June 2022

Frank W. Nelte

150 MISTRANSLATIONS IN THE BIBLE PART 3

This is the third in a series of seven articles, in which the following Scriptures are discussed in a Genesis to Revelation sequence.

39	NUMBERS 13:33
40	DEUTERONOMY 6:4
41	DEUTERONOMY 16:1,2, 4,5,6
42	DEUTERONOMY 16:3
43	DEUTERONOMY 25:9
44	JOSHUA 6:4-6,8,13
45	JUDGES 11:31
46	JUDGES 18:30
47	1 KINGS 19:16
48	2 KINGS 7:13
49	1 CHRONICLES 20:3
50	ESTHER 1:10
51	JOB 16:14

52	JOB 21:24
53	JOB 40:23
54	PSALM 8:5
55	PSALM 31:22
56	PSALM 45:7
57	PSALM 81:3
58	PROVERBS 19:2
59	PROVERBS 29:15

LESIASTES 1:4

#39 = NUMBERS 13:33

THE VERSE:

And there we saw **the giants**, the sons of Anak, *which come* of **the giants**: and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This verse is clearly speaking about giants. But the Hebrew word that is used here for these people does not mean “giants”. It has a different meaning.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

This verse is a statement made by the ten evil spies who convinced the people of Israel to not want to cross the Jordan into Palestine. Their statement here is a distortion of the truth.

The word “giants” is a mistranslation, even though the people these evil spies referred to were clearly “giants”. The Hebrew word these spies used here is “**nephilim**”. This Hebrew word means “the fallen ones”, without implying that those fallen ones are of unusually large stature. See the discussion of Genesis 6:4 for more details.

There is also a 6-page section dealing with Numbers 13:33 in my article “Were There Giants On Earth

Before Noah's Flood?", which thoroughly discusses this mistranslation.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

And there we saw **the fallen ones**, the sons of Anak, *which come* of **the fallen ones**: and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

The evil spies were lying by **grossly exaggerating**. Yes, they had seen a few giants. But their analogy was clearly absurd, considering that Caleb by himself later drove those three sons of Anak away (see Joshua 15:14) without any trouble whatsoever. These spies also lied in referring to these sons of Anak as "nephilim". The giants they had seen were assuredly **not** "**nephilim**"! They were **only** "**rephaim**". See my article regarding "Were There Giants On Earth Before Noah's Flood?" for more details.

#40 = DEUTERONOMY 6:4

THE VERSE:

Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God *is* one LORD: (Deuteronomy 6:4)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This verse is used by various people to deny that Jesus Christ has always been God together with God the Father.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

This verse has been seriously mistranslated.

The mistranslation of this verse is expounded in great detail in my 2009 30-page article entitled "**Deuteronomy 6:4 and Mark 12:29 Explained**". That article includes amongst other things the following discussions regarding the translation of Deuteronomy 6:4.

1) The effects of punctuation.

2) The context in which Deuteronomy 6:4 appears.

3) How this verse and its context appears in the New Testament.

4) How the Jews have historically viewed this verse.

5) The key Hebrew words that are used in this verse.

6) A correct translation for Deuteronomy 6:4.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

The following are all possible ways to correctly translate this verse.

1) “O Israel, hearken unto the Eternal our God, the Eternal alone.”

2) “Obey, O Israel, the Eternal our God, the Eternal only.”

3) “Pay attention, O Israel, to the Eternal our God, the Eternal alone.”

4) “O Israel, listen to the Eternal our God, the Eternal alone.”

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

The message of this verse is not to tell Israel how many Gods there are. This statement tells Israel who is the only God they were to obey, and that was Jesus Christ. Israel only had contact with Jesus Christ, and they did not know anything about God the Father.

Jesus Christ said to the Jews regarding God the Father: “**you have not known Him**” (see John 8:55). But they did know the God who dealt with them in Deuteronomy 6, and that God was Jesus Christ. And Deuteronomy 6:4 is a command for Israel to only obey the one God with Whom they had any contact, Jesus Christ.

See the article for more details.

#41 = DEUTERONOMY 16:1, 2, 4, 5, 6

THE VERSES:

Observe the month of Abib, and keep the **Passover** unto the LORD your God: for in the month of Abib the LORD your God brought you forth out of Egypt by night. (verse 1)

You shall therefore sacrifice **the Passover** unto the LORD your God, of the flock and the herd, in the place which the LORD shall choose to place His name there. (verse 2)

And there shall be no leavened bread seen with you in all your coast seven days; **neither shall there *any thing* of the flesh, which you sacrificed the first day at even, remain all night until the morning**. (verse 4)

You may not sacrifice **the Passover** within any of your gates, which the LORD your God giveth you:

(verse 5)

But at the place which the LORD your God shall choose to place His name in, there you shall sacrifice the **Passover** at even, at the going down of the sun, **at the season** (Hebrew “mow’ed”) that you came forth out of Egypt. (verse 6)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THESE TRANSLATIONS:

These verses give the impression that the Passover is being spoken about. But the word “Passover” was **deviously inserted** into these verses by some dishonest scribe. The motivation for these devious changes was **to justify the Jewish custom** of referring to the Seven Days of Unleavened Bread as “Passover”.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THESE TRANSLATIONS:

The evidence for the fraudulent changes in this section of Scripture is not found in preserved manuscripts but **in the pages of the Bible itself**. We are dealing with a passage that is absolutely vital to upholding a Jewish belief, which belief is clearly unbiblical according to all the other Scriptures in the entire Old Testament. And these fraudulent changes have been accepted in every preserved manuscript, because they endorse a specific Jewish custom.

In addition, there is also **a mistranslation** in verse 6.

The only evidence for these alterations consists of exposing incompatible, contradictory and illogical statements in the changed text, when compared to other biblical passages. The person who altered this text overlooked some things which expose his fraudulent tampering.

Here is what happened:

1) In these verses some scribe **removed** the expression “**the Feast of Unleavened Bread**” from verse 1, and then **replaced it with** the word “**Passover**”.

2) In addition, this scribe also simply **inserted** the word “**Passover**” into the text of verses 2, 5 and 6.

3) The instructions in verses 2, 5 and 6 are in accordance with the command in Leviticus 23:8, to bring “an offering made by fire” for all of the seven days of Unleavened Bread, but the instructions in these verses are **not for the Passover**.

4) Furthermore, the forger also **added a section** from Exodus 12:10 to the text of verse 4.

The evidence for these deceptive alterations of the original text is presented in my 2004 16-page article

titled “Deuteronomy 16:1". That article discusses **the evidence for this corruption** of the original text at length.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THESE VERSES:

The text of these verses must originally have read more or less as follows:

Observe the month of Abib, and keep **the Feast of Unleavened Bread** unto the LORD your God: for in the month of Abib the LORD your God brought you forth out of Egypt by night. (verse 1)

You shall therefore sacrifice unto the LORD your God, of the flock and the herd, in the place which the LORD shall choose to place His name there.” (verse 2)

And there shall be no leavened bread seen with you in all your coast seven days. (verse 4)

You may not sacrifice within any of your gates, which the LORD your God gives you: (verse 5)

But at the place which the LORD your God shall choose to place His name in, there you shall sacrifice at even, at the going down of the sun, **on the Holy Day** on which you came forth out of Egypt. (verse 6)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THESE VERSES:

Briefly:

1) Exodus 23:14-17 = “Three times in the year” is equated with: Feast of Unleavened Bread + Pentecost + Tabernacles. Passover does **not** feature in this “three times a year” instruction. These verses are a part of the Old Covenant context.

2) Exodus 34:18-23 = “Three times in the year” is equated with: Feast of Unleavened Bread + Pentecost + Tabernacles. Again, Passover does **not** feature in this instruction.

3) Deuteronomy 16:16 = “Three times in the year” is equated with: Feast of Unleavened Bread + Pentecost + Tabernacles. Here Passover also does **not** feature in this instruction.

4) In each case (Exodus 23:17; Exodus 34:23; Deuteronomy 16:16) the “three times in the year” statement is **a summary statement** of what was discussed in the preceding verses. So **in Deuteronomy 16 the discussion of Unleavened Bread is clearly missing**. Why? We should **expect** the Feast of Unleavened Bread to have been discussed in the verses prior to Deuteronomy 16:16, as is the case in Exodus 23 and in Exodus 34. “Passover” does not really fit into the discussion preceding Deuteronomy 16:16.

5) Deuteronomy 16:1 = Israel came out of Egypt by night on the 15th day (Numbers 33:3), the day after the Passover day. So this verse here identifies the 1st Day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and not the Passover day.

6) Deuteronomy 16:2 = The Passover lamb was **not** selected out of “the flock **and the herd**”. This instruction identifies animals for regular daily sacrifices. The Hebrew word here translated as “herd” is **never** used for sheep and goats. See Exodus 12:5. Further, the Passover was **not** instructed to be sacrificed “in the place which the LORD shall choose”. This specific instruction really applied to the Levitical sacrifices in general, but not to the Passover.

7) Deuteronomy 16:3 = The reference to “**seven days**” identifies the Feast of Unleavened Bread and **not** the Passover. Only a Jew who had accepted the unbiblical Jewish custom of referring to the whole Feast of Unleavened Bread as “the Passover” could possibly be fooled to believe that this verse is speaking about “the Passover”.

8) Deuteronomy 16:4 = This verse contains **a clear forgery**! The first part (“and there shall no leavened bread be seen with you in all your coasts seven days”) is a repetition of Exodus 13:7, clearly speaking about the Feast of Unleavened Bread. This is the original text of this verse.

The next part (“neither shall there any thing of the flesh which you sacrificed the first day at even remain all night until the morning”) was **added as a forgery**. It is **copied from Exodus 12:10**, a reference to the Passover.

This **backtracking** from the text of Exodus 13:7 to the text of Exodus 12:10 is equivalent to backtracking from speaking about the Feast of Unleavened Bread to again speaking about the Passover. This last section of Deuteronomy 16:4 is a forgery!

This forgery is also **an incomplete statement**. Missing are the instructions regarding **what to do when something does remain** over until the morning. Verse 4 ends with an incomplete instruction, which didn’t seem to bother the man who made this forgery.

9) Deuteronomy 16:5 = The **original Passover** instruction was **very much** intended to be “sacrificed” **within their own gates**. That is common knowledge from Exodus 12. The word “Passover” should be omitted from this verse here, and then the instruction applies perfectly to all the Levitical sacrifices during the Feast of Unleavened Bread. The Passover was **not** given as a part of the Levitical sacrificial system.

10) Deuteronomy 16:6 = The words “**at the season**” are a clear mistranslation of the Hebrew word “**mow’ed**”. The text here should correctly read: “**on the Holy Day on which** ...” or “**on the appointed day on which** ...”. This verse is not speaking about “a season” at all! This verse really identifies **the Holy Day** on which Israel left Egypt.

This verse states in clear terms that Israel left Egypt at the going down of the sun on the Holy Day

("mow'ed"), that being the start of the 15th day. Once the word "mow'ed" in this verse is correctly translated, it becomes clear how completely out of place the word "Passover" is in this verse. See again the discussion of Leviticus 23 in the earlier section.

11) One more **major** problem with the text of Deuteronomy 16 is the use of **the wrong verb for the Passover**. Two Hebrew verbs need to be considered here:

1) "**Zabach**" means "to sacrifice an animal".

2) "**Shachat**" means "to kill an animal or a human being".

The word that is **always** (except in this altered text of Deuteronomy 16) used for the **Passover** is "**shachat**".

The word that is **always** used for the **animal sacrifices** is "**zabach**".

In Deuteronomy 16 the verb "**zabach**" is used in verses 2, 4, 5, and 6, and also in Deuteronomy 17:1. This tells us that these verses are talking about animal sacrifices, and not about the Passover.

The scribe who altered the text here did not grasp that **"zabach" never refers to the Passover**. Had the forger realized this, he would surely have altered "zabach" to "shachat" in these verses. The use of "zabach" in verses 2, 4, 5, and 6 makes quite clear that these verses are speaking about regular animal sacrifices, and not about the Passover.

My 2004 article on Deuteronomy 16:1-6 presents more details and information regarding this alteration.

#42 = DEUTERONOMY 16:3

THE VERSE:

You shall eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shall you eat unleavened bread therewith, *even* the bread of affliction; for you came forth out of the land of Egypt **in haste**: that you may remember the day when you came forth out of the land of Egypt all the days of your life.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

The focus of "in haste" is in line with the Jewish teaching that Israel left Egypt later on the same night that they ate the Passover.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

This is a mistranslation. It is the same mistranslation as the one in Exodus 12:11. See the comments in the section dealing with Exodus 12:11 for a detailed discussion.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

You shall eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shalt you eat unleavened bread therewith, *even* the bread of affliction; for you came forth out of the land of Egypt **in fear**: that you may remember the day when you came forth out of the land of Egypt all the days of your life.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

This is a repetition of the information already presented in Exodus 12. The focus is on remembering the 1st Day of Unleavened Bread when Israel had come out of Egypt, and also on keeping the Feast of Unleavened Bread for seven days.

#43 = DEUTERONOMY 25:9

THE VERSE:

Then shall his brother's wife come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit **in his face**, and shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This sounds far more **humiliating** than it was intended to be. After all, there could always be certain perfectly valid circumstances for refusing to marry a brother's widow.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The Hebrew noun translated "**face**" is "**paniym**", and here it is used with the prefix "beth" (i.e. the letter "b"). This prefix mostly has the meaning of "in". However, there are also many cases where "beth" is used with "paniym" and where this clearly has the meaning "**before the face**".

For example:

- Joshua 21:44: the Hebrew translated "**before them**" is "beth" + "paniym".

- Joshua 23:9: the Hebrew translated "**from before you**" is also "beth" + "paniym".

- Ezekiel 42:12: the Hebrew translated as "**before (the wall)**" is "beth" + "paniym", and literally reads "before the face of the wall towards the east".

[In the above examples I have omitted transliterating the personal pronouns from the Hebrew text,

to avoid unnecessary information.]

So while the prefix "beth" generally has the meaning of the preposition "in", when used with the noun for "face", it can equally well mean "before". And that is in fact the case here in Deuteronomy 25:9.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Then shall his brother's wife come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit (on the ground) **before his face**, and shall answer and say, So shall be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

The general intent of this whole instruction was that **unmarried** brothers of the deceased man would marry his childless widowed sister-in-law. Understand that God was actively encouraging anyone to engage in **polygamy**. Rather than encouraging polygamy, polygamy is something that God "tolerated" (for lack of a better word), at that time. And the intent with this Scripture here was that an unmarried man would fulfill this particular duty.

We need also understand that this instruction was not limited to immediate brothers, but included **the looser meaning of "brother"**, i.e. cousins and uncles in our terms.

This becomes clear from the account in Ruth. Boaz was not the brother of Elimelech, but "a kinsman" from the clan of Elimelech (Ruth 2:1). And Boaz was most certainly not the brother of the deceased "Mahlon". As best Boaz was an uncle of Mahlon, the deceased husband of Ruth. Likewise, the "kinsman" ahead of Boaz was also not a brother of Mahlon, he too was only "a kinsman", i.e. a cousin or uncle (Ruth 4:1).

In other words, in recognition of the possibility that the actual brothers of the deceased man themselves might already be married, **this custom provided for (unmarried) immediate cousins and uncles to also be eligible to marry the widow of the deceased man**. It was still considered to be within the same family.

The firstborn child of such a marriage would **theoretically** be counted as a descendant of the deceased man (Deuteronomy 25:6), say "theoretically" because the Bible never presents Obed as a son of Mahlon, son of Elimelech. Rather, Obed **always presented as son of Boaz** (Ruth 4:21, Matthew 1:5). It is **the line of Boaz** that has been preserved by Obed, not the line of Mahlon. So even though Ruth had a son, in practice the line of Mahlon nevertheless died out.

When the brothers (or cousins and uncles) of the deceased man were themselves already married with children of their own, then taking the deceased brother's or nephew's widow as an additional wife could easily have had unintended consequences.

Specifically, if the new wife then did have some children, that might have the effect of diminishing the inheritance of this man's own children by his first wife, by some of his inheritance going to the firstborn child that would be reckoned to the deceased man.

It was never the intention of this instruction to adversely affect the living, just because a relative (a brother, nephew or cousin) had died childless.

We see this illustrated in this example with Ruth. Boaz informs his "kinsman" that he has the right to redeem Naomi's property. Once this kinsman (likely an uncle or cousin of Mahlon) learned that he would then also have to marry Ruth, he said: "**I cannot redeem it for myself, lest I mar my own inheritance**". He presented a very valid reason for not wanting to take an additional wife. Boaz knew this, and Boaz had in fact **counted on** this reaction from his kinsman, since Boaz (he was still unmarried) was in fact very eager to marry Ruth himself.

When this kinsman then agreed to let Boaz redeem the property, it says: "so he drew off his shoe" (Ruth 4:8). **No spitting of any kind is recorded here**. This other kinsman was certainly not spitting in the face of either Boaz or Ruth (who wasn't even personally involved in this whole incident). And **if** spitting had been involved, then it would have been spitting on the ground in the presence of (i.e. before the face of) the individual involved.

#44 = JOSHUA 6:4-6,8,13

THE VERSES:

In Joshua chapter 6, which deals with Israel marching around Jericho, we have five references to **the Jubilee**. However, those five references are **hidden by a mistranslation**.

In the five verses below we have included four different Hebrew words, and highlighted how those four words are translated. Those four Hebrew words are:

1) **Qeren** = general word for the horn of an animal, used like a trumpet.

2) **Shofar** = specifically a ram's horn, also used like a trumpet.

3) **Yobel** = means "to bring or lead forth someone or something".

4) **Mashak** = means "to draw someone somewhere".

These Hebrew words are discussed in great detail in the section that deals with Exodus 19:13. See that section again for those details.

Here are the five verses in question.

And seven priests shall bear before the ark seven **trumpets** (Hebrew **shofar**) of rams' **horns** (Hebrew **yobel**): and the seventh day you shall compass the city seven times, and the priests shall blow with **the trumpets** (Hebrew **shofar**). (Joshua 6:4)

And it shall come to pass, that when they **make a long** ***blast*** (Hebrew **mashak**) with **the ram's** (Hebrew **yobel**) **horn** (Hebrew **qeren**), *and* when you hear the sound of **the trumpet** (Hebrew **shofar**), all the people shall shout with a great shout; and the wall of the city shall fall down flat, and the people shall ascend up every man straight before him. (Joshua 6:5)

And Joshua the son of Nun called the priests, and said unto them, Take up the ark of the covenant, and let seven priests bear seven **trumpets** (Hebrew **shofar**) of rams' **horns** (Hebrew **yobel**) before the ark of the LORD. (Joshua 6:6)

And it came to pass, when Joshua had spoken unto the people, that the seven priests bearing the seven **trumpets** (Hebrew **shofar**) of rams' **horns** (Hebrew **yobel**) passed on before the LORD, and blew with **the trumpets** (Hebrew **shofar**): and the ark of the covenant of the LORD followed them. (Joshua 6:8)

And seven priests bearing seven **trumpets** (Hebrew **shofar**) of rams' **horns** (Hebrew **yobel**) before the ark of the LORD went on continually, and blew with **the trumpets** (Hebrew **shofar**): and the armed men went before them; but the rereward came after the ark of the LORD, *the priests* going on, and blowing with **the trumpets** (Hebrew **shofar**). (Joshua 6:13)

In these five verses the word "shofar" is used nine times, the word "yobel" is used five times, and the words "qeren" and "mashak" are used once each. Here are the relevant expressions with these words in the above five verses:

Verse 4 = seven **shofarim of yobel** ...

Verse 4 = the priests shall blow with the **shofarim**

Verse 5 = they make a long blast = **mashak**

Verse 5 = ... with the **yobel of qeren** ...

Verse 5 = when you hear the sound of the **shofar** ...

Verse 6 = the seven **shofarim of yobel** ...

Verse 8 = seven priests bearing the seven **shofarim of yobel** ...

Verse 8 = ... and blew with the **shofarim** ...

Verse 13 = bearing the seven **shofarim of yobel** before the Ark ...

Verse 13 = ... and blew with the **shofarim** ...

Verse 13 = the priests going on and blowing with the **shofarim**

Here is what our translators have done:

1) In verses 4, 6, and 13 they translated the Hebrew "**shofarim of yobel**" as "**trumpets of ram's horns**".

2) In verse 5 they translated the Hebrew "**yobel of qeren**" as **"the ram's horn"**.

With these translations the translators assigned the meaning of "**ram's horn**" to the Hebrew word "**yobel**", and the meaning of "**trumpet**" to the Hebrew word "**shofar**".

But in verse 5 the expression "**the ram's horn**" is a translation of the two words "**yobel**" and "**qeren**".

So here is the point we should note!

Translating "yobel" as "ram's horn" is a mistranslation!

The Hebrew words "shofar" and "yobel" are not synonyms. They are not interchangeable, and they don't mean the same things. "shofar" that means "ram's horn", and therefore "yobel" must mean something else. And it does. Simply because two words are **associated** in some way, that does not mean that they must therefore also be interchangeable in meaning.

None of the translators understood correctly the text they were attempting to translate into English. It is acceptable to translate "**shofar**" as "**trumpet**", and it is also acceptable to translate "**qeren**" as "**horn**". But in this context "**yobel**" should be translated either as "**leading forth**" or as "**Jubilee**", and not as "ram's horn". So here are **correct translations** for all these verses.

And seven priests shall bear before the ark **seven trumpets of leading forth**: and the seventh day ye shall compass the city seven times, and the priests shall blow with **the trumpets**. (Joshua 6:4)

And it shall come to pass, that when they make *a long blast* with **the horn of leading forth**, and when ye hear the sound of **the trumpet**, all the people shall shout with a great shout; and the wall of the city shall fall down flat, and the people shall ascend up every man straight before him. (Joshua 6:5)

And Joshua the son of Nun called the priests, and said unto them, Take up the ark of the covenant, and let seven priests bear **seven trumpets of leading forth** before the ark of the LORD. (Joshua 6:6)

And it came to pass, when Joshua had spoken unto the people, that the seven priests bearing the **seven**

trumpets of rejoicing forth passed on before the LORD, and blew with **the trumpets**: and the ark of the covenant of the LORD followed them. (Joshua 6:8)

And seven priests bearing **seven trumpets of rejoicing** forth before the ark of the LORD went on continually, and blew with **the trumpets**: and the armed men went before them; but the rereward came after the ark of the LORD, the priests going on, and blowing with **the trumpets**. (Joshua 6:13)

However it is also perfectly correct to translate "yobel" in these verses as "Jubilee". In that case these 5 verses look as follows:

And seven priests shall bear before the ark **seven trumpets of Jubilee**: and the seventh day ye shall compass the city seven times, and the priests shall blow with the trumpets. (Joshua 6:4)

And it shall come to pass, that when they make *a long blast* with **the horn of Jubilee**, and when ye hear the sound of the trumpet, all the people shall shout with a great shout; and the wall of the city shall fall down flat, and the people shall ascend up every man straight before him. (Joshua 6:5)

And Joshua the son of Nun called the priests, and said unto them, Take up the ark of the covenant, and let seven priests bear **seven trumpets of Jubilee** before the ark of the LORD. (Joshua 6:6)

And it came to pass, when Joshua had spoken unto the people, that the seven priests bearing the **seven trumpets of Jubilee** passed on before the LORD, and blew with the trumpets: and the ark of the covenant of the LORD followed them. (Joshua 6:8)

And seven priests bearing **seven trumpets of Jubilee** before the ark of the LORD went on continually, and blew with the trumpets: and the armed men went before them; but the rereward came after the ark of the LORD, the priests going on, and blowing with the trumpets. (Joshua 6:13)

Joshua 6:13 is the very last time that the word **yobel**", the word for "Jubilee", is ever used in the Bible! After this event the word for "Jubilee" is **never used again** in the Bible. Never again is there a direct reference to a jubilee. Throughout the time during which the nations of Israel lived in the land, the word "yobel" is not used a single time. So no Jubilee is ever recorded, or even alluded to. See also the section dealing with Exodus 19:13.

#45 = JUDGES 11:31

THE VERSE:

Then it shall be, that **whatsoever comes forth of the doors of my house** to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, **shall surely be the LORD's**, and I will offer it up for a burnt offering. (Judges 11:31)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This translation implies that Jephthah was offering God a burnt offering whosoever or whatsoever would come out of his front door to meet him.

That implication is totally false and perverse!

And obviously, "whatsoever" could possibly walk out of Jephthah's front door, it could only be a "whosoever", i.e. a human being, who could come out of his front door. There was no other possibility.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

Jephthah knew quite well that a bullock, a sheep, a goat, a turtledove, or a young pigeon were **the only animals he could possibly offer to God** as a burnt offering. But none of those animals were about to come out of his front door. And **Jephthah knew that**.

So under no circumstances was Jephthah ever considering "offering a burnt sacrifice" whoever might first walk out of his house to meet him. Yes, Jephthah was foolish in making this vow, but **he really wasn't that stupid**!

So we are dealing with **an incorrect translation**, which has put a totally false slant on the Hebrew text.

Here is the correct picture:

Jephthah in fact made **a twofold commitment**, and this is obscured in our translations. Our translations present that Jephthah was only making one commitment. The translators didn't really understand what Jephthah actually said in this vow.

The ten-word English expression "**and will offer it up for a burnt offering**" represents the two Hebrew words "**veha-alitihu olah**". Without the prefix and the suffix, this represents the two Hebrew words "alah" and "olah". "Alah" is a verb that means "to offer", and "olah" is a feminine noun that basically means "burnt offering". This noun "olah" is in fact the feminine active participle of the verb "alah". (I mention this only to show that these two Hebrew words are in fact very closely connected to one another, as we in English might say "to offer an offering".)

Now the whole verb "veha-alitihu" is made up of the following parts:

- "ve" = conjunction meaning "**and**"

- "ha-aliti" = hiphil perfect of the verb "alah" = **I will offer**

- "hu" = **masculine** third person singular pronoun = **him**

Follow this with the noun "olah" **burnt offering**. And the whole two-word expression then translates as "and I will offer **him** a burnt offering".

The suffix "hu" in the verb "veha-alitihu" is the masculine third person singular pronoun **"it" "Thatshim" and not "it"**.

Next, there is nothing in the Hebrew text that justifies including the word "**for**" in the translation. The Hebrew says "I will offer him a burnt offering", it does **not** say "...**for** a burnt offering". But including "for" in our translations completely changes the meaning.

There is a huge difference between saying:

1) "I will **offer him a burnt offering**", and saying

2) "I will offer him **for** a burnt offering".

In the expression "I will offer him a burnt offering", the individual identified as "him" is **the recipient of the offering**. But in the expression "I will offer him **for** a burnt offering", **the individual** identified as "him" **becomes the offering itself**.

And that is why the translators chose to incorrectly translate the masculine pronoun "it" instead as "him" because they realized that Jephthah was **obviously** not planning from the start to sacrifice a male human being as a burnt offering. So they translated the pronoun for "him" as "it". In doing they implied that Jephthah somehow expected a sacrificial animal to walk out the door of his house to meet him, a totally ridiculous idea!

The translators never try understand what Jephthah himself had in mind when he made this foolish vow. In his own mind **Jephthah's vow could not possibly have ended up in human being becoming a burnt offering**; how Jephthah worded his vow precluded that possibility.

Now the fact that Jephthah used the third person singular **masculine** pronoun in this two-word expression tells us Jephthah himself is introducing **second commitment** in his vow. He vowed to do **two things**:

1) He vowed that **the first person** to come out of his house would be dedicated to living a lifetime in total service to God, i.e. the person would become a servant (i.e. slave) to the High Priest at the Tabernacle.

2) In addition **he also vowed** to bring a burnt offering to God. That is what the expression "**and** will offer Him a burnt offering" means. So the third person pronoun here needs to have a capital "H", because "Him" refers to God, the recipient of the burnt offering".

When this is correctly understood, then we need to also correct the first part of this verse. It is **not "whatsoever" but "whosoever"** would come out the doors of his house, that Jephthah was referring to.

For the first part of his vow **Jephthah had a human being in mind**, not some animal coming out of his front door. He was more or less thinking of giving one of his own servants to the High Priest as a permanent servant at the Tabernacle, somewhat like Samuel's mother dedicating her son Samuel to lifelong service to God in the days of the High Priest Eli.

One key here is to understand that the two parts of Jephthah's vow have no connection to one another. The conjunction "and" introduces **additional commitments**, somewhat like saying in English, "... and **on top of that** I will **also** give a burnt offering".

One more point to consider is that the expression "shall **surely** be the Eternal's" there is no word in the Hebrew text for "surely". The Hebrew text only says "shall be the Eternal's". Some translators simply inferred the word "surely" in this context because it is dealing with a vow, but strictly speaking "surely" should not be included in the translation. There are many translations, while still not correct, which at least do not include the word "surely" in their translations of this verse.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Here is how this verse should be translated correctly:

Then it shall be, that **whosoever** comes forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall be the LORD'S. **And** (i.e. in addition) **I will** (also) **offer Him** (i.e. God) **a burnt offering**. (Judges 11:31)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

Can we see the change when we replace the pronoun "it" with the pronoun "him" in this verse? And it should be "Him" because this pronoun refers to God.

As I have already said, Jephthah made **two** commitments.

The **first** commitment was that **the person** who would walk out of his front door "**shall be the Eternal's**".

The **second** commitment was that Jephthah would **in addition** also bring a **burnt offering**, obviously consisting of one of the animals God had listed as acceptable.

These **two bargaining chips** Jephthah presented to God in foolish efforts to secure God's help. And those two bargaining chips were completely independent of one another.

Furthermore, the Hebrew word participle here translated as "**whatsoever**" should really be translated as "**whosoever**", as in: "that **whosoever comes forth out of the doors of my house** ...".

The translators **conflated Jephthah's two commitments together into one misunderstood commitment**. That's the type of mistranslation you frequently get when people translate something that they themselves don't really understand.

We need to recognize that **Jephthah obviously fully expected a human being to come out and meet him**! That's what front doors are for ... for human beings to walk in and out. And that is what this statement reflects. In the first part of his vow, Jephthah was not thinking of animals that could be sacrificed – he was thinking of a human being, a person, an individual, whose life would be dedicated to the service of God.

We should also consider that God obviously had full control over who would first walk out of Jephthah's house. It was the type of commitment that God does not approve of, **the type of commitment that nobody should ever make**. Nobody should ever make a binding commitment for the life of another human being. To forcefully teach that lesson to us, **it was God** who saw to it that Jephthah's daughter was the first one to come out of that door to meet Jephthah.

It wasn't just an unfortunate coincidence that his daughter came out first. No, that was fully under God's control. And we should never try to bargain with God, as in: "Lord, if You will do this for me, then I will do that for You", especially not when what we promised to do is not 100% under our own full personal control.

When Jephthah said that the first person would be "the Eternal's", he was thinking of that person dedicating the rest of his or her life to the service of God. Jephthah was in fact making a vow along exactly the same lines as the vow that Hannah, the mother of Samuel, made. Notice Hannah's vow:

And **she vowed a vow**, and said, O LORD of hosts, **if You will indeed** look on the affliction of Your handmaid, and remember me, and not forget Your handmaid, but will give unto Your handmaid a man child, **then I will give him unto the LORD all the days of his life**, and there shall no razor come upon his head. (1 Samuel 1:11)

Hannah was asking for a baby boy, not a girl. But Hannah was not making a commitment for a living male, who could already have had his own hopes and dreams. No, she was making a commitment for a child that had yet to be conceived. And because her husband was **a Levite of the line of Kohath**, therefore her male children were already dedicated to the service of God. The commitment Hannah made, to dedicate her first son to the service of God, didn't change that potential son's destiny very much. Her vow was a commitment that was well under her control, and one that did not restrict that potential son's lifestyle in any significant way.

While Samuel was genealogically not of priestly line (i.e. Samuel descended from Izhar the son of Kohath, and Aaron descended from Amram the son of Kohath), God did in fact use Samuel in the

capacity of High Priest, the one who performed all the important sacrifices, after Eli and Eli's sons had died. And Samuel got married and had his own children. And Hannah's vow was quite acceptable before God.

Here is the similarity and also the difference between these two vows:

Hannah said "if then I will give him (a Levitical baby boy) unto the Eternal all the days of his life". This she said for a son who would be a Levite, and who would be expected by virtue of his background to carry out certain duties and responsibilities in the service of God.

Jephthah said "if then (whosoever that person may be) shall be the Eternal's". This he said for a person who might be male or female, Israelite or non-Israelite, free person or slave. With this vow it could have been anybody, including Jephthah's own wife (had she come out first). This vow was not acceptable before God.

Comparing the two statements in these two vows:

"Give him to the Eternal" and "he/she shall be the Eternal's" make exactly the same statement. Both statements are about dedicating some specific individual **other than self** for a life long service of God. But with Jephthah's vow it clearly removed freedom of choice from that other person.

To put this commitment Jephthah was making into our terms today:

Jephthah was saying the following: **If a man** that comes out to meet me, then he shall live **the life of a monk** (because the man would be a Levite) for the rest of his life. And **if a woman** that comes out to meet me, then she shall live **the life of a nun** for the rest of her life. Please understand that this is only an analogy to draw a parallel, and this analogy is certainly not meant literally.

Obviously, they were not literally going to be either a monk or a nun. But if the person who would be the Eternal's was a woman, she would **lose the freedom to marry and have a family**. Whoever the person was (i.e. it wasn't going to be a Levite), he/she would also lose a great deal of freedom regarding traveling and socially interacting with most other people. The person would be devoted to the service of the Eternal, basically living the life of **a servant/slave to the High Priest**.

Think of the example of "Anna, a prophetess", who "departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day" (see Luke 2:37). That is the type of life to which Jephthah was committing the person who would first meet him. Anna did this of her own free will. But Jephthah impulsively imposed this **on the unfortunate person who would come to meet him**. That represents a huge difference.

So let's permanently banish the stupid and absurd idea that Jephthah was somehow committing to perform a human sacrifice. That is an extremely perverse idea that Satan, the god of this age, would

want people to believe.

Jephthah was committing himself to dedicating some specific person to **a lifelong service to God**, the same way that Samuel's mother dedicated the potential son to a lifelong service of God. **And in addition to** that specific commitment, Jephthah **also** committed himself to bringing a burnt offering to God. But these two things are totally independent of one another.

Now even with this mistranslation sorted out, it was still extremely foolish of Jephthah to make such a commitment.

Who could possibly come out of the door of his house to meet him?

The only options were **Jephthah's own wife, his only child, one of his servants, or a visitor** who happened to be in the house. There are no other options for who might possibly be the first person to come out of his house.

Jephthah did not have the right to make that kind of commitment for the life of any of these people. What if his wife had walked out first? What if a visitor had walked out first? When Jephthah made this stupid commitment, he was committing someone else's life to God. How foolish is that?

#46 = JUDGES 18:30

THE VERSE:

And the children of Dan set up the graven image: and Jonathan, the son of Gershom, **the son of Manasseh**, he and his sons were priests to the tribe of Dan until the day of the captivity of the land. (Judges 18:30)

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The name "Manasseh" is a mistranslation, and it should correctly read "the son of Moses".

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

And the children of Dan set up the graven image: and Jonathan, the son of Gershom, **the son of Moses**, he and his sons were priests to the tribe of Dan until the day of the captivity of the land. (Judges 18:30)

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

This mistranslation has been corrected in many translations like ASV, DARBY, ERV, RSV, NRSV, etc.

Jonathan, the grandson of Moses, set up a priesthood that also became hereditary, passing from father to son. Finally Jonathan could be just as good as his priestly cousins from Aaron's line. Finally he was their equal.

The Ephraimite Micah had made a bunch of idols. Many other Israelites at that time also had their own idols like that. But it was **the grandsons of Moses**, who undoubtedly had envied his priestly cousins and uncles, **who introduced idolatry on a tribal level into the nation of Israel**. The grandsons of Moses had formed a **competing priesthood** to the priesthood of Aaron. And Jonathan's pagan priesthood continued uninterrupted right up to "the day of the captivity of the land".

#47 = 1 KINGS 19:16

THE VERSE:

And Jehu the son of Nimshi shall you anoint *to be* king over Israel and Elisha the son of Shaphat of Abelmeholah shall you anoint *to be* prophet **in your room**.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This translation implies that Elisha would replace Elijah fairly soon. But this is not what the text really indicates.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The expression "in your room" is a translation of the Hebrew "tachath" (or "tahat"). This word has a range of meanings. The main meanings are: beneath, instead of, under, in exchange for.

In the following examples the translation of "tachath" is rendered in bolded text for easier recognition.

Genesis 1:7 = **under** the sky;

Genesis 6:17 = **under** heaven;

Exodus 32:19 = **beneath** the mount;

Deuteronomy 4:18 = **beneath** the earth.

Our English translation of this verse is a case of the translators simply having opted for the wrong meaning of the Hebrew word in this text.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

And Jehu the son of Nimshi shall you anoint *to be* king over Israel and Elisha the son of Shaphat of Abelmeholah shall you anoint *to be* a prophet **under you**.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

God was **not replacing Elijah** with Elisha. Not at all. This is quite clear from subsequent references to Elijah (Malachi 4:5; Matthew 17:3, 10-12; etc.).

Here God was simply appointing an assistant for Elijah. As the text says, Elisha followed Elijah "**and ministered unto him**" (1 Kings 19:21). In fact, Elisha ministered to Elijah for a number of years. In 2 Kings 3:11 Elisha is identified as the one who "poured water on the hands of Elijah" (i.e. acted as Elijah's personal servant). That hardly goes together with supposedly replacing Elijah.

When Elijah was discouraged and complained that he was alone (1 Kings 19:10), God didn't say: "Okay, then I'll just replace you with Elisha." Not at all. What God really said was: "Alright, in that case I'll give you **an assistant**, so you are not alone. And in due time (i.e. many years later) when your life comes to an end, **then** he can take over the job that you will be doing until that time. So go and anoint Elisha to be a prophet under your guidance."

God gave Elijah an assistant (i.e. Elisha), just like God had given Moses an assistant (i.e. Aaron, and also Joshua).

#48 = 2 KINGS 7:13

THE VERSE:

And one of his servants answered and said, Let *some* take, I pray thee, five of the horses that remain, which are left in the city (behold, they *are* as all the multitude of Israel **that are left in it: behold, I *say*, they *are* even as all the multitude of the Israelites** that are consumed:) and let us send and see.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

As it stands this verse is somewhat confusing due to the repetitions in it.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

Here we have an example of **the careless repetition of even Hebrew words** made by some Jewish scribe. These repeated words are not found in the Greek LXX, the Syriac text of the Old Testament, and in over 40 other MSS that have survived. What this indicates is that this careless repetition **only entered the text relatively late**, probably no more than 1000 years ago. And yet these words have been fully accepted as part of the official text.

This is an example of unauthorized words finding their way into the official text (in this instance no doubt due to an unintentional mistake.

While the English wording here presents slight changes from the previous seven words, **in the Hebrew text** this repetition is immediately apparent as **100% identical** to what went before.

The section presented **in bold text** in the above quotation should not be in the text of this verse.

In addition, this verse also contains **a mistranslation**.

The words "that are consumed" are a translation of the two Hebrew words "asher" + "tamam". "Asher" is a relative pronoun here used to express a result, and therefore correctly translated as "that". The verb "tamam" has a range of meanings. While it does also mean "consume", its primary meaning is "**to be complete**".

For example, here are some translations of this verb "tamam":

In Leviticus 25:29 it is rendered as "**whole**" ("within a **whole** year").

In Joshua 3:17; 4:1 it is rendered as "**clean**" ("people passed **clean** over Jordan"").

In 1 Samuel 16:11 it is rendered as "**all**" ("are here **all** your children?").

In Psalm 18:25 it is rendered as "**upright**" ("You will show Yourself **upright**").

In Job 22:3 it is rendered as "**perfect**" ("that you make your ways **perfect**").

So the point is this:

Because the text with the added words did not make much sense to them, therefore the translators selected the meaning "consumed" for the Hebrew "tamim". They assumed that the verse was supposed to convey two parallel statements.

However, when we leave out the words that were unintentionally added, the correct meaning of "tamim" in this context will be easier to see.

<u>A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:</u>

Most likely this verse should read more or less as below:

And one of his servants answered and said, Let them take five of the horses that remain in the city, behold, they *are* as all the crowd (multitude) of Israel **that are whole**, and let us send and see.

<u>THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:</u>

Here the servant was saying to the king, **let's take five of the horses that are still healthy enough to ride**, horses that are healthy like the multitude of Israelites (with this expression this servant was referring to those Israelites in the city who were still strong enough to fight), and let's investigate this report.

When people provide the word "consumed" here, they are thinking of "horses consumed like a multitude of people consumed." This would have been a very negative perspective for this servant to present in his attempt to solicit some action from the king. It's a perspective of it can't do any harm because they'll die if they stay here, so let's just send them.

By providing the word "whole" (also a valid meaning of "tamim"), the perspective for this obviously bad situation is somewhat more positive. The intent of the statement is take five of the horses that are still reasonable shape, like the shape the fighting soldiers are in that are left. This was more likely to elicit a positive response from the king than saying: Let's send some of the mags that are likely to drop dead from starvation and exhaustion before they get very far.

This version offered the king more hope, and that's what that servant apparently wanted to do, investigate an avenue that appeared to offer hope.

Either way, the Hebrew text is quite clear that **seven words were accidently repeated**. Once they were in the text, there was the fear to remove these words. But they don't belong in the text.

#49 = 1 CHRONICLES 20:3

THE VERSE:

And he brought out the people that *were* in it, **and cut *them* with saws** (Hebrew "megerah"), and with harrows of iron, **and with axes** (Hebrew "megerah"). Even so dealt David with all the cities of the children of Ammon. And David and all the people returned to Jerusalem. (1 Chronicles 20:3)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

The way this verse is translated makes David out to be **some grotesque monster** who had his enemies "cut into pieces" with saws and axes and harrows of iron. This picture is absurd!

The key here is quite simple. And lies with the Hebrew word that is translated as "cut them". Here are the facts.

There are two Hebrew verbs "suwr", which are spelled identically. Together they are used exactly four times in the OT Hebrew text. By spelling alone you cannot distinguish between these two words. In analogy think the English word "light" without any context you cannot know whether the word should mean "**the opposite of darkness**" or whether it should mean "**the opposite of heavy**". We have two distinct meanings which can only be correctly identified by context.

That's what the Hebrew verb "suwr" is like. For those who use the Strong's Numbers, these two Hebrew verbs are #7786 and #7787 in Strong's Dictionary.

Hebrew "suwr" #7786 is used three times: Judges 9:22 ("had reigned"), in Hosea 8:4 ("they have made princes"), and in Hosea 12:4 ("he had power"). As can be seen from all three uses, this word means: **to act as a ruler**, to reign, to govern.

Hebrew "suwr" #7787 is used only once in the whole Old Testament, and that is in 1 Chronicles 20:3. This word means to cut or saw, **to reduce to pieces**. And so in this verse it is translated as "**he cut them** with saws and with harrows of iron and with axes", a rather grizzly picture, to say the least.

Can you see what happened here? This is what we should expect when people who don't have God's spirit start about translating the Bible. As always, see back to 1 Corinthians 2:11, that the things of God can only be correctly discerned by people who have God's spirit.

The translators should really have understood that 1 Chronicles 20:3 the Hebrew word "suwr" has the meaning of #7786, and **not** #7787. In other words, the Hebrew **word #7787 is never used in the O.T.**! Rather, the Hebrew word #7786 is used four times!

And so 1 Chronicles 20:3, in reference to David, should correctly be translated as:

And he brought out the people that were in it, **and ruled over them** (i.e. **he put them into servitude as laborers**) with saws, and with harrows of iron, and with axes. Even so did David unto all the cities of the children of Ammon. And David and all the people returned to Jerusalem. (1 Chronicles 20:3)

This is also the picture we get from the parallel account in 2 Samuel 12. Notice the relevant verse.

And he brought forth the people that were therein, and **put them** (Hebrew verb "suwm"), under saws (Hebrew "megerah"), and under harrows of iron, and under axes (Hebrew "**magzerah**") of iron, and made them pass through the brickkiln: and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon. So David and all the people returned unto Jerusalem. (2 Samuel 12:31)

This is the parallel verse to 1 Chronicles 20:3. And here we see a different Hebrew verb used. The verb "**suwm**" used here means **to put, place, make, appoint**. So this parallel verse shows that David did **not** have these Ammonites "sawed and hacked to pieces", but he put them under servitude to work in menial tasks as laborers with saws and harrows and axes and brickkilns. The same meaning is intended in 1 Chronicles 20:3.

Another point to notice here is that this verse uses the word "megerah" for saws, and the word "magzerah" for axes. But the later writer of Chronicles (most likely Ezra) used the word "megerah" to mean both, saws and axes. So by the time of the Apostle Paul there was hardly a distinction between these two tools, or the processes involved in using them.

#50 = ESTHER 1:10

THE VERSE:

On the seventh day, when the heart of the king was **merry with wine**, he commanded Mehuman, Biztha, Harbona, Bigtha, and Abagtha, Zethar, and Carcas, the seven chamberlains that served in the presence of Ahasuerus the king,

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This is another example of a correct translation which some people interpret incorrectly. Some people assume that this verse means that the king was drunk when he called for queen Vashti. But that is not correct.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The Hebrew word here translated as "merry" is **towb**. This word does **not** mean "**drunk**". The Hebrew word for "drunk" is **shakar**", and that word is used in Genesis 9:21, Scripture that speaks about Noah having been "drunk". But it is not used in Esther 1:10.

The word "towb" is used 559 times in the Old Testament. It is translated in the KJV 361 times as "**good**", 72 times as "**better**", 20 times as "**well**", 16 times as "**goodness**", 9 times as "**goodly**", etc. The word **never has a negative meaning**.

In the Hebrew text of this verse there is the slightest indication that the king was drunk, intoxicated or even on the verge of getting drunk when these events took place. In fact, the exact same Hebrew words is used in Proverbs 15:15, which says "he that is of a **merry** (towb) heart has a continual feast". And that part of Proverbs 15:15 has a totally positive meaning.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

The KJV translation is fine.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

This verse shows that the king was **relaxed**, **happy**, and in a **good mood**. In this frame of mind he wanted the queen to make an appearance **in her royal robes**. Think of a state leader wanting his wife to appear at a reception for foreign dignitaries.

There is not the slightest hint in this passage that the king was in any way intoxicated. Much later, in New Testament times, Jesus Christ turned a large quantity of water into wine for the same purpose, to make the people at that wedding in Cana (John 2:9) relaxed and "merry". So we should not read our own ideas into this biblical passage.

#51 = JOB 16:14

THE VERSE:

He breaks me with breach upon breach, He runs upon me **like a giant**.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This is a mistranslation.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The Hebrew word here translated as "giant" is **"gibbor"**, and **does not mean "giant"**. This word really means "mighty one", i.e. someone like a powerful warrior in battle.

Many translations have recognized this mistranslation. For example, Darby, Young's Literal Translation and Rotherham translate the expression as "like a mighty man", and NASV, NIV, RSV and NRSV translate this as "like a warrior".

"Giant" is clearly a mistranslation of the Hebrew word "gibbor".

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

He breaks me with breach upon breach, He runs upon me **like a mighty man** (or like a warrior)."

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

Job is discouraged and he feels almost like he is being worked over by a mighty warrior, with all the pain and suffering he was enduring. But "giant" is an inappropriate translation here.

As an aside, this illustrates one weakness in having different people translate different parts of the Bible (i.e. the way the KJV was produced). Whereas the man who translated Genesis quite competently translated "gibborim" in Genesis 6:4 as "mighty men", the man responsible for translating the Book of Job unfortunately chose to render "gibbor" as "giant" here in Job. Had the same man who translated Genesis also been responsible for translating Job, this verse would most likely not have the word "giant" in it.

Unless everyone involved in making a translation of the whole Bible has active input for **every single verse**, there are always going to be numerous inconsistencies in a translation produced by a team of translators. When every person involved in making the translation actively checks every single verse, there is a greater likelihood of consistently rendering a specific Hebrew or Greek word by the same English counterpart.

Unfortunately the KJV set a precedent for a very large number of English words in the translation of the Bible representing **two or more** Hebrew (OT) or Greek (NT) words. This incorrectly implies that the Hebrew (or Greek) words involved are synonyms, when in very many cases they are not really synonyms at all, due to their lack of really understanding the Bible (i.e. see 1 Corinthians 2:11) that translators have frequently incorrectly assumed different root words to be synonyms.

This also raises some questions regarding the competency of subsequent translators, when they don't even correct such obvious mistranslations as Job 6:14. What **other** mistranslations have they also copied blindly from their predecessors?

#52 = JOB 21:24

THE VERSE:

His breasts (Hebrew "'atin") are full **of milk** (Hebrew "chlb"), and his bones are moistened with marrow. (Job 21:24)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

In verses 23-26 Job is comparing the frame of mind of two different men at the time of death. One man had been happy and content and at ease during his life, while the other man had lived a miserable life filled with bitterness. Job's point in this discussion is that **in death these two men are equal**, because both their bodies will decay. Job himself here is obviously in a very negative and critical frame of mind. That was because Job found himself in the situation of the man who was bitter, and Job's bitterness clouded his judgment.

Now verse 24 is part of the description of the man who had been happy and content. But the statement "his breasts are full of milk" **doesn't make sense**, since men simply don't have "breasts full of milk". We don't need a PhD degree to know that.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

In one sense this translation is **not really a problem**, because it is only part of **the theoretical argument** that Job was presenting, and it has no consequences for us one way or the other.

But this verse is a good illustration regarding **how translators deal with Hebrew words when the meaning isn't really clear to them**.

Two specific Hebrew words in this verse are of interest to us. Those words are "**'atin**" and "**chlb**". I have intentionally left out the vowels in the word "chlb" for reasons which I will explain shortly. But before we look at these two Hebrew words, let's see how this verse is rendered in other translations of the Bible.

SOME OTHER TRANSLATIONS

His pails are full of **milk**, And the marrow of his bones is moistened. (Job 21:24 ASV)

His sides are full of **fat**, and the marrow of his bones is moistened; (Job 21:24, 1890 Darby Translation)

His thighs are full of **fat**, and his bones are moistened with marrow. (Job 21:24, The 2011 King James Bible)

His sides are full of **fat**, And his bones moist with marrow. (Job 21:24, 1869 Noyes Translation)

His breasts have been full of **milk**, And marrow his bones doth moisten. (Job 21:24, Young's Literal Translation)

euen when **his bowels** are at **the fattest**, and his bones full of mary. (Job 21:24 Coverdale)

His breasts are full of **milk**, and the marrow of his bones is moistened. (Job 21:24 ERV)

His stomach is full of **milk**, and his bones are strong and healthy. (Job 21:24 GWV)

His buckets are filled with **milk**, his bone marrow is healthy. (Job 21:24 ISV)

His milk pails are full of **milk**, and his bones are moistened with marrow. (Job 21:24 KJ21)

His vessels being full of **healthy fluid**, and the marrow of his bones being well moistened. (Job 21:24 Leeser OT)

his loins full of **milk** and the marrow of his bones moist. (Job 21:24 NRSV)

His pails are full of **milk**. The marrow of his bones is moistened. (Job 21:24 WEB)

His pails are full of **milk**, and the marrow of his bones is moistened. (Job 21:24 JPS)

His vats are full *with* **milk** and the marrow of his bones is moist. (Job 21:24 LEB)

and **his insides** are full of **fat**, marrow and his (sic) is diffused in him (Job 21:24 Apostolic Bible Polyglot)

and **his inwards** are full of **fat**, and his marrow is diffused throughout him. (Job 21:24 Brenton's English

Septuagint)

His bowels are full of **fat**, and his bones are moistened with marrow. Job 21:24 Douay-Rheims Bible)

His breasts are full of **milke**, and his bones runne full of marowe. (Job 21:24 Geneva Bible of 1587)

Here we have about 20 different translations for Job 21:24. And we see that they have translated the Hebrew word "**chelb**" as: breasts, pails, sides, thighs, stomach, loins, milk pails, bowels, inwards, insides, vats and vessels.

And they have translated "**chelb**" as: milk, fat and healthy fluids. If we exclude the vague term "healthy fluids", then this leaves us with the two options of "milk" and "fat" for this word "chlb".

That represents quite a range of translations for these two Hebrew words. Perhaps the different King James translations illustrate the range of translations for this verse best.

1) The **1769 KJV** translated these two words as "**breasts**" and as "**milk**".

2) The **21st Century KJV** translates these words as "**milk pails**" and as "**milk**". 3) The **2011 KJV** translates these words as "**thighs**" and as "**fat**".

Why do we have this lack of consistency amongst all these translations? Let's start by looking at the Hebrew word which in the unpointed Hebrew text reads (transliterated): "**chlb**".

The original Hebrew text of the Old Testament did not contain vowels. That is why for the vowels for this word Vowel points were only added to the text many centuries after the time of Christ's ministry. So readers of the unpointed Hebrew text must always provide the needed vowels themselves, something that is in most situations very easy to do. But occasionally this can also be somewhat challenging.

For the unpointed written word "chlb" there are in fact **two options** for the missing vowels.

1) There is the word "**cheleb**", and this word means "**fat**".

2) There is the word "**chalab**", and this word means "**milk**".

Both these Hebrew words are derived from the same unused root word that means "**to fat**". And both words are clear possibilities in our verse here.

So the reader of the original unpointed Hebrew text, when he sees the word "chlb", has to decide for himself whether it is supposed to mean "fat", or whether it is supposed to mean "milk". It is always **the**

context in which the **words** is used that tells us whether we should read "fat" or whether we should read "milk". Most contexts for "chlb" are clear, and the intended meaning is obvious.

But if the context is somewhat unclear, then some people might read "fat" for the word, which other people will read as "milk". That's what we see with our 20 different translations.

And that is what we have in Job 21:24 – **ambiguity about the intended meaning**. The cause of this ambiguity is the other Hebrew word that is used in this verse. That is the word "**atin**".

The problem is that this word "atin" is used only here in Job 21:24. It is not used anywhere else in the Old Testament. **And the Hebrew scholars don't really know what this word means**.

Outside of this one use in this one verse, the scholars have nothing to go on to tell them what this word really means. When the Hebrew language died out, it was dead for centuries. And then when it was later revived based on the written Hebrew records, the scholars had no way of reviving this specific word, because they had nothing at all to go on. And so they couldn't revive this specific word. And it is still dead.

But since this word appears one single time in the Hebrew Scriptures, therefore they had to attach some meaning to it. How did they do that? How **could** they do that? There was only one possible approach they could use. And that one approach was to **look at the context** in which it is used.

But unfortunately the context provides an ambiguity, in that this context can be speaking about either "fat" or "milk". Since there is absolutely no way to definitely know which of these two words was intended by Job, therefore all translators must decide subjectively on one of these two possibilities.

This in turn makes it more difficult to guess at the meaning of the word "atin".

So if a translator decided on the meaning of **milk** for the word "chlb", **then** he was forced to look for a meaning for the word "atin" that would fit with "milk". That included all the translations as **breasts**, **pails**, **stomach**, **buckets**, **milk pails**, **loins**, **vats** and **vessels**.

But if a translator decided on the meaning of **fat** for the word "chlb", **then** he was forced to look for a meaning for the word "atin" that would fit with "fat". That included all the translations as **sides**, **thighs**, **bowels**, **insides** and **inwards**.

For this verse the translation is really a guessing game. It is divorced from any knowledge of what the word "atin" actually did mean.

So let's look at what authoritative Hebrew reference works tell us.

The Online Bible Hebrew Lexicon tells us that "atin" comes from an unused root meaning **apparently** to contain". This lexicon then gives the meaning for "atin" as "bucket, pail". Note the word "apparently" in their reference to the root.

The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament presents "atin" as the **assumed** root of "atin". It then also gives the meaning for "atin" as "bucket, pail". Note the word "assumed" in their reference to the root.

The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew Dictionary likewise gives the meaning for "atin" as "bucket, pail".

What have these three dictionaries done?

They have **assumed** that "chlb" in this verse **must mean "milk"**. Can they prove that? No, of course not. They have simply taken the same side in this debate. And with that assumption as foundation, they have then assigned an **assumed** meaning to "atin".

So what about the translations that translate "atin" as **"sides, thighs, bowels, insides, inwards"**? What have they done?

All those translations have simply **assumed** that "chlb" in this verse **must mean "fat"**. And they can't prove their position any more than the other group. But based on this assumption, they have **then assumed** meanings for "atin" that would fit in with "fat".

Now ultimately the correct meanings for these two Hebrew words in this verse don't really matter, because this verse is only a Job's somewhat bitter rambling about the undeserved trials, which God had allowed Satan to put on Job.

The value of this verse to us is that it gives us a **behind-the-scenes view**, so to speak, **of what translators do** when they don't actually understand the text they are trying to translate. With the different examples of how they translated this verse we have a grandstand seat recognizing that **all of them are guessing**. And in this instance it makes no difference who is right and who is wrong, because neither translation has any consequences. **The great variety of translations** of this verse exposes that all the translators were only guessing.

This is good for us to understand, because **there are other verses** where the translators were also guessing, because they likewise didn't really understand the text they were translating. But in those cases their guessing is not as easy to recognize. In those cases almost all of them made the same wrong guesses, in that way presenting somewhat of a unified front for their guesses.

Quite some [illegible] Translation [illegible] accepted [illegible] that mistranslation.

When subsequent translation, mistranslation is quite difficult recognize the mistranslation for what it is.

Job 21:24 is one clear example where where the translators really should have provided the conjunction “and”, because here it is certainly implied.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

Blow the trumpet in the new moon **and on the full moon**, on our feast day.

THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:

There are several occasions when the trumpets are blown. Numbers 10:10 we see three specific categories of days in this regard.

Also in your gladness, and in your solemn days, and in the beginnings of your months, you shall blow the trumpets over your offerings and the sacrifices of your peace offerings; that they may be to you for a memorial before your God: I *am* the LORD your God. (Numbers 10:10)

The three categories of days are 1) gladness, 2) solemn days, 3) first of every month. The Hebrew for “solemn days” is “mow’ed”, and it refers to “Holy Days”.

Two of the annual Holy Days fall on the 1st Day of Unleavened Bread, and 1st Day of the Feast of Tabernacles.

This statement in Psalm 81:3 applies equally to the 12 new moon days (one of which happens to be a Holy Day, the Day of Trumpets), and 2 full moon days.

The full moon days on which the trumpets were blown happen to be “mow’ed” days, but at the same time are also the first of seven-day Feast (“chag”). That Davidic in Psalm 81:3 refers to the trumpet being blown on the (“chag”) day, because these “mow’ed” full moon days are each the start of a seven-day feast.

We should note that **Psalm 81:3 does not call the Day of Trumpets “a feast day”**.

The Day of Trumpets is a new moon. The words “feast day” are specifically linked to the **full moon**. And these words “feast day” are equally to the 1st Day of Unleavened Bread and the 1st Day of Tabernacles. But the words “feast day” not refer to the new moon days. **The implied conjunction “and”** is the key to understanding this verse correctly.

With this verse David did not single out one specific day in the year for attention. Psalm 81:3 in fact applies to 14 days in the year.

#58 = PROVERBS 19:2

THE VERSE:

Also, *that* the *soul* is *not* *good*, **that hastens with feet** *is* *sin*. (Proverbs 19:2)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

Technically speaking this translation, because the verse does have the meaning "sin". However, this translation can **create false impression**. This translation does not state that Solomon was actually making the implication that leads to sinning. That is not Rushing doesn't necessarily involve something wrong. Being in a hurry does not break any of God's laws.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

This translation is **inappropriately translated** the verse "chata". This verb does indeed mean "to sin", but it also has a more general meaning.

The main meaning of the verse "chata" is **to mark, goal, target**. Only when this concept is applied to any moral issue, that then it means "to sin".

For example, in speaking about the fighting men in the tribe of Benjamin, Judges 20:16 tells us:

Among *the* *were* hundred chosen left-handed, every **could** **stones** at an hair *breadth*, **and not miss** (Hebrew "chata"). (Judges 20:16)

This verse illustrates the meaning of the verse "chata". Warriors with (with gunbows & arrows) miss their target by hair's breadth. Don't have any guilt, meaning that they are not "sinning". It's just that they could have done better.

Coming to Proverbs 19:2, in this verse Solomon was making **two points**:

Not ignorant is essential to acquire knowledge and understanding. This is one of the 40 statements about knowledge that Solomon makes in Book of Proverbs, in addition to statements about wisdom and about understanding.

Now in this regard, while being without knowledge is certainly not good, by itself being without knowledge is certainly not a sin in a moral sense, in the sense of having actively broken any God's laws. And Solomon doesn't state being without knowledge is sin, he says that "is not good".

But being without knowledge certainly "misses the mark" for God desires the human being **God wants to strive for knowledge** and understanding. And anything "is not good" before God automatically **misses the mark** for God wants the human beings, even though Solomon does not spell out this "missing the mark" ramification for being "without knowledge".

2) Coming to the second line of the verse. Specifically, people who "without knowledge" (part of verse) **is good to impulsively** "to hasten with the feet" (part of verse). Again, this also is certainly not a sin in a moral sense, and it doesn't actively break any of God's laws.

But acting impulsively, **especially without knowledge** does break Gods's law, likewise certainly "misses the mark" for God desires us. God wants to strive to correct knowledge and hasten to correct knowledge. And God wants to think before we act.

In Luke 12:48 Jesus Christ explained a principle.

That principle is something wrong without knowledge, and a penalty is something wrong with knowledge. The point is even without knowledge **there is certain penalty**. That's because God expects us to make an effort to acquire knowledge.

So Proverbs 19:2 Solomon said that "with the feet impulsively" misses the mark. In other words, Solomon was telling us to always think before we act. This intended meaning for the second part of verse 2 is expressed in the 1853 Isaac Leeser Translation.

Also the word knowledge is not there is nothing good, **but hastens with the feet misses the right path**. (Proverbs 19:2 Leeser Translation)

To the right path we have consequence of acting impulsively and have undesirable consequence in a moral sense. Leeser's translation "misses the right path" instead of the KJV "he sins" correctly reflects the thought that Solomon meant to convey with this statement.

#59 = PROVERBS 29:15

THE VERSE:

The rod of reproof we do not **let *himself*** be fingers in the mother (Proverbs 29:15)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

The word "himself" in the Hebrew text, so we might presented in print. However, it is appropriate to provide additional explanation for the translated **the word "himself" wrong**. Solomon was referring to "left himself".

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

The provided word "himself" qualifies the translated "left". The Hebrew here is "shalach" (alternatively "shalah"). Hebrew verbs will express **intentional action** in the passive voice form "shalach" means **intentionally sent off, dismissed**. This verse translation is "left" neutral, implying **conscious doing anything**. But that's not what "shalach" in the pual form conveys.

Consider the "sent off" (shalach) and not "sent away from family". It did not "expel" the child from family. So can be "sent off" dismissed, but still in the family. Something being "sent off" is "sent" means that the child is sent off **without getting** "the rod and reproof".

This verse presents a contrast. The first "shame" of a child wisdom. The contrast is "dismissed **without receiving punishment that been incurred** brings his mother to shame".

Solomon's point is that the child is somehow passively "left himself". No contrast is **the deserved punishment**, powerful teaching is **not administered**. Both the child "left himself" brings his mother to shame. Rather, the disobedient child that is **never corrected appropriately** that brings his mother to shame.

The appropriate administration of punishment produces wisdom. And the punishment not administered, that results problems. The contrast is the punishment vs no punishments for disobedience.

An ancient biblical times were such things as children being left themselves. The concept of children left themselves was mentally unsolicited. Children were expected help with from an age. They were expected to take chicken and sheep, helping in the fields, etc. There was no chance of children being left alone with nothing to do.

For example, Jacob was with a Jacob's pre-teen sons looking after his animals, Jacob himself looked after an animal. And King David was about 17 years old, he had already been involved in looking after his father's sheep for some years.

But in the fields and domestic animals for which young children could be responsible, it is that children are kept left themselves. Some translators who

incorrectly provided the words “to himself” were viewing this verse with a city mentality.

A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:

The rod of wisdom is not to be taken away ***without correction*** or bring his mother to shame. (Proverbs 29:15)

#60 = ECCLESIASTES 1:4

THE VERSE:

One generation passes away, and *another* generation comes: but the earth abides **for ever**.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS TRANSLATION:

This implies that this planet earth will exist for ever. But that is not correct.

THE PROBLEMS WITH THIS TRANSLATION:

Biblical Hebrew (and same for **Biblical Greek**) is one word means both, “eternal”, and also “for a very long time”. The Hebrew word for both these concepts is “olam”.

Latin on the hand, and distinguish between “eternal” and “for long time”. Was the Vulgate translated the Hebrew word in verse **“eternal”**. The English translators (KJV, then) relied on the Vulgate translation of “olam” supposed means “for ever”.

When understand this (that in Biblical Hebrew or Biblical Greek) specific word that “for ever” (sometimes meaning “for long time”), should realize that Scriptures in English have the word “for ever” in the based single word in the original text, really based on translators deciding “eternal” or “for ever” in context that tells whether this Hebrew Greek word means “for ever”, whether it means “for very long time”.

Together this limitation expressed “for ever” Old Testament Hebrew the word “olam” combination with “the” expression **“le-olam-ed”**. Thus this expression “le-olam-ed” is (usually translated “for ever”), referring “for ever”. But whether “olam” is on its own, be referring “for ever”, it could be referring to “very long time”. (The Greek equivalent “for ever” is **“tous aionas ton aionon”**.)

Since “olam” is in Ecclesiastes 1:4, therefore we look to Scriptures tell us whether Ecclesiastes 1:4 supposed mean “for ever” whether supposed mean

“for a very long time”.

So let’s examine some other statements about the earth.

2 Peter 3:10-12 tells us that the heavens shall pass away, **the earth will be burned up**, physical matter shall be dissolved, the heavens shall be dissolved, and physical matter will melt.
These statements tell us that this entire universe, including our planet earth, is going to disappear.

Revelation 21:1 tells us that the present heavens and the earth are going to pass away.

Psalm 102:25-26 tells us this whole universe is going to **be folded up** and **changed**, and will then be exchanged for a new one.

Hebrews 1:10-12 is quoting these verses from Psalm 102 and shows that **this present universe will perish** and wax old, to then be replaced by a new one.

The utter destruction of the present universe is a pre-condition for the creation of the new heavens and the new earth.

This subject is expounded further in my article “A New Heaven And A New Earth”.

Some of Ecclesiastes 1:4 is a translation based on the Latin Vulgate interpretation of this verse. Here “olam” really only means “for a very long time”.

<u>A CORRECT TRANSLATION OF THIS VERSE:</u>

“One generation passes away, and another generation comes; but the earth abides **for a long time**.”

<u>THE CORRECT MEANING OF THIS VERSE:</u>

In this verse Solomon was comparing the “lifespan” of the earth to the lifespan of a generation and various cycles in nature. Compared to these cycles, the human lifespan on earth has existed, and will continue to exist, “for a very long time”.

Keep in mind that in Ecclesiastes Solomon basically presents his observations and his own conclusions. Very few statements in this book should be taken as absolute statements. Very many of his observations are subject to more or less seeing the situation completely differently. If Solomon really wanted to dogmatically say in this verse that the earth would have used the expression “le-olam va-ed”. But this Solomon did not do in this verse.

Here Solomon only intended to abide for a time. Other Scriptures make clear that the earth itself will at some point in the future also “pass away”.

This concludes Part 3 in this series of 7 articles. Part 4 starts with mistranslations in the Book of Isaiah.

Frank W. Nelte