassar's 10th to his 16th) the Egyptians could have found cause to change allegiances. Then, in this scenario, after the Assyrian Empire's total collapse the Egyptian rulers, unable to maintain a peace with the Neo-Babylonian monarchy, eventually engaged them in battle at Carchemish during Nabopolassar's 20th and 21st years (Chronicle 4:16-28; 5:1-11). At present, this author knows of no data which would refute such a contention and has no objection to it as a viable solution to the problem.

Notwithstanding, perhaps the best resolution is that given well over three hundred years ago by Ussher.<sup>10</sup> First, bear in mind Josephus' statement with regard to this incident. He says that the occasion in which Neco slew Josiah was the result of the Egyptian army's passing through Judah on its way to the River Euphrates to engage the *Medes and Babylonians* who had just overthrown the Assyrian Empire.<sup>11</sup> With Ninevah's fall to the allied forces in c.612 B.C., followed by that of the city of Haran c.B.C. 610, the Assyrian Empire collapsed, forever ceasing to exist. As the leader of the allied

<sup>9</sup> Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldean Kings*, *op. cit.*, B.M. 21901, Obverse side, p. 55.

<sup>10</sup> Archbishop James Ussher, *Annals of the World*, (London: 1658), p. 81.

<sup>11</sup> Josephus, *Antiquities*, X, 5, 1.

forces, Nabopolassar, King of Babylonia, now engaged in the well known and commonplace ancient custom of taking unto himself the title of any and all kings whom they conquered.

Thus with its land nearly totally occupied by the allied forces, in B.C. 609 the kingdom of Assyria was no longer an entity. Its remaining army was in hiding and regrouping near the Euphrates for its doomed counterattack and siege which attempted to retake Haran in 609, the seventeenth year of Nabopolassar.<sup>12</sup> The land had now become mainly the property of the king of Babylonia who therefore also captured for himself the appellation, "King of Assyria". A Scriptural example of this practice may be seen in Ezra 6:22 where Darius (I, Hystaspis) the King of Persia, having overcome Babylonia and Assyria, also bore the title "King of Assyria". (Cp. vs. 15 and consider that, as Ussher states, heathen authors relate how Babylon was formerly part of Assyria. Scripture also mentions that the kingdom of Chaldea was founded by the King of Assyria, Isa. 23:13.)

Thus, taking into account Josephus' statement along with the aforementioned Babylonian Chronicle record, the II Kings 23:29 passage is seen to refer to Neco's going up to join the beleaguered remnant of the Assyrian army which had been driven out to only a small corner of the kingdom and thereby engage Nabopolassar, the new possessor of the title "King of Assyria", and his allies near Carchemish on the Euphrates and Haran. Keil and Delitzsch acknowledge this as a viable solution as well as that of the first offered possibility.<sup>13</sup>

Finally, it has been shown that there is no legitimate reason to reject either the Hebrew or the Babylonian accounts of this incident. The alteration of the Hebrew Text from "against" to "to the aid of" the king of Assyria by the NKJV, NIV, RSV, NEB, etc. is totally unwarranted and unnecessary. The Hebrew record must not be altered; and even more especially, it must not be so capriciously changed over the latest often mutilated or misunderstood archaeological discoveries, etc. As the divine historical Hebrew Text relates, Neco "went up *against* the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates".

The reader can now judge for himself and see that the Babylonian account does not actually contradict the King James Bible which is a faithful rendering of the Hebrew Text. Part of the problem is due to the fragmented nature of the Chronicle, leaving much to the imagination and subjective will of the translator. Has it not been appalling to see to what lengths critics and translators will go in their exaggerated and, at times, dishonest reporting of facts as well as in their interpretations and translating where the Holy Writ is concerned? Yet such is the pit into which modern scholarship in general has plummeted.

Matthew 2:1 Now **when** Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, (KJB)

[9]

Matthew 2:1 Now **after** Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the king, behold, wise men from the East came to Jerusalem, (NKJV)

"When" to "after" – this interpolation *is* a possible interpretation of the Greek (it could also be rendered "having been"). However, the real reason for the change is due to a faulty piece of work done by Leslie Madison<sup>14</sup> with regard to the Greek words "brephos", which he affirms means only a newborn baby and "paidion", which he claims to refer only to a childling from about 2 to 5 or so years old. Thus he pretends that the Matthew account of the birth of Jesus is speaking of a time two years AFTER His birth. Then other circumstantial evidence is offered from the biblical account of the birth to support this thesis.

<sup>12</sup> Grayson, *ABC, op. cit.*, Chronicle 3, p. 96.

<sup>13</sup> Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentary, op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 493.

<sup>14</sup> Leslie P. Madison, "Problems of Chronology in the Life of Christ", (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1963), pp. 25-27.

However, the distinction is **not** that precise in the Greek or in the scriptures. The word paidion (παῖδιον) **is** used of *infants* (Luke 1:59, 66, 76, 2:17, 27; John 16:21; Heb. 11:23), and bēphos (βρέφος) **is** used of a *young child* (2 Tim. 3:15).<sup>15</sup> This incorrect work was accepted almost without challenge or investigation in evangelical circles due largely to an over-reaction to the many excesses and errors concerning the birth of our Lord arising from non-scriptural Catholic traditions and myths.

The **internal** evidence found in the scriptures is overwhelming and it attests to the fact that the word should be rendered "when".<sup>16</sup> The result is that the wise men arrived at the manger in Bethlehem near the time of Jesus' birth as the King James Bible declares (a more detailed paper and CD's are available free of charge or obligation).

Mark 14:6 And Jesus said, **Let her alone; why trouble ye her? she hath wrought a good work on me.** (KJB)

[10]

Mark 14:6 But Jesus said, **"Let her alone. Why do you trouble her? She has done a good work for Me.** (NKJV)

"On" me to "for" me is very different in meaning. To do something "for" someone does not imply that the "someone" is a worthy or honored person. "On" me, places Jesus at the pre-eminence among those at the table. The emphasis is thus placed upon *the person of Jesus* instead of on the good work of the woman.

2 Corinthians 2:17 For we are not as many, which **corrupt** the word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ. (KJB)

[11]

2 Corinthians 2:17 For we are not, as so many, **peddling** the word of God; but as of sincerity, but as from God, we speak in the sight of God in Christ. (NKJV)

"Corrupting" the Word of God is NOT the same thing as "Peddling" the Word of God. The entire meaning and force of Paul's accusation is lost in the new reading.

Esther 2:5 *Now* in Shushan the palace there was a certain Jew, whose name *was* **Mordecai**, the son of Jair, the son of Shimei, the son of Kish, **a Benjamite**;

Esther 2:6 **Who had been carried away from Jerusalem with the captivity** which had been **carried away with Jeconiah** king of Judah, whom Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon had carried away. (KJB)

[12]

Esther 2:5 In Shushan the citadel there was a certain Jew whose name *was* Mordecai the son of Jair, the son of Shimei, the son of Kish, a Benjamite.

Esther 2:6 **Kish had been carried away** from Jerusalem with the captives who had been captured with Jeconiah king of Judah, whom Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon had carried away. (NKJV)

Mordecai was carried away to Babylon with King Jeconiah. This has been altered by many of the newer translations to read that Kish, Mordecai's great grandfather, was carried away in order to force the biblical account to fit into an incorrect time frame based upon an erroneous identification of the Ahasuerus of the Book of Esther. This is NOT permissible, firstly because "Kish" is NOT a translation, but rather is a **private interpretation**. **No one has such authority**.

The identifying of Ahasuerus with Xerxes I was done by Georg Friedrech Grotefend, who when he was a young student at the University of Gottingen, set himself to decipher the curious, wedge shaped

<sup>15</sup> Harold W. Hoehner, *Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1981), p. 24.

<sup>16</sup> William Tyndale's 1534 New Testament, the 1557 Geneva Bible, the 1380 Wycliffe, the 1539 Great Bible (Cranmer's), and the 1595 Bishop's Bible as well as other pre-King James English versions also read "When" here at Matthew 2:1

Persian characters (cuneiform) which had been found on inscriptions among the ruins of the ancient Persian city of Persepolis.

This mis-identification is a result of translating the Persian word "Khshayarsha" into Xerxes (Greek), and Xerxes into Akhashverosh (Hebrew), and finally Akhashverosh into Ahasuerus in English. All of this *is* accurate, but it is then insisted that this means that the Ahasuerus of the Book of Esther is the Greek Monarch Xerxes I, who reigned circa. 486-465 B.C.

If this identification were correct, the third year of his reign (Est. 1:3) would be 484 B.C. and Mordecai would be at least 113 years old at the beginning of the story (597 B.C. - the year of the captivity of Jeconiah - minus 484). If he were newborn when he was deported, he would be nearly 125 years old when he became prime minister of Persia as the story of Esther covers a period of about 12 years. Although this is possible, it is *very unlikely* as only one man's age has been reported as being that great since the days of the Judges (over 700 years earlier). Further, as Esther was Mordecai's first cousin, she would tend to be far too old to fit the story.

The Hebrew text, as well as the KJB English text, clearly tells us that it *was* Mordecai who was carried away to Babylon in 597 B.C. with King Jeconiah (Jehoiachin - Est 2:6, compare 2 Ki. 24:6). Ezekiel was carried away at the same time (Ezk. 1:1-2, 40:1).

The only way that Ahasuerus can be Xerxes I (or even Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C. 465-424) as many now believe as a result of the above mentioned faulty decision, is for the "who" of Esther 2:6 to be Mordecai's great grandfather Kish (Est. 2:5) and that Kish was the one carried away with Jeconiah. This is the way most commentaries and many new translations render the meaning. In so doing, they give us an *interpretation* rather than a *translation*!

However, the Hebrew construction states unmistakably that Mordecai was the person that was carried away with Jeconiah.

Furthermore, ***Xerxes is not a personal name*** – it is a title or throne name which means Shah (King). Ahasuerus is another throne name or title meaning "the Mighty". Darius means "the Maintainer" or "the Restrainer" and Arta simply means "the Great" or even "king" so that the title Artaxerxes is rendered either as "the Great Shah" (or King) or "King of Kings" (Ezra 7:12). Notice that all of these appellations are ***titles of god***. Therefore ANY Persian or Median Monarch could have borne the title "Xerxes" or any other of these titles (or even more than one of them!).

Hence, we see that the translation of Ahasuerus into Xerxes, though correct, does not mean that this person is the Xerxes I of secular history. In fact, the son and successor of Darius Hystaspis, Xerxes I, in his inscription at Persepolis, calls himself in one sentence "Xerxes the great King" (ie: Artaxerxes) and in the next "Darius the King."

Some have picked up on the translation of Ahasuerus to Xerxes and have attempted to solidify the identification by insisting that the character of Ahasuerus matches that of Xerxes I as depicted by Herodotus and other classic writers. But there is nothing in the character of Ahasuerus that does not agree equally well with all that we know from classic literature of Darius Hystaspis, for example.

Thus the argument for the identification of Ahasuerus with Xerxes from the similarity of the old Persian name Khshayarsha and the Hebrew Akhashverosh and the Greek Xerxes, is of NO force, for the word in any form is simply the word "Shah", and might be applied to any monarch who sat upon the throne of Persia.

Moreover, sound exegesis dictates that no etymology may ever take precedence over a clear context. The opposite is quite popular today among those who overemphasize lexical word studies and amongst Greek dilettantes; however, it is the path to error. Etymology may ***confirm*** a context or even assist in clarification, but it is not an exact science and therefore should be used as sole judge with extreme

caution – and then only when there is nothing else available to consult. Context is the first and great guide. Etymology is only a indication; it must *never* be used to overturn clear context!

Finally, there is something amiss with the above etymological reasoning inasmuch as "Ahasuerus" means "Aha" (The Mighty) and "Suerus" (King). How then in translating does this suddenly reduce to "Xerxes" which means only "Shah" or "King"? Actually it would seem that "Artaxerxes" would have been a more faithful rendering. The translators of the Septuagint (LXX) certainly so concurred. What happened to "The Mighty" portion during the translation? Selah.

Context then demands that Ahasuerus is some monarch, more probably Persian than Median (Est. 1:3, 1:19 compare Dan 6:8, 12, 15 where the order of the words Persians and Medes is reversed), who reigned BEFORE Xerxes I of secular history – very likely Darius I (Hystaspis or the Great) as Ussher, that prince of chronologists, so thought.

If this identification is correct, his 3rd year would be 519 B.C. This would result in shortening Mordecai's age to 78 (minimum) at the beginning of the story.

Another error that is artificially produced as a by-product of the above discussed erroneous identification, is that in the small time frame of the stories of the Book's of Ezra and Nehemiah, in two successive generations the top leaders of God's people have *the same names yet are supposed to be different men* (see nearly any Bible Dictionary). Hence, we have three biblically rare personal names which do not appear in any other time frame in the Scriptures supposedly being different people with the same name who just happen to become leaders in the succeeding generation.

The result is that we now are being led to accept that these are two different Ezra's, two different Nehemiah's, and two different Mordecai's. But when the extra years are removed from the time frame by correcting the identification of Ahasuerus to being some Persian king *prior* to Xerxes I, it becomes mathematically plausible for us to see that these are one and the same men – as the context of the stories has always made apparent. Therefore, the Mordecai of the Book of Esther is most certainly the same Mordecai of Ezra 2:2 and Neh. 7:7.

Ezekiel 39:1 Therefore, thou son of man, prophesy against Gog, and say, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I *am* against thee, O Gog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal;

Ezekiel 39:2 And I will turn thee back, **and leave but the sixth part of thee**, and will cause thee to come up from the north parts, and will bring thee upon the mountains of Israel: (KJB)

[13]

Ezekiel 39:1 "And you, son of man, prophesy against Gog, and say, "Thus says the Lord GOD: "Behold, I *am* against you, O Gog, the prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal;

Ezekiel 39:2 "and I will turn you around and lead you on, bringing you up from the far north, and bring you against the mountains of Israel. (NKJV)

"And leave but the sixth part of thee" is left out in the NKJV. This is omitted in nearly all newer translations as the scholars are not agreed on the meaning of the original construction. The literal rendition of the Hebrew is "I will six thee". Others feel that the reading should be "strike thee with six plagues", and then refer the reader back to Ezekiel 38:22 where pestilence, blood, overflowing rain, great hailstones, fire, and brimstone are listed.

That the meaning is not certain to some is *not* justification for the *omission* of these words from the Holy Writ! The KJB translators placed in italics words that they had added for the purpose of clarity. These words were not so given therefore these men had positive evidence that the Hebrew was present and genuine. The author simply believes that the Holy Spirit guided these translators to render a faithful reading. The author is further convinced that more was known about the Hebrew language 400 years ago than is known today. It is blindness and pride that would lead one to conclude that we know more today concerning a "dead language" (which for practical intent is true of Hebrew) than was known in the distant past. The words should stand as the KJB reads.

Zechariah 1:8 I saw by night, and behold a man riding upon a red horse, and he stood among the myrtle trees that *were* in the bottom; and behind him *were there* red horses, **speckled**, and white.

Zechariah 6:3 And in the third chariot white horses; and in the fourth chariot grised and **bay horses**.

Zechariah 6:7 And **the bay** went forth, and sought to go that they might walk to and fro through the earth: and he said, Get you hence, walk to and fro through the earth. So they walked to and fro through the earth. (KJB)

[14]

Zechariah 1:8 I saw by night, and behold, a man riding on a red horse, and it stood among the myrtle trees in the hollow; and behind him *were* horses: red, **sorrel**, and white.

Zechariah 6:3 with the third chariot white horses, and with the fourth chariot dappled horses – **strong steeds**.

Zechariah 6:7 Then **the strong steeds** went out, eager to go, that they might walk to and fro throughout the earth. And He said, "Go, walk to and fro throughout the earth." So they walked to and fro throughout the earth. (NKJV)

The color of the horses is very significant. Red in the Scriptures is the color for war and bloodshed (as in Rev. 6:4). As Jesus is on a red horse, we are looking in the fullest prophetic scope to His second advent at which time He will come in His Kingdom Glory to judge and to make war (cp. Rev. 19:11; Isa. 63:1-6). The immediate context is dealing with Jerusalem's enemies in Zechariah's day.

White horses in the Scriptures speak of victory or triumph (Rev. 6:2, 19:11). The third color of horse present is said to be speckled here, in other places they are referred to as dappled or grizzled (hail spotted). Grizzled is from grizzly which means pale but spotted.

In the 8th vision, Black horses are mentioned as also being present (6:2, 6 & 8). The black horse is again referred to in Revelation 6:5-6, where it represents **famine** (cp. Jer. 14:1-2, Lam. 5:10).

Here, as in Zechariah 6, the dappled or grizzled horse (spotted, speckled, splotched or blotched) symbolically represents wholesale death from sources **other than** just war and famine, such as, plagues, pestilence, epidemics etc. (cp. Rev. 6:8 - in Ezekiel 14:21 sword, famine, beasts and pestilence are listed). Now the color of this horse as described here and in other Scriptures has been widely discussed by various commentators, many of the newer translations, and some of the older translations. Sometimes the various Hebrew words (*seruqqim*, *amots*, etc.) are rendered "sorrel or bay".

Many of the commentators and translators are confused by this, thinking that they are all different horses symbolizing something different each time but this is not so. Some of the reasons for the confusion are, firstly – that the Hebrew words rendered "sorrel" or "bay" are not well understood, secondly – most translators and commentators know little about horses, and thirdly – a propensity within such men to "correct" or change the King James Bible. The following are offered for consideration:

- (1) the Hebrew words may sometimes refer to a breed of horse irrespective of color. For instance, the word "Appaloosa" invariably brings to mind a predominately reddish brown horse with a "blanket" on one of its flanks that is white with black spots. But this is not necessarily true at all. Some Appaloosas are almost pure black in color, others are even basically gray with white splotches all over them (or white with gray).
- (2) or that the Hebrew word "*seruqqim*" (שֵׁרֻקִים, from root "saruk", Strongs #8320) which occurs only here in the entire O.T., is being used as a descriptive adjective as could also be the case in chapter 6, verses 3 and 7, where the Hebrew "*amots*" (אֲמוֹצִים, Strongs #554) is used. Gesenius, the noted German Hebrew authority (professor at Halle, died Oct. 23, 1842), renders "active" or "nimble" as possible meanings for *amots*. Others add to these "swift", "fleet", and "strong".

Hence, a type or breed of horse or even a physical attribute may sometimes be that which is being referred to, whereas on other occasions when a different word is recorded, the color of that breed is being described. The **context** will militate as to the best solution. When the horse is being described as grizzled, speckled, spotted, dappled etc., it just means that it is basically a pale horse – a pale white horse that has whitish or grayish spots or blotches on it. "Seruqqim" then, does not mean sorrel here, as some so construe.

In any case, the color intended to describe these horses is assured, as that color is clearly given in other Scripture by using other words whose meanings are certain. Even the spurious LXX concurs, translating "seruqqim" into "gray and piebald" (Piebald means: of different color, spotted or blotched, composed of incongruous parts).

The significance of the color is that **it is descriptive of the skin condition** (ie: blotched, spotted etc.) of the victims of the various plagues and epidemics which these horses symbolize (cp. Lev. 13:2,4,10,14-16,19,24,42,49, and 14:37). These are the same horses mentioned in connection with the fourth chariot in Zec. 6:3 & 6:6 which go toward the south, and they equate to the "pale" horse of Rev. 6:8 (here, the Greek word is "chloros" {χλωρος, Strongs #5515} which means pale, greenish, or yellowish – its Hebrew equivalent is "yeraqraq" (קֶרֶקֶר, Strongs #3422); cp. Lev. 13:49; 14:37 and also the LXX).

The colors of the horses have the same meanings here as in the first vision (Zec. 1:7-17). Again, **red** symbolizes war and bloodshed, **black** designates death by famine, **white** speaks of victory and/or triumph, and **dappled or grizzled** etc. denotes pestilence, epidemic and/or plague.

The number "four" points to the **universality** of the judgment (cp. Isa. 11:12 "the four corners [quarters] of the earth") and the whole "Beast system" political structure of "the times of the Gentiles" (Lk. 21:24), as prefigured by the four empires of Daniel's colossus vision (Dan. 2:36-45).<sup>17</sup>

The four horses are connected with the four horsemen of the Apocalypse (Rev. 6:1-8), who appear in the same context of judgment and destruction of wicked men.

A direct connection is seen between these four colored horses and Ezekiel 14:21 where the four judgments there are given as sword, famine, beast and pestilence (cp. Jer. 15:2,3; 43:11; Ezk. 5:2,12; Rev. 6:8). The sword compares to the red horse (war, bloodshed); the famine to the black horse; plague and pestilence to the pale or grizzled horse (as people's skin is blotched by various plagues - Lev. 13); and the beast to the white horse upon whom "The Beast" comes forth impersonating the True Conqueror and Overcomer (Rev. 6:2 cp. 6:8. Also note that the Gentile kingdoms are likened unto wild rapacious beasts – Dan. 7). The connection of Ezk. 14:21 to Zec. 6 and Rev. 6 is, though only circumstantial evidence, another piece to the puzzle solidifying the correct identity of the white horse rider in Rev. 6:2 as being that of the Anti-christ.

Hence, these visions portray four horns, or foreign powers, that ruled over and scattered Israel (1:18-19), four carpenters who brought judgment on these horns (1:20-21) and now four means through which these judgments came – **sword, famine, beast and pestilence**.

At Zechariah's request (v.4) the interpreting angel explained the significance of the horses with their chariots. The directions that are assigned for the chariots to go toward are given with Jerusalem as the reference point (v.6). As already noted, the horses symbolize earth judgments, and the chariots with their accompanying angels are the ministers of God who will carry out these judgments.

---

<sup>17</sup> Merrill F. Unger, *Unger's Commentary on the Old Testament*, Vol. II, (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1981), pp. 1995-1996; also see p. 1965.

The black horses (death by famine) were sent to the north from whence direction Israel's worst enemies throughout history came (the Assyrians, Babylonians, Seleucids, and Romans), and from which her end-time foes – the king of the north (Ezk. 38-39; Dan. 11:40b-45) as well as the Antichrist and his hordes (Rev. 16:13-16), will burst forth.

- The white horses follow after the black to the north (v.6) to consummate special judgment in that sector because of the terribly cruel atrocities inflicted on Israel from that quarter. Those punishments will be culminated by the triumphant returning Messiah (Rev. 16:13-16; 19:11-19), symbolized by the white horse's Rider in Rev. 19:11. The most immediate context demands that "the north country" is primarily referring to Babylon which is reached by beginning due north and then through the fertile crescent to the east. This interpretation is consistent with the previous vision in which "wickedness" in the symbol of a woman had been transplanted to Babylon (Zec. 5:5-11; cp. Rev. 18:2,10,21; Rev. 19:1-3).
- The grizzled (hail spotted, piebald or blotched) are dispatched to the south in the direction of Israel's ancient foes, Egypt and Edom.

Immediate partial fulfillments of this vision occurred shortly thereafter. The "remnant" had just been delivered from Babylonian domination through God's judgment on that nation by Cyrus. But though conquered by Cyrus, Babylon revolted in the fifth year of Darius Hystaspes who in turn devastated and depopulated the country. As for Egypt, it revolted against Darius and was conquered by Xerxes I in 485 B.C. and, again, after continued rebellion, by Ochus in 340 B.C. Alexander took it from the Persians in 332 B.C.

Nothing is said directly of horses going east and west, because the "Great Sea" (the Mediterranean) lay to the west and the Arabian Desert on the east. But because the scope of this and ALL the night visions is worldwide, all four chariots will encircle the globe after judgment is specifically visited upon the north and south.

- It should be noted that the red horses (v.2) seemingly are assigned no mission here (vs.6-8) and that the bay horses are separated from the grizzled, whereas in verse 3 they appear to be together. The best solution is that the black, white and the grizzled are referring to the second, third and fourth chariots respectively which are sent on specific missions (v.6), and that the Hebrew word *amots* used here in verse 7 (the word bay) is a synonym, or at least nearly so, further describing the hue of the red horses in verse 2. The context of verse 7 demands that the bay is a reference to the red horses which are drawing the first chariot of verse 2. This determination is confirmed by noting that the horses in verse 7 are assigned to go to and fro throughout the whole earth (its four quarters - also note that to & fro are mentioned three times in verse 7 signifying emphasis - hence, importance to this assignment) indicative that war and bloodshed will hold sway over all the world. This is also true of the red horse rider in Rev.6:4. The time period for this chariot judgment is that of "the times of the Gentiles", which were initiated in 606 B.C. (Luk. 21:24; cp. Mat. 24:6-7).<sup>18</sup>

Though the same Hebrew word, *amots*, is used in verse 3 with respect to the grizzled horses of the fourth chariot, it is not meant that some of the horses pulling the fourth chariot are "bay" (red) and others grizzled. All of the horses pulling the fourth chariot are grizzled (dappled, blotched, etc.). This is clearly seen in verse 6 when this team is again referred to and they are said to only be "grizzled". This is confirmed by the mention of the color of similar steeds in Zec. 1:8 and Rev. 6:8.

We understand verse 3 to mean that the hail spots, dapples or blotches on these pale, grizzled, etc. horses have a small amount of "bay" or red present (as in "fleabitten" dappled horses) as might well be

---

<sup>18</sup> An alternative interpretation, though considered unlikely, is that 'amots (bay) is intended to be an adjective denoting strength. Thus the meaning would be the "strong, red" horses went forth (or even possibly strong red as to color). Still possible, but yet less probable, is that here the word is intended to convey the type or breed of the red colored steeds.

the case of the condition of the skin of a person with some plague (which is what these horses portray: for **biblical confirmation** see Lev. 13 especially verses 2,4,10,14-16,19,24,42,49 and 14:37 – note the use of such terms with reference to skin color as "bright spot, white bright spot, **raw** flesh, white and somewhat **reddish**, white, white **reddish** sores, greenish or **reddish**"). We consider the cited references from Leviticus as irrefutable and conclusive proof as to the color of the grizzled et al., horses and also to the interpretation placed upon the meaning of these particular horses in Scripture. The result is a uniform interpretation regardless of the Hebrew or Greek word used and a vindication of the King James Version's handling of the problem.

Although it is possible that in this context the word *amots* is denoting that the grizzled horses are further being described as strong, fleet or nimble, etc. (the Hebrew word *amots* is only used in vs.3 and 7 in the entire Old Testament); in view of all that has been said above, we consider this to be highly unlikely, and that the matter has been forever solved and laid to rest.

In any case, the duty assignments to the four chariots with their specific colored team of horses is certain.

#### ...Christ Jesus

Philippians 2:6 Who, being in the form of God, **thought it not robbery to be equal with God:**

Philippians 2:7 **But made himself of no reputation**, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: (KJB)

[15]

Philippians 2:6 who, being in the form of God, **did not consider equality with God something to be grasped,**

Philippians 2:7 **but emptied himself** by taking the form of a servant, *and* coming in the likeness of men. (NKJV). (1st publication of N.T.)

Philippians 2:6 who, being in the form of God, **did not consider it robbery to be equal with God,**

Philippians 2:7 **but made Himself of no reputation**, taking the form of a bondservant, *and* coming in the likeness of men. (NKJV)

As can be seen, the NKJV has corrected their original edition but those who have the 1st edition have the erroneous, less powerful reading of the above verses in Philippians.

Acts 4:27 For of a truth against thy **holy child Jesus**, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, (KJB)

[16]

Acts 4:27 "For truly against Your **holy Servant Jesus**, whom You anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together (NKJV)

"Holy child Jesus" versus "holy Servant Jesus" – this is an attack on the deity of the Lord Jesus. The Greek "paida" (παῖδα) is from "pais" (παῖς) – a child. "Pais" can be rendered "servant" if the context so demands, but observe that the 1611 King James Bible chose to honor the Lord whereas when given an apparent choice, the new version chose not to.

1 Timothy 6:10 For the love of money is **the root** of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. (KJB)

[17]

1 Timothy 6:10 For the love of money is **a root** of all **kinds** of evil, for which some have strayed from the faith in their greediness, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. (NKJV)

"The **love** of money (not "money") is **the root of all evil**" has been perverted to "a root of all **kinds** of evil".

1 Timothy 6:20 O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane *and* vain babblings, and oppositions of **science** falsely so called: (KJB)

[18]

1 Timothy 6:20 O Timothy! Guard what was committed to your trust, avoiding the profane *and* idle babblings and contradictions of what is falsely called **knowledge** – (NKJV)

The warning is against "science" that is not true truth – not against true science. It is against something that parades as science, but it is in reality "false science". This warning would, as preserved by the original King James, include such Bible contradicting nature myths (fairy stories for adults) as the theory of evolution and the "big bang". The Scriptures are quite clear that neither the universe nor the earth **began** with a "big bang" (see Genesis 1), but rather the opposite; they will **end** with a "big bang" (II Pet 3:10-12).

Daniel 11:9 So **the king of the south** shall come into *his* kingdom, and shall return into his own land. (KJB)

[19]

Daniel 11:9 "Also **the king of the North** shall come to the kingdom of the king of the South, but shall return to his own land. (NKJV)

Is it the "king of the south" that shall come or is it the "king of the north"? The A.D. 1611 King James Bible is faithful to the Hebrew text of the Masoretes which reads "south".

The word "north" is not to be found in the Hebrew. The primary reason for taking such liberties with the Masoretic text is an attempt to force the verse to fit the facts of secular history rather than to merely translate the text (here the NIV and others make the same error but the NAS is faithful). The NKJV is attempting to have this verse mesh with Seleucus II Callinicus' (the Seleucid "king of the north") counter invasion against Ptolemy III Euergetes Egyptian kingdom (the "king of the south). However, the verse is part of the story found beginning at the sixth verse of Daniel chapter 11 and speaks of a previous battle which took place in B.C. 246.

Ptolemy II Philadelphus, the Greek king of Egypt (285-246 B.C.), and Antiochus II Theos, the Grecian king (262-246 B.C.) of the Seleucid Empire (Syria, Mesopotamia, southern Asia Minor, Iraq and most of Iran) had been bitter enemies and had waged war against one another for years. Finally, about 250 B.C., they entered into an alliance and sealed this treaty by the marriage of Ptolemy II's daughter Berenice to Antiochus II (v.6). Ptolemy had forced Antiochus to divorce his wife, Laodice, in order that Berenice would be queen and not merely a "second wife" or concubine, as part of the agreement so that the marriage would really have the desired effect of making the peace between their kingdoms.

However, after Ptolemy died Antiochus reinstated Laodice as his wife and queen. Laodice then poisoned Antiochus, and had Berenice and her son along with all those who had accompanied Berenice from Egypt put to death, and raised her son, Seleucus II Callinicus, to the throne.

Berenice's brother, Ptolemy III Euergetes ("Benefactor", 246-221 B.C.) succeeded his father, Ptolemy II Philadelphus, and set out to avenge the death of his sister (v.7). He marched north, defeated the Syrian army (the king of the north), put Laodice to death, conquered large areas of the Seleucid kingdom and carried back to Egypt 40,000 talent of silver and 2,500 idols, many made of gold (Seleucus II fell from a horse and died while in exile, thus Ptolemy III survived him by about 6 years, cp. verse 8b).

Thus Ptolemy III Euergetes came into "his" (Seleucus II Callinicus) kingdom (v.9), "and shall return". While pursuing his revenge, word reached Ptolemy III of a rebellion back in Egypt, thus he broke off the invasion and returned quickly to suppress the insurrection. Had this rebellion not necessitated his recall, he would have totally destroyed the kingdom of Syria.

Thus, verse 9 as stated in the KJB and in the Hebrew Masoretic text clearly is supported with this portion of secular history and no alteration of the text is in any way justifiable (their job is to translate, not interpret).<sup>19</sup>

After this humiliating defeat, Seleucus II Callinicus (the king of the North) counter invaded Egypt, but he was totally routed. This is the part of the historical record into which the NKJV (& the NIV) attempts to force verse 9 to fit. This we have shown to be unwarranted.

One may contend that this verse neither affects any "doctrine" nor does it bear upon the plan of salvation. But it DOES affect doctrine! It creates doubt in the mind of the unsuspecting layman and pastor alike that he can know whether he has a trustworthy Bible in his hand – ***and that is the very foundation of all doctrine!***

---

<sup>19</sup> This author is familiar with the nuances of lower (or textual) criticism. The work of the modern textual critic/translator is largely composed of a balancing act. On one end is formal equivalence and on the other, dynamic equivalence. At the formal equivalence end, the word in question is translated exactly according to the Greek lexicon, paying little or no attention to the quality of the sentences that is being produced. The result is nearly a word for word or literal rendition of the Greek into the other language.

The problem with this is that various languages contain different sentence structure such that the resultant rendering is often out of context, out of order within the sentence, may be either nonsensical or even misleading, and lacks emotion. It is impossible to actually translate word for word from any language to another and produce an intelligible result. For example, consider a literal translation of the familiar John 3:16 passage – "For so loved the God the world that the his Son the only begotten he gave that every one the believes into him may not perish but may have life eternal". One would hardly call this result "English". Realizing this, a condition has been imposed by the proponents of formal equivalence to the effect that, though they deem a word for word translation of utmost importance, it must not be done so rigidly as to produce nonsense as in our example. This necessitates a counterbalance.

Today, dynamic equivalence is that counterbalance. At the other end of the see-saw, the translator attempts to verbalize the "message" that is being conveyed. From the Greek, he *extrapolates* or takes out what he *thinks* the author had in mind. Then, instead of translating or matching the words and wording as they are found in the grammar, words are injected that express *the thought* of the original author in the language the critic is using!? The NIV is notorious for doing this [See Jay P. Green, Sr. (ed.), *Unholy Hands on the Bible*, Vol. II (Lafayette, IN: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund Pub., 1992), pp. 119-318. Dr. Green, a well known Greek and Hebrew scholar who has produced several Bible translations and a complete interlinear Bible in four volumes, has done the Church a great service in exposing the unfaithfulness of the New International Version (NIV).

Not only has the NIV committee selected the corrupt critical Greek text as its New Testament base, Dr. Green reveals that the translators were not even faithful in their rendering of it as they have left around 5 percent of the Greek words altogether **un-translated!** "A slightly lesser percentage" of the original Hebrew O.T. has been left un-translated (p. 120). Thus tens of thousands of God breathed words are not in the NIV.

Moreover, they have added over 100,000 words without so signifying to the reader by placing such words in italics as did the Authorized King James translators. All 100,000+ lack any Hebrew or Greek support whatever (pp. 120, 222-223). Both Green and Dr. D.A. Waite (see last paragraph in this fn.) expose the NIV as being replete with free wheeling paraphrases rather than accurately rendering a translation. Nor are they alone in exposing this unfit translation; see also: *The NIV Reconsidered* by Radmacher & Hodges; (Dallas, TX: Redencion Viva Pub., 1990) and Norman Ward, *Perfected or Perverted*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Which Bible Society)].

Thus dynamic equivalence is, for all practical purposes, a paraphrase. A paraphrase means to use several words to communicate the meaning of a single word. For example, the Greek word *theopneustos* (θεοπνευστος) in II Timothy 3:16 is rendered "is given by inspiration of God." The translator is constantly engaged in choosing between each extreme. He should seek to render a *verbal* equivalence between the two languages before him as much as possible and still make sense, while at the same time attempting to inject the emotion and life of the original meaning. Such is extremely subjective and invariably one side of the see-saw is strongly tipped – usually (though not always) toward the "formal" end for such is the natural inclination of the scholar.

Dr. D.A. Waite, a most qualified linguist (66 semester hours of combined Classical and Koine Greek from the University of Michigan and Dallas Theological Seminary, 25 hours in Hebrew, a total of 118 hours in foreign languages, two earned doctorates, and over 35 years teaching experience), maintains that it is at this very point the King James translators exhibited superior translation technique because they avoided the dynamic equivalence method, using instead "verbal" equivalence [Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, (Collingswood, NJ: The Bible For Today Press, 1992), pp. 89-132]. That is, "the words from the Greek or Hebrew were rendered as closely as possible into the English" (Waite, pp. 90 and 98).

Dr. Waite further points out that the 1611 translators were most careful in their application of formal equivalence by carefully attending to the "forms" of the original wording. If the structure in the original language could be brought into the English, they so did. That is, if the word was a verb, they brought it over as a verb; they did not – as is common practice by most modern translators – change or transform it into a noun or some other part of speech.

Hebrews 2:16 For verily he took not on *him the nature of* angels; but he took on *him* the seed of Abraham. (KJB)

[20]

Hebrews 2:16 For indeed He does not **give aid** to angels, but He does **give aid** to the seed of Abraham. (NKJV)

First, we remind the reader that both of the above translations are being made from the exact same Greek words as contained in the *Textus Receptus* (the original Greek reading of the New Testament). The rendering of this verse in the NKJV is also found in the Westcott and Hort translation, the 1881 Revised Version, the NAS, NIV and many other modern versions. This is one of the many cases where the translation is facilitated by the **context**. The immediate context of verse 16 is unmistakably revealed in the verse that follows:

Wherefore in all things **it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren**, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things *pertaining* to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. (Hebrews 2:17, KJB)

Thus the translators, though the Greek is admittedly difficult if verse 16 alone is considered, had their job clarified by the Holy Spirit. That which follows in verse 17 has nothing to do whatever with "giving aid" to angels. Furthermore, verse 14 both **confirms** and **precedes** the "problem" verse with the correct context:

Forasmuch then **as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same**; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; (Hebrews 2:14, KJB)

Clearly the subject being presented is that of the human nature of the Messiah, and as the letter is addressed to "the Hebrews" it is of special relevance to those who proceeded from the loins of Abraham. Moreover, verse 16 amplifies verse 5:

For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak. (Hebrews 2:5, KJB)

The writer of the Book of Hebrews is being led by the Holy Spirit to demonstrate, beginning with familiar Old Testament fundamentals, why the Messiah had to be a man and could not be an angel.

When God gave Adam dominion over the earth, man became the **delegated** sovereign of planet earth. When Adam freely chose to obey Satan, he officially forfeited to Satan his right to rule the world. At that moment, The Devil **legally** took over dominion of the earth.

Earth rightly belongs to Adam's race, but as a result of our fore-father's capitulation to Satan with the subsequent result that he became Satan's slave:

Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? (Romans 6:16, KJB)

Neither Adam nor any of his descendants – as slaves beget slaves – can qualify to pay the redemption price of the forfeited world and its people. As slaves, they lost all legal rights to their person and their domain. Slaves have no right to possess property or authority to rule – or even the legal right to enter court to file suit to attempt to recover that which was lost through devious guile and subterfuge. **Slaves have no legal rights.**

Someone must be found – if humanity is to escape eternal loss – who is "worthy" to make restitution for man's debt. Note in the following passages from the Book of Revelation (5:2-10):

<sup>2</sup> And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof?

<sup>3</sup> And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon.

<sup>4</sup> And I wept much, because no man was found worthy to open and to read the book, neither to look thereon.

<sup>5</sup> And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof.

<sup>6</sup> And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth.

<sup>7</sup> And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne.

<sup>8</sup> And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four *and* twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints.

<sup>9</sup> And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;

<sup>10</sup> And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. (KJB)

As John looked at this great scroll, he wept much because no man could be found who was untainted with Adam's sin. No man or angel in the universe could claim the right to open this scroll. Could anyone be found to redeem man's lost heritage or was all lost?

The above verses reveal the one Person who qualifies to pay the redemption price and recover the lost heritage. It is the God-man, Jesus the Christ (Christ is Greek, Messiah is the Hebrew equivalent), who would pay the debt by voluntarily forfeiting His own life.

In the greater sense, it must be remembered that Adam's rule was not without stipulation. He and all his race were to govern ... but that authority and dominion were answerable to God, who had given that authority. God demonstrated this by placing Adam and Eve "under orders" – viz:

And the **LORD** God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. (Genesis 2:16-17, KJB)

The point is, that *the earth is ultimately God's permanent possession by right of creation*, and nothing can ever alter that fact. Satan merely conquered earth's vice-regent, not its King and Owner.

The earth *is* the **LORD'S**, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein. (Psalm 24:1, KJB)

In type, this was signified by God's **permanent** gift of a portion of His land to each family among His chosen people, Israel.

<sup>23</sup> The land shall not be sold for ever: for the land *is* mine; for ye *are* strangers and sojourners with me.

<sup>24</sup> And in all the land of your possession ye shall grant a redemption for the land.

<sup>25</sup> If thy brother be waxen poor, and hath sold away *some* of his possession, and if any of his kin come to redeem it, then shall he redeem that which his brother sold. (Leviticus 25:23-25, KJB)

Just as an Israelite could sell or lose his land for a time, so Adam lost his God-given dominion over the earth. Satan became the "god of this world" (II Cor. 4:4).

But this situation could only be superficial and temporary, for:

... the earth hath he given to the children of men. (Psalm 115:16, KJB)

A lost estate in Israel could be redeemed by *any kinsman* with the purchase price if he were *willing* to so do. But who and where is one who is both kinsman and redeemer, one who has **both the right** and the **power** to take over "the uttermost parts of the earth [for his] possession" (Psalm. 2:8)?

The identity of the rightful heir must be determined, and the description is very specific. **It must be a man rather than an angel, for it was man's lost estate that must be reclaimed and it was a man that lost it.** This then is the point contained in the second chapter of Hebrews verse 5, God never gave angels dominion over the earth:

For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak. (Hebrews 2:5, KJB)

**and again:**

... the earth hath he given to the children of men. (Psalm 115:16, KJB)

Therefore none of the angelic hosts in heaven, and certainly not the demonic hordes of Satan, could qualify. Though there have been billions of Adam's sons, none of these could qualify for the further reason that their very souls are included in the estate that is to be redeemed.

In all the world's history, there has only been "none righteous, no, not one" (Rom 3:10).

And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. (Revelation 5:3, KJB)

None of the saints around the throne could even bring himself to dare **look** at the book, just to see whether he would qualify. They had all experienced the purifying fire of Christ Jesus' judgment on their works (1 Cor. 3:11-15) and of His presence – and had even been **made** like Him (Rom. 8:29). But this was **by his grace alone** – not by any merit of their own. The one who could open the scroll must do so **by right of his own demonstrated – not merely imputed – merit.**

The only one **able** to redeem the earth **is the Creator Himself – the original owner.** But to be a kinsman of Adam, He must first become a genuine man – the 2nd man, the last Adam (I Cor. 15:45 and 47).

All of the above is the Scriptural backdrop for the understanding of the Greek contained in verse 16. The 1611 King James translators recognized the importance of bringing this "remote context" (or distant context) to bear upon this verse – the literal Greek itself being cryptic and obscure. As all linguists well know, some interpretation is necessary when one is engaged in translation from any language to another; sentence structure, word order, etc. often being different. The object is to be faithful to the original wording and meaning such as to do as little interpretation as possible. Thus, guided by the Spirit of God, the KJB translators correctly rendered verse 16 with regard to the remote context as well as with regard to the *immediate context* of the verses surrounding it. They signified that they had done this by placing "him the nature of" and "him" in italics. All other translations contain similar (many more than found in the KJB) word insertions, but unlike the King James Version – they do not let the reader know this by so indicating.

Moreover, the verse as rendered in the KJB shows Jesus as the true fulfillment of mankind's only hope as revealed in the Old Testament prophecies – that He is the promised "seed of the woman."

And I will put enmity between thee (Satan) and the woman (Eve), and between thy seed and **her seed**; it (her seed) shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. (Genesis 3:15)

Further, He is pictured by the KJB translators as especially being the fulfillment of the continuation of the Genesis 3:15 promise as given to Abraham.

And in thy (Abraham) seed (**singular!** Greek = spermati = σπερματι, LXX - cp. Gal. 3:16) shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice. (Gen. 22:18, KJB)

But we are not left at the mercy of some mere man or modern Greek or Hebrew authority to divulge that the word "seed" in the above verse is not speaking of the Jewish nation but is in the singular and as such is a unmistakable reference to Messiah. The Holy Spirit reveals this truth to him in English elsewhere in Scripture.

Now to Abraham and his seed (σπερματι = spermati – singular in Greek) were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds (σπερμασιν = spermasin – plural; both from the root σπερμα, = sperma; see the LXX), as of many; but as of **one**, And to thy seed (σπερματι – singular), which is **Christ**. (Galatians 3:16, KJB)

All of the rich setting and overview that has preceded is completely lost in the modern reading of Hebrews 2:16.

Equally alarming, the reading found in the NKJV et al. not only smacks of anti-Semitism, *it introduces a conspicuous error* into the Word of God – namely, that God does not give aid to angels.

This contradicts Daniel 10 wherein the prophet for whom the Book is named was told by an angel that he had been dispatched from the throne of Heaven to come to strengthen him. Nevertheless, the heavenly messenger had been withstood for a period of 21 days by the demon prince who oversaw the kingdom of Persia. It was not until God dispatched the archangel Michael to come to the aid of the angelic messenger that he was able to successfully battle through and reach Daniel.

Thus, the **internal evidence** of other Scripture lays bare this inaccurate rendering of the Word of God and shows all other translations who so follow as being erroneous and inferior. The Monarch of Books, the true English rendering of the Holy Writ as preserved in the 1611 King James Bible is thereby demonstrated to be conspicuously superior and preeminent.

Finally, John Owen has given an extensive refutation of this modern rendering as far back as the year A.D. 1680.<sup>20</sup>

2 Chronicles 36:10 And when the year was expired, king Nebuchadnezzar sent, and brought him (Jehoiachin - see II Chr. 36:9) to Babylon, with the goodly vessels of the house of the LORD, and made Zedekiah **his** brother king over Judah and Jerusalem. (KJB)

[21]

2 Chronicles 36:10 At the turn of the year King Nebuchadnezzar summoned *him* and took him to Babylon, with the costly articles from the house of the LORD, and made Zedekiah, **Jehoiakim's** brother, king over Judah and Jerusalem. (NKJV)

The word "his" has been **omitted** and "**Jehoiakim's**" has been **substituted**.

The Hebrew Masoretic text reads "his" exactly as the 1611 A.D. King James has faithfully recorded. The word "Jehoiakim's" is totally absent from the verse. The New King James reflects a deliberate alteration to the God given text. This is unforgivable, as this **addition** to the true reading is an **interpretation** of the text rather than a **translation**. This is forbidden four times in the Scriptures (Deu. 4:2; Psa. 12:6-7; Pro. 30:6-7; Rev. 22:18-19) under the penalty of a most severe curse from the LORD Himself.

<sup>20</sup> John Owen, *An exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, W.H. Goold (ed.), Vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980; rpt. of 1855 ed.), pp. 454-462.

When the 1611 version was produced, any words that were deemed necessary to be added for clarity were "flagged" by those translators by recording them in *italics*. This distinction reflected their reverence for God's Word as opposed to man's thoughts, and also served to warn the reader that such italicized words were intended as helps but were not to be treated as being the Holy Words of the Living God. Although the NKJV *has* marked this addition with a number, it has relegated to the center reference in small print the actual Word of God.

The reason for this having been done is an effort on the translators' part to "correct" the "misconception" that the Hebrew text depicts, whereupon one might be "misled" to believe that the "his" in verse ten was with reference to Jehoiachin in verse nine. They "know" that this cannot be for Zedekiah is Jehoiachin's uncle, not his brother (I Ch. 3:15-16). Thus, they feel justified in inserting the addition.

However, the "his" of verse ten is referring back to Jehoiachin in verse nine! In their zeal to clarify, their *reasoning* has actually led them into doing the very opposite of what they intended. They intended to avert the apparent error and instead have actually **forced** one into their rendition of the Bible in another place. The following detailed explanation should enable the reader to understand the paradox.

However, we must first introduce another so-called "unfortunate scribal error" as the two cases go together in explaining and resolving one another.

**Jehoiachin was eight years old when he began to reign**, and he reigned three months and ten days in Jerusalem: ... (II Chronicles 36:9, KJB)

**Jehoiachin was eighteen years old when he began to reign**, and he reigned in Jerusalem three months. ... (II Kings 24:8, KJB)

The problem<sup>21</sup> is that the first verse relates that Jehoiachin was eighteen years old when he began to reign yet the second states that he was only eight. As the two verses appear to contradict one another, this is commonly touted as a scribal error in the Hebrew Text. Since we *know* by faith that the Scriptures are infallible and God breathed, we know that somehow both of the above must be correct and that a Bible honoring solution is possible. In fact, three feasible as well as possible answers are offered, none of which violates either the context or veracity of Scripture.

The first is that Jehoiachin was actually eighteen years old upon his ascension (II Ki. 24:8) whereas the II Chronicles 36:9 passage, which literally translates that he was "a son of eight years", is referencing the fact that his dynasty or kingdom had been under Nebuchadnezzar as its suzerain since the fourth year of his father, Jehoiakim (B.C. 605, Jer. 25:1, cp. II Ki. 24:1). From that year until Jehoiachin succeeded his father on the throne, an eight year span had elapsed during which he was a vassal crown prince. Thus, upon his accession, the beginning of his reign could be rightly referenced to the time in which Nebuchadnezzar placed the Babylonian yoke upon him and his kingdom; thereby he was "a son of eight years" under Nebuchadnezzar's dominion. Moreover, the Chronicles passage is looking back nearly five hundred years after the fact. It is so relating to emphasize the fact that upon Jehoiachin's coming to the throne, Nebuchadnezzar was already conducting a siege against Jerusalem (in punishment for Jehoiakim's rebellion) which, along with the new king, had already been under Babylonian authority for the past eight years.

A second alternative explanation for the confusion is that, taking both statements as being factual, Jehoiakim named or anointed his son to succeed him at an early age (Judaic reckoning) in an attempt to secure the throne through his lineage by way of Jehoiachin (Jeconiah). This would have been done in order to deny the throne to his weak and ineffective younger brother, Zedekiah.

---

<sup>21</sup> Floyd Nolen Jones, *A Chronology of the Old Testament: A Return to the Basics*, 16th ed., rev. & enl., (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2005), pp. 192-194. This explanation has been taken from my referenced book.

The third solution offered, and that preferred by this author in light of that which follows, is that Josiah must have anointed Jehoiachin, his grandson, to succeed him just prior to his encounter with Pharaoh Neco. Realizing that his sons were wicked, godly Josiah must have hoped that his grandson Jehoiachin (Jeconiah), though only eight years old at the time, would turn out better. As Josiah himself was but eight when he began to reign, he would have few qualms in placing so young a child upon the throne of Judah. Josiah fully realized that he might not return from this conflict with the Egyptians. In the first place, he was going up against a much larger contingency. Secondly, it had been prophesied that he would die young and also prior to the judgment that God would send upon the Kingdom of Judah (II Ki. 22, II Chr. 34). Having already reigned thirty-one years, Josiah was now about 39 years of age. Thus he knew that his time was very possibly at hand.

The only Biblical and legal way that a grandson etc., could be made to inherit the throne while his father and uncles were still alive was that of *adoption* to the status of a full son.<sup>22</sup> It is the contention of this writer that Josiah did adopt and name as his successor young Jehoiachin (Jeconiah) just prior to departing for his fatal encounter with Neco at Megiddo. Moreover, this scenario enjoys Scriptural corroboration:

And **Josias begat Jechonias and his brethren**, about the time they were carried away to Babylon: (Matthew 1:11, KJB)

This Scripture occurs in Matthew's roll of Christ Jesus' ancestors. Beginning with David and Solomon at the sixth verse, it continues through the eleventh listing the kings of Judah in His lineage. Verse eleven asserts that Josiah *begat* Jeconiah (Jehoiachin being his "throne" name) though he was not his son. Although in a larger Biblical sense, it is permissible to speak of "begetting" descendants beyond the generation of one's own offspring, the context of this "begetting" would have occurred at the time of the adoption. The truth of this is clearly seen in that which follows: "and his brothers". Now this is indeed very strange, for the allusion is clearly to Josiah's sons and as such, are Jehoiachin's uncles and father – unless – unless he had been adopted. Then and only then could it be said that Josiah's sons are Jehoiachin's brothers! Lest there remain any reservations, consider:

And when the year was expired, king Nebuchadnezzar sent, and brought him (Jehoiachin, see vs. 9) to Babylon, with the goodly vessels of the house of the LORD, and made **Zedekiah his brother** king over Judah and Jerusalem. (II Chronicles 36:10. KJB)

Again, how can Zedekiah be Jehoiachin's brother? Only by his being adopted to full sonship. However the people of the land did not abide by Josiah's decision. Instead, they placed Josiah's twenty-three year old son Jehoahaz (not his eldest, II Ki. 23:36) on the throne (II Ki. 23:8). After reigning but three months, Jehoahaz was removed by Pharaoh Neco and carried prisoner to Egypt where he died. Placing the land under tribute, Neco installed Jehoahaz's older brother Jehoiakim (the father of Jehoiachin) as his vassal on the throne of Judah (II Ki. 23:33-37) where he reigned eleven years.

Of course, this does not demand that he reigned eleven years to the very day. For example, if he reigned ten years and three months, that would qualify as being "in his eleventh year". Thus, whereby Jehoiachin (Jeconiah) was *anointed* to be King when but a child (II Chr. 36:9), he did not actually occupy the throne until he was eighteen years of age (II Ki. 24:8-12) – a span of eleven years when numbered inclusively. Moreover, Chronicles is stating the situation as viewed from the priest's/ Temple's/God's perspective whereas the Book of Kings is presenting it from the historical/ political/throne view.

The "discrepancy" or "scribal error" between II Kings 24:8 and II Chronicles 36:9 is thus resolved. The verses are seen to signify that Jehoiachin's first year upon the throne would have been his "year of accession"; hence he would have been eight during his first official year of reign (Judaic method of

---

<sup>22</sup> See Genesis 48 where Joseph's sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, are adopted by Jacob and placed as sons, (vs. 5, cp. vv. 12 and 16 for the ritual) so that they could become equal heirs with his other sons.

reckoning). Thus II Kings 24:8, II Chronicles 36:9, and Matthew 1:11 – Scriptures long held by liberals, agnostics, infidels, and most scholars to be in error – when placed together, actually explain, confirm and sustain one another.

Furthermore, we know that Jehoiachin (Jeconiah) was actually eighteen and not eight when installed to reign as we are informed by the writer of Kings that after reigning only 3 months and 10 days, he and *his wives* were carried away to Babylon (II Ki. 24:15). An eight year old would hardly be married, much less have multiple wives. Neither is it tenable that God would brand an eight year old as "evil" (II Chr. 36:9).

Thus, like his "father" David, Jehoiachin was anointed to reign but many years passed before he actually ascended to the head of the Monarchy. The first time "he came unto his own" and presented himself as their anointed King "his own received him not" (Joh. 1:11) saying "we will not have this man to reign over us" (Luk. 19:14). The second time, he was welcomed as King, for no one is said to have installed him. Both thereby become types of another and far greater in this same dynasty, even the Lord Jesus, the Christ. Jesus was anointed to rule by the last of the Old Testament prophets, John the Baptist. The Father confirmed the same at that occasion by audibly speaking from heaven (Mat. 3:13-17; 11:7-15); yet the Lord Jesus has not yet occupied "the throne of His father, David" (Luk. 1:31-32).

Thus the translators of the NKJV, by arrogating unto themselves the authority to "add" to the Holy Word at II Chronicles 36:10 and placing the true reading into the margin, have left themselves no Scriptural recourse with which to explain the apparent discrepancy between II Kings 24:8 and II Chronicles 36:9. They are forced to claim that Jehoiachin was actually eighteen when he ascended to the throne and that the "eight" recorded in II Chronicles 36:9 is a scribal error that has crept in over the years. Such faith shall surely be rewarded.

Once again, the Authorized 1611 King James Bible is seen to faithfully reproduce the true original reading and is seen to be superior to the NKJV – as well as all other translations. The matter is concluded – two or more witnesses have testified. Let the mouths of the gainsayers be silent.

Floyd Nolen Jones, Th.D., Ph.D. —1995<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Following a 14 year professional career during which he held varying positions of responsibility as Paleontologist, Geophysicist, District Geophysicist, Geophysical Manager, and Regional Geophysicist with Texaco and Tenneco respectively, Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones was selected to attend Division Manager School shortly before resigning from his scientific vocation in 1974 to pursue Biblical studies.

Having attained a Ph.D. as well as a Th.D., Dr. Jones has garnered majors in the disciplines of Geology, Chemistry, Mathematics, Theology, and Education from six institutions of higher learning. A magna cum laude graduate and an evolutionist, he also possesses a minor in Physics (25 hours) and is an ordained Minister (SBC).

Dr. Jones twice served as adjunct Professor at Continental Bible College in Brussels, Belgium. A best selling author who has produced a definitive work on Bible chronology and an extensive analytical red-letter harmony of the Gospels, he has also written several works exposing textual criticism in defense of the traditional biblical text. He is currently engaged in ongoing biblical research and the teaching of God's infallible Word. Dr Jones and his wife, as well as his children and grandchildren, reside in Texas.

An examination of the book of Ecclesiastes will further illustrate the extent to which the translators of the NKJV have tampered with the text.<sup>24</sup> The first chapter contains approximately 50 changes from the KJB (not including spelling, e.g., cometh to come; labour to labor; etc.). Project this rate and we would expect to find nearly 600 such variations over the Book's 12 chapters. The following list contains some of the principal alterations. Although some may seem harmless at first glance, others are much more serious.

Citation	King James	New King James
Ecc. 1:13	sore travail	grievous task
1:14	vexation of spirit	grasping for the wind
1:16	my heart had great experience of wisdom	My heart has understood great wisdom
2:3	to give myself unto acquainting	to gratify my flesh with guiding
2:21	equity	skill
3:10	the travail, which God hath given	the God-given task
3:11	the world	eternity
3:18	that God might manifest them	God tests them
3:18	they themselves are beasts	they themselves are like beasts
3:22	portion	heritage
4:4	right work	skillful work
5:1	Keep thy foot	walk prudently
5:6	the angel	the messenger of God
5:6	thy voice	your excuse
5:8	he that is higher than the highest	high official
5:20	God answereth him	God keeps him busy
6:3	untimely birth	stillborn child
7:29	inventions	schemes
8:1	boldness	sternness
8:10	the place of the holy	the place of holiness
10:1	Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour	Dead flies putrefy the perfumer's ointment
10:10	If the iron be blunt	If the ax is dull
10:10	wisdom is profitable to direct	wisdom brings success
12:9	gave good heed	pondered
12:11	the masters of assemblies	scholars

This is only a sampling, but observe what has been done. Equity, which is a trait of godliness, is now "skill" (2:21). The world is now "eternity" (3:11). Man without God is no longer a beast but is only "like a beast" (3:18). The clear reference to deity in Ecclesiastes 5:8 ("he that is higher than the highest") is removed and reduced to merely "higher official" – but at least God is keeping the scholars busy (5:20). The most revealing of the above changes is the last where "the masters of assemblies" is now rendered "scholars".

We have no valid reason to doubt that the King James we hold in our hands is the very Word of God preserved for us in the English language. The authority for its veracity lies neither in the first printing of the 1611 edition, the personal character of King James I,<sup>25</sup> the spiritual condition of the Church of England at that time – nor does it lie in the scholarship of the 1611 translators. Our authority lies in the promise of God to preserve His Word!

<sup>24</sup> David F. Reagan, *The King James Version of 1611, The Myth of Early Revisions*, (Knoxville, TN: English Bible Resource, 1986), pp. 13-19. Within the confines of this small manuscript, Dr. Reagan is most perceptive, concise, and factual.

<sup>25</sup> In 1650, 25 years after James' death, Anthony Weldon who had been excluded from the court took his revenge by charging in writing the late King of homosexuality. As there were still alive many who knew both its falseness and Weldon's motive, the accusation was largely ignored and lay dormant until recent years. The untruthfulness of the allegation has been documented of late by Stephen A. Coston Sr., *King James: Unjustly Accused?*, (St. Petersburg, FL: KönigsWort Inc. Pub., 1996).