Euphrates: a problem of geography
by: Jonathan Machtemes

all Bible verses herein are taken from the King James translation unless otherwise noted. A line will be frequently used to cross out either poorly translated words or ones of special focus with the OBRY inserted immediately after. Such as river. As has been the case in previous articles, I will frequently (and deliberately) NOT cross out all proper and/or specific nouns, and will seem inconsistent in that way. I can assure you this is not an inconsistency nor complacency, but my best attempt to ease nearly any reader into OBRY, instead of performing a universal swap of all proper and specific nouns, which I believe would be too much of an overload of vital information. It is my hope that those who study along with me will acquire a better and better sense of OBRY as we go.

Gen 15:18 In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates. Gen 17:8 And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God. Gen 10:19 And the border of the Canaanites was from Sidon, as thou comest to Gerar, unto Gaza, as thou goest, unto Sodom, and Gomorrah, and Admah, and Zeboim, even unto Lasha.

At this point I could, quite literally, rest my case...on those three verses. Within those three simple statements, from one book of the Bible, its abundantly clear that the Euphrates cannot be the Biblical. If you didn’t catch it, carefully read them one more time.

Any reader of those parallel passages who did not have an existing and contradictory model present already in their mind would quite naturally conclude that constituted part of the border of the Canaanites, or properly. With a little more examination, it’s clear that the Philistines, or properly, is at the border comprised of the river. The Great Sea constitutes the western border and Sidon is in the north. "All the land of Canaan" thus equates to "from Sidon to Gaza" thus equates to "to". Without the current accepted model driven into our minds through all the maps printed within our Bibles, the current State of Israel deception, and the absence of honest and critical voices in the academic community, we’d not have the first problem with understanding that was promised as the northern extremity and received as such from the time Israel entered with Joshua. Yet others will adhere to the secular sources over the direct Biblical ones. I invite all who are able and willing to explore the with me. I assure you that when we are finished you’ll have no doubt that the Great could never be, and never was the Euphrates.
The Border of Inheritance

So, what do we know about the \( \text{JR}x_{6578} \) anyways? It's first appearance, in Gen 2:14, simply lists it as the 4th \( \text{w+}n_{5104} \), proceeding from the prominent \( \text{w+}n_{5104} \) of the \( \text{g}n_{1588} \), "garden". That's it. The former three \( \text{w+}n_{5104} \) listed all have some level of description of where they run, (not "where they once ran"). These rivers are contemporary with \( \text{m+}w_{4872} \), "Moses". Even though we get no description of the course of \( \text{JR}x_{6578} \), it gets, by far, the most page time. Is this a coincidence?

The second appearance of \( \text{JR}x_{6578} \) is a chief building block upon which this paper is predicated. Gen 15:18, "In the same day the LORD \( \text{yeu}_{3068} \) made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the \( \text{m+x}m_{4714} \), or "Egypt", unto the great \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \), the \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \) Euphrates \( \text{JR}x_{6578} \), so from \( \text{m+x}m_{4714} \) \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \) unto \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \) \( \text{JR}x_{6578} \) are the boundaries promised by \( \text{m+x}m_{4714} \). And, incidentally, a \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \) cannot be a wadi. So, the idea that a wadi in the north of what is called Sinai being \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \) \( \text{m+x}m_{4714} \) is untenable. So, moving forward, are there any other passages which list the \( \text{JR}x_{6578} \) as one of the borders of the \( \text{b}b_{1121} \) "sons of" \( \text{2+}w_{3479} \)? Yes... and they are:

Deu 11:24 Every place whereon the soles of your feet shall tread shall be yours: from the wilderness and Lebanon, from the river, the \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \) \( \text{m+x}m_{4714} \), even unto the uttermost sea shall your coast be.

Jos 1:4 From the wilderness and this Lebanon even unto the great river, the \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \) \( \text{m+x}m_{4714} \), all the land of the Hittites, and unto the great sea toward the going down of the sun, shall be your coast.

honorable mention:

Exo 23:31 And I will set thy bounds from the \( \text{r}d_{5488} \) even unto the sea of the \( \text{h}n_{3220} \) and \( \text{d}e_{318} \) unto the desert wilderness unto the river: \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \) \( \text{m+x}m_{4714} \) for I will deliver the inhabitants of the land into your hand; and thou shalt drive them out before thee.

*Two quick items: for the last verse, it should be stated that there are many wildernesses (\( \text{m+}d_{4057} \)) spoken of from really all over the place; however, the southern area is far more synonymous for this. And, besides for one instance in which the \( \text{w+n}_{383} \) (the river of \( \text{m+x}m_{4714} \)) is called a \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \), it is typically called a \( \text{h}n_{5158} \) and that will be briefly expounded upon later.

Obviously, the border descriptions, such as these, aren't coming from a cardinal directional viewpoint, lest \( \text{w+n}_{1419} \) "the sea the great" and \( \text{w+n}_{5158} \) \( \text{m+x}m_{4714} \) are one in the same, and that is not the case. What IS the case, however, is that we can establish two more things: 1) \( \text{2+w}_{3479} \) did receive their inheritance as promised at least by \( \text{d}u_{1732} \) "David's" day, (actually much earlier), and 2) that \( \text{JR}x_{6578} \) is in the north, or \( \text{w+n}_{6828} \).

Let's address the second point first.

We can use many direct and indirect verses to do this, but here are two direct ones:

Jer 46:6 Let not the swift flee away, nor the mighty man escape; they shall stumble, and fall toward the north by the \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \) \( \text{w+n}_{4714} \). \( \text{JR}x_{6578} \).

Jer 46:10 For this is the day of vengeance, that he may avenge him of his adversaries: and the sword shall devour, and it shall be satiate and made drunk with their blood: for \( \text{w+n}_{6635} \) \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \) hath a sacrifice in the north country by the \( \text{w+n}_{5104} \).
As I mentioned, there are more passages that indirectly say the same, but first let us look at the first point: that bnyywral had received their full inheritance, as this is a point of contention to this day. The two most glaring passages are:

2Sa 8:3 David smote also Hadadezer, the son of Rehob, king of Zobah, as he went to recover his border at the river Euphrates. 1Ch 18:3 And David smote Hadadezer Hadadezer king of Zobah unto Hamath, as he went to establish his dominion by the river Euphrates. (there should be no difference in the name of eddozr, since it is the same OBRY name in both passages)

Now, a word of some interest in 2 Sa 8:3, is ewyb. Its said to be from the root wb. wb is used, contextually, for "return" and works well; however, in the form "ewyb" it seems to imply force or greater expenditure, and appears in the same form in Gen 14:16, (\text{\textsc{\textquotedblright} returns L\textsc{\textquotedblright} and his possessions from the band of kings}), Gen 37:22, (\text{\textsc{\textquotedblright} tries to deliver \textsc{\textquotedblright} and return him to their father), and 2 Ki 16:6, (where R\textsc{\textquotedblright} king of P\textsc{\textquotedblright}, recovers \textsc{\textquotedblright} from Y\textsc{\textquotedblright}) It appears elsewhere with the same meaning and impact. It implies both force and energetic return... not new acquisition.

Now, as far as bnyywral receiving their full inheritance unto pri, far earlier than dud, "David's" time (in fact, from Joshua's time), as promised over and again by yeue, consider:

Deu 1:7 Turn you, and take your journey, and go to the mount of the Amorites, and unto all the places nigh thereunto, in the plain, in the hills, and in the vale, and in the south, and by the sea side, to the land of the Canaanites, and unto Lebanon, unto the great river, the river Euphrates, the river Euphrates. Deu 1:8 Behold, I have set the land before you: go in and possess the land which the LORD yeue sware unto your fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to give unto them and to their seed after them.

What boundaries of land did yeue swear to the Patriarchs? Gen 15:18, "... from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates. So, what would they spy out if not from the (or as cited earlier) "(2 Ki 24:7, 1 Ki 8:65, 2 Ch 7:8) unto the the river Euphrates? This is exactly what they did; however, the who's glory it is to conceal His words, told us in this way:

Num 13:21 So they went up, and searched the land from the wilderness of Zin unto Rehob, as men come to Hamath. This passage is saying they searched from the southern extremity to the northern extremity. But that passage didn't say "to pri", it said "unto Rehob, as men come to Hamath". What does Rehob and Hamath have to do with pri? Actually, quite a lot, which will will see more as we go, so pay close attention.

As you will see, in the following passage, the or "wilderness of Zin", comprises a portion of the southern border of iewyl.

Num 34:4 And your border shall turn from the south to the ascent of Akrabbim, and pass on to Zin: and the going forth thereof shall be from the south to Kadeshbarnea, and shall go on to Hazaraddar, and pass on to Azmon:
Num 34:5 And the border shall fetch a compass from Azmon unto the river of Egypt, and the going out of it shall be at the sea.

*Incidentally, the reason the word Ρ וָ is called a Ρ וָ sometimes and Ρ וָ other times is because a Ρ וָ is a Ρ וָ, but not every Ρ וָ is a Ρ וָ. Think of it like: a river is a stream, but not every stream is a river.

From "Zin" unto "Rehob to come to Hamath" were their search parameters. Do you remember King Α ΔΩΖ 1909/1928? He was the king of Α ΔΩΖ 6678, whom David fought while recovering his border at "Rehob to come to Hamath". He was also the son of Ρ ΤΛ 1340, (2 Sa 8:3 and 8:12). Many places are named after a patriarch, such as "M X 2574 sends gifts with his son to ΑΔ 1732 "David" because he had frequent wars with Α ΔΩΖ 1909/1928. So, "M X 2574, Α ΔΩΖ 6678, and Ρ ΤΛ are obviously in near proximity to one another, and since "David smote Hadadezer Hadadezer king of Zobah unto Hamath" when recovering his border at "Rehob to come to Hamath", is why the spies went "unto Rehob, as men come to Hamath" to search their full borders.

In Jos 19:24-31, the inheritance of the tribe of "Asher" is described. It includes Ρ ΤΛ 1340. It also includes Ρ 6665 and Δ Δ 16721. Jos 19:32-39 describes the inheritance of "Naphtali". Both Ρ 6665 and "M X 2574 are listed within the scope of "Naphtali". Unfortunately, most translators also list the descriptive words along with "Tyre and Hamath" as additional cities, whereas I believe this is either a mistake or deliberate deception. It reads, "Τ 5892 ΜΠΡ 4013 Α Δ Δ 6661 Ρ 6665 Μ X 2574 Ρ 7557 Ρ 3672", which, I believe, would be more appropriately translated, "and the fortified cities: the sides of Ρ, and strips of "M X, and Α Δ". Either way, "Asher" occupied Δ Δ 16721, which we saw as a northern extremity earlier and we'll see again in Jos 13, and Δ Δ 1532 occupied portions of "M X 2574, which we'll see later is synonymous with or parallel to the "Rehob to come to Hamath".

There are some who may argue, "they just never acquired a border at "Rehob to come to Hamath" until Δ Δ 1732 and then only briefly", but that argument would not be following the evidence. If 44432 3068 promises a border at "Rehob to come to Hamath" multiple times, (Gen 15:18, Deu 11:24, Jsh 1:4), is it or is it not precisely where He expects Ρ 3478 3068 to go and acquire land unto? You see, He did not simply make an offer to Ρ ΤΛ 4828, Ρ 3327, and Ρ 3290 and their descendants to occupy a certain geographical area. He said, "it WILL be so". In the "Δ ΠΛ 4057 "wilderness", 44432 3068 made a covenant with Π 1121 Ρ 3478 concerning land occupation, (Deu 29 and 30). In Deu 11:24, He repeats what they will possess, "from the river Ρ 5104, the river Euphrates Ρ 5104 Ρ 3678, even unto the uttermost sea shall your coast be", and in verse 31 He states, "you WILL occupy, you WILL possess", as in "immediately".

In Joshua 13, the account states that Joshua was old, but 44432 3068 said to him, "there is yet much land to be taken". In 13:4-5, 44432 3068 is telling 44432 3091 what land remains in the North. He lists Ρ 72 ΔΔ 6721, Ρ 6663, ΡΜΙ 3844, and ΛΟΛ 1171 beneath Ρ 2022 Ρ 2768 unto Ρ 935 Ρ 2574. Again, did 44432 3068 change His mind or were they to occupy Ρ 5104 Ρ 3678? When Π 1732 returned to his border at "Rehob to come to Hamath" and defeated king Α ΔΩΖ 1909/1928, wasn't it the king of Ρ 2574 who sent him gifts because of the wars he'd had with Ρ 6678? Wasn't the Lebanon associated with "Rehob to come to Hamath" in Deu 1:7? Didn't the scouts go from "Δ ΠΛ 4057 Ρ 6790, (one extremity), to Ρ ΤΛ 1340 Ρ 3672 "Rehob to come to Hamath", (the other extremity), in Num 13:21? Did not "Asher" and "Naphtali" inhabit locations directly related to the northern border?

When 44432 3068 is describing the northern land to be taken, He makes a sweep from west to east then east to west. Jos 13:5 "And the land of the Gibeonites, and all Lebanon, toward the sunrising, from Baalgad under Mount Hermon unto the entering into Hamath." "all Lebanon, toward the sunrising" - west to east. Now, east to west, "All the inhabitants of the hill country from Lebanon unto Misrephothmaim, and all the Sidonians, them will I drive out from before the children of Israel". So,
He's been thorough about the northern border. If these places are what needed taking to establish the northern border, what do you suppose runs right through there, from east to west? Is it the border, the northern border promised? If so, the \( \text{JR} \times 6578 \) must be there. If you say, "no", you must assert that \( 2\text{W}A\text{L}3478 \) forgot His promise or changed His mind. Why would He expect full obedience and not deliver full inheritance?

You'll remember, earlier, Deu 29-30 was cited concerning the covenant that if the sons of \( 2\text{W}A\text{L}3478 \) kept the laws, statutes, and judgments of \( 2\text{W}A\text{L}3478 \) they get the land promised their fathers along with many blessings. If they did not, they would be struck by disease, violence, and cast from the land. This covenant is referenced many times and it's always an even agreement: the land and blessings promised the Patriarchs in exchange for the keeping of the laws, statutes, and judgments. Does anyone think if \( 2\text{W}A\text{L}3478 \) kept 50% of their end they should have all the land and blessings? If not, then why would anyone think \( 2\text{W}A\text{L}3478 \) would expect 100% compliance from them and only deliver a partial percentage of the land?

At this point, there's no question that \( \text{JPR}5104 \text{JR} \times 6578 \) was the intended, promised, and achieved border. We've seen that \( 1\Delta \text{Jr}16721 \), \( 2\text{W}U\text{J}2574 \), \( 3\text{JH}7340 \), and \( 4\text{LH}\text{LH}3844 \) are directly associated with the northern border and the northern border is the \( \text{JR} \times 6578 \). We've seen two tribes taking possession of these locations and David reacquiring the border at \( \text{JR} \times 6578 \). There was never a change of plans since it was promised to \( 4\text{LH}\text{LH}85 \) that his descendants would occupy from \( \text{JPR}5104 \text{JPR}4714 \) to \( \text{JPR}5104 \text{JR} \times 6578 \), all the land of the \( \text{JHMJ}3669 \), and their land stretched from \( 1\Delta \text{Jr}16721 \) to \( 2\text{W}U\text{J}5804 \) or \( \text{JPR}5104 \text{JR} \times 6578 \) to \( \text{JPR}5104 \text{JPR}4714 \). We've also seen that \( 2\text{W}U\text{J}2574 \) is on an east/west trajectory with \( \text{JPR}2022 \text{JH}\text{H}2768 \) "Mount Hermon", along with \( 4\text{LH}\text{LH}3844 \) "the Lebanon" and \( 1\Delta \text{Jr}16721 \) "Sidon", and that is going to make \( \text{JR} \times 6578 \) being "Euphrates", which is across hundreds of miles of desert to the northeast of these locations, entirely unworkable. But, if for any reason, these facts are not yet convincing.....

Consider Riblah

\( \text{RLL}\text{LH}7247 \) "Riblah", gained notoriety later in the accounts of Kings and Chronicles as the location where both \( \text{RHY}6547 \text{JHY}6549 \) (or sometimes \( \text{JHY} \)) "Pharaohnechoh" and \( \text{JHY}6547 \text{JHY}4701 \) "Nebuchadnezzar" sat to pronounce judgment on the kings of \( 2\text{W}A\text{L}3478 \) "Judah". In 2 Ch 35:20 we're told, "when Josiah had prepared the temple, Necho king of Egypt \( \text{JPR}5104 \text{JPR}4714 \) came up to fight against Carchemish by Euphrates \( \text{JR} \times 6578 \). Its not too easy to try to figure where \( \text{JPR}\text{JPR}2751 \) "Carchemish" is, but with a few other scriptures and some deduction we'll see that it is, at the least, in proximity to \( \text{RLL}\text{LH}7247 \) and \( \text{RLL}\text{LH}7247 \) is in proximity to "Megiddo" and \( \text{JR} \times 6578 \).

The first interesting thing is that \( \text{JHY}6549 \) and king \( \text{JHY}2977 \) of \( 2\text{W}A\text{L}3478 \) "Josiah of Judah" fight at \( \Delta \text{Jr}4023 \). Looking at the above map, "Megiddo" is maybe 30 miles southwest of Lake Tiberias (as the crow flies), hundreds of miles from Euphrates, and yet they battled there? How was this so? If \( \text{JPR}\text{JPR}4714 \) were Egypt what king would march his army through the punishment of Sinai and Negev only to most likely encounter hostiles through Judah? Egypt is on the sea. You sail your army to the neutral port and march them to your target location as quickly as possible. Nechoc's battle was with the King of \( \text{JHY}804 \) "Assyria" not \( 2\text{W}A\text{L}3478 \). He could have easily, (and may I add, intelligently), sailed his army north of today's Lebanon. And how would \( \text{JHY}2977 \) "Josiah " know in advance to catch \( \text{JHY}6549 \) at "Megiddo"? If I were \( \text{JHY}6549 \) I'd avoid any skirmish until my goal at \( \text{JR} \times 6578 \) was complete. But, this is obviously what he did.

When \( \text{JHY}2977 \) heard \( \text{JHY}6549 \) was (or had) fought \( \text{JHY}804 \) at \( \text{JR} \times 6578 \) he decided to go to war against him. Why? You see, \( 2\text{W}A\text{L}3478 \) didn't care for \( \text{JHY}804 \) at all, nor did they have any specific grudge against \( \text{JPR}\text{JPR}4714 \). \( \text{JHY}2977 \) had been very successful as king in going into regions not under Judah's direct control up to that point. He had waged the most thorough campaign to destroy the high places and idols, in all the land, of any king up to that point, as witnessed in 2Ch 34:6,
"And so did he (destroyed the high places and idols) in the cities of Manasseh, and Ephraim, and Simeon, even unto Naphtali", (remember Naphtali from earlier?) With all his success, I believe he tried to make a play at regaining control of that very important area of the pri 6578, (after all, yeude 3063 had controlled dmwq 1834 and hmi 2574 as per 2 Ki 14:28, before yrbom 3379 king of wwrp l 3478 took it back). The best time to strike at an army would be after it was weakened from conflict. But at mln 4023, if in fact it is Meggido? Either way, this didn't work out well for ywyl 2977. He died and his son yeuahz 3059 "Jehoahaz" became king for three months and was taken and brought before nku 6549 at rble 7247 (not krkmyw 3751), put in chains, and his brother yeuyqym 3079 "Jehoiakim" was installed by nku 6549. Okay, so mln 4023 is a small problem. Rul 7247 is a huge one.

Rul 7247, according to 2 Ki 23:33, 25:21, Jer 39:5, 52:9, and 52:27, is in arx 776 hmi 2574 "land of Hamath". So what's the problem? Look at the map. The black star represents the assumption of Hamath. Rul 7247 is in ywil 776 hmi 2574. According to Num 34:11, Rul 7247 is the third stop heading downward from wwrp l 3478' northeast corner. I guess that might not be a problem if Euphrates were ywil 6578, (except maybe that Rul 7247 would be in the desert) but since it isn't, this is a giant problem. Here is why. In Num 34:9 a place called ywil oynn 2704 is the last stop of the northern border going east. If you search hxr oynn 2704 you'll find it in Eze 48:1, "Hazarenan, the border of Damascus northward". That makes it sound like ywil oynn 2704 borders dmwq 1834 "Damascus". How can that be? The green star, on the map, is Damascus. Damascus is much further south than the assumed Hamath is. Did I do something wrong? Well, lets check again.

Our trustworthy friends at Strong's lists ywil oynn 2704 one more time as H2703 "hxr oynun 2704". The extra y must have been the appropriate reason to separate it into two listings like that... even though that doesn't appear to bother our trustworthy friends at Strong's many many other times. If we check ywil oynn 2703, we see it in Eze 47:17 "And the border from the sea shall be Hazarenan, the border of Damascus, and the north northward, and the border of Hamath. And this is the north side.". How does Damascus, the green star, border the location that marks the northeast corner of ywil 776 wwrp l 3478 yet ywil oynn 2704 borders both it and hmi 2574 and Rul 7247, which is three stops down from ywil 1834 ywil oynn 2704, is in the land of hmi 2574? Its because ywil 1834 is not Damascus and ywil 6578 is in no way Euphrates. It looks like the Greater Israel Project needs to dig themselves a new ywil 6578 from the south side of Damascus running due west to Sidon and the sea. And a note of great importance: you’ll notice the Greater Israel Project claims a promise of land from the Nile in Egypt unto the Euphrates river. They claim ywil 5104 (or nhl 5158) mxrym 4714 is the Nile, yet each time the two rivers are compared in scripture, the ywil 6578 is called "the great", not nhl 5158 mxrym 4714. Would anyone in their right mind call Euphrates "great" when comparing it to the Nile?
The point is, ""\(\text{Naw}\)" went to fight ""\(\text{Naw}\)" in \(\text{Krk}\) at the \(\text{Ne}\) yet he sits in judgment in \(\text{Rble}\) (2 Ki 23:33). The same thing occurs beginning at Jer 46:2, ""Against Egypt \(\text{Mtr}\), against the army of Pharaohnecho king of Egypt \(\text{Mtr}\), which was by the river Euphrates \(\text{Nyr}\) in Carchemish, which Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon smote in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah."", and yet we see ""\(\text{Naw}\)\(\text{Naw}\)" doing the very same thing as ""\(\text{Naw}\)\(\text{Naw}\)" 2Ki 25:6 ""So they took the king, and brought him up to the king of Babylon to Riblah; and they gave judgment upon him."" So, they both battled in \(\text{Krk}\) and they're both sitting in judgment at \(\text{Rble}\) and they're both sitting in judgment at \(\text{Rble}\) in the land of \(\text{Hmi}\) which is three stops down heading south from \(\text{Rble}\) (which borders ""Damascus""?) Refer again to the above map. Can this possibly work in Palestine?

So, what if it's a different \(\text{Rble}\)? A different \(\text{Rble}\) that's also in \(\text{Hmi}\)? So, besides 2 Ki 23:33, 25:21, Jer 39:5, 52:9, and 52:27, there's, again, Jos 13:5 to consider, "And the land of the Gibeles, and all Lebanon, toward the sunrising, from Baalgad under mount Hermon unto the entering into Hamath." These are the northern areas and are being listed in a west-east orientation, and there is \(\text{Hmi}\). Besides Ezk 47 and 48 putting Hamath on the northern border, Num 34:8-9 does as well, and remember, \(\Delta \text{mW}\) (as they insist on translating it "Damascas") is on the far side of that border. Refer again to the map if its even necessary at this point. One thing that is utterly indisputable is that \(\text{Hmi}\) is always associated with the northern border, as is \(\Delta \text{mW}\) as is the \(\text{Nyr}\).

Allow me to illustrate and elaborate:

Eze 47:17 And the border from the sea shall be Hazarenan, the border of \(\text{Damascus}\) \(\Delta \text{mW}\), and the north northward, and the border of \(\text{Hamath}\) \(\text{Hmi}\). And this is the north side.

2Ki 14:25 He restored the coast of Israel from the entering of \(\text{Hamath}\) \(\text{Hmi}\) unto the sea of the plain, according to the word of the LORD God of Israel \(\text{Yr}\), the hand of his servant Jonah, the son of Amittai, the prophet, which was of Gathhepher.
Euphrates has no rhyme or reason. No serious gains. No point. A war near the mouth in a land that wants to be taxed to death or go to war with them to control the length of Euphrates. Empire expansion secure a position on the Euphrates nearer the source than mouth. For what exactly? He would have the staggering numbers we see being traded throughout these empires on the part participating in is absurd, nor does the Middle East have (or ever had) the kinds of commodities in the much trade. The idea that a "silk road" situation could compare to the commerce we see these empires wide world. A complex river system, stretching far inland, would be the perfect vehicle to glean so among many many others traded with her), and from there they shipped and received goods from the Bible, it's because they were at the mouth of they keep such a coveted position in world trade like that? From all evidence I can glean from the many long centuries. Their assumed locations along today’s Lebanese coast are inconsequential... nothing special. These Biblical towers of commerce traded with nations the world over. And how did they keep such a coveted position in world trade like that? From all evidence I can glean from the Bible, it's because they were at the mouth of or very near to it, and many peoples shipped to them on the or "Assyria", among many many others traded with her), and from there they shipped and received goods from the wide world. A complex river system, stretching far inland, would be the perfect vehicle to glean so much trade. The idea that a "silk road" situation could compare to the commerce we see these empires participating in is absurd, nor does the Middle East have (or ever had) the kinds of commodities in the staggering numbers we see being traded throughout these empires on the.

If were today's Euphrates it would mean ws word that "restored" (that word "restored" in 2 Sa 8:3, (the eastern border, but as witnessed in Eze 47:20, "The west side also shall be the great sea from the border, till a man come over against Hamath. This is the west side", it runs all the way to the great sea. It is also called "the broad" in Ams 6:2.

In the third passage, we saw hold a great feast and all holds this as well: this is one of many passages that swap "" meaning to come to or "restored" in 2 Sa 8:3, (the eastern border, but as witnessed in Eze 47:20, "The west side also shall be the great sea from the border, till a man come over against Hamath. This is the west side", it runs all the way to the great sea. It is also called " the broad" in Ams 6:2.

And what did we just witness? One, that and border at at NE border. Two, that or "restored" (that word "restored" again) the border of This is the very same border at this time, concretely to , since we witnessed hold a great feast and all . How do you suppose they got so wealthy and strong? They are rich and mighty like the cities of the , the river or very near to it, and many peoples shipped to them on the , (even , per Eze 27:23, as in "Eden", and or "Assyria", among many many others traded with her), and from there they shipped and received goods from the wide world. A complex river system, stretching far inland, would be the perfect vehicle to glean so much trade. The idea that a "silk road" situation could compare to the commerce we see these empires participating in is absurd, nor does the Middle East have (or ever had) the kinds of commodities in the staggering numbers we see being traded throughout these empires on the.

If were today's Euphrates it would mean ws word that "restored" (that word "restored" in 2 Sa 8:3, (the eastern border, but as witnessed in Eze 47:20, "The west side also shall be the great sea from the border, till a man come over against Hamath. This is the west side", it runs all the way to the great sea. It is also called " the broad" in Ams 6:2.
Incidentally, is it not interesting how ܢܐܠܐ 894 and ܐܘܕܐ 5019 are never referred to as "from the East": ܐܢܐ 6924, or ܐܢܐܪܐ 4217 ܐܢܐ 1053.

Another consideration is that of Ezekiel's prophecy against the king of ܡܪܝܡ 4714, who at the time was ܐܘܕܐ 5019. The entirety of chapter 31 is good to read, but let's look at the very telling passages. Remember, ܐܘܕܐ 894 defeated the king of ܒܒܠ 804 at the ܒܪܐ 6578 and we immediately see him battling ܒܘܒܠ 2977 at ܗܠܐ 4023 and sitting to judge at ܒܪܐ 7247.

Eze 31:3 Behold, the Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon with fair branches
Eze 31:4 The waters made him great, the deep set him up on high with her rivers running round about his plants, and sent out her little rivers unto all the trees of the field.
Eze 31:12 And strangers, the terrible of the nations, have cut him off, and have left him: upon the mountains and in all the valleys his branches are fallen, and his boughs are broken by all the rivers of the land.

There is a lot of imagery in Ezekiel and in this chapter and the next. Prophecy often involves a subtle weaving of symbolism with literalism. In the same book, if Ezekiel is prophesying against ܒܒܠ 894 there is a great deal of sea imagery. It's not all literal, but some is. Bible prophecy blends pertinent imagery with reality. Consider also Isaiah's prophecy against the king of ܠܢܐ 6865 in chapter 14. The same form is employed. ܒܘܒܠ 804 would have been a great tree in ܐܠܢܘܢ 3844 with ܢܐ 5104 and smaller streams running out from it, with the beast and birds nesting in and underneath because ܒܘܒܠ 804 had controlled the entire region of the ܒܪܐ 6578 for over a century by then. ܐܠܢܘܢ 3844 is prolifically associated with the northern most regions of ܠܢܐ 3478 border, as is ܢܐ 5104 ܒܪܐ 6578.

A Brief look over the NER

This section is brief, but packs a real punch, so please pay close attention.

According to the kjv, Jos 24:2 reads, "Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, even Terah, the father of Abraham, and the father of Nachor: and they served other gods.". That's interesting. Flood? Like "Noah's Flood" = ܠܢܐ 999 ܡܢܝܢ 4325? No. It's ܢܝܪܐ 5104. The text reads ܠܢܐ 5676 ܢܝܪܐ 5104 or "on the other side of the river". This expression is used countless times of one's orientation to ܪܕܐ 3383, commonly translated as "Jordan". You may see ܠܢܐ 5676 ܢܝܘܪܐ 3383 = "on the other side of yarden", or ܟܠܐ 5676 ܠܒܕܐ 3383 = "crossing of yarden". But here, and many other places, it's just ܢܝܪܐ 5104 or "the ܢܝܪܐ". Even though Psa 66:6 and Job 40:23 illude to ܪܕܐ 3383 being a ܢܝܪܐ 5104, as well as Gen 15:18 and Isa 11:15 calling the ܐܒܕܐ 7883 a ܢܝܪܐ 5104, we can be certain, through exhaustive cross-checking, that when you see ܢܝܪܐ 5104 with no modifier, it's ܒܪܐ 6578. Exo 23:31 is a perfect example: "and from the desert unto the river". Desert = ܡܕܒܪ 4057, which is absolutely associated with the southern border and is selectively called "desert" instead of "wilderness", and river = ܢܝܘܪܐ 5104, which is the "Great River" = ܢܝܘܪܐ 5104 ܠܒܕܐ 1419, ܢܝܪܐ 5104 ܒܪܐ 6578. Furthermore, ܒܪܐ 6578 is the only ܢܝܪܐ 5104 called ܠܕܐ 1419 in ܐܢܘܬ 3667, so it logically follows that if only one river in all the land is called "the great river", any time one referred to "the river" with no modifier, it would be "the great river" of the land. Can I back that up? Sure:

1Ki 4:21 And Solomon reigned over all kingdoms from the river ܢܝܪܐ 5104 unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of ܡܪܝܡ 4714
2Ch 9:26 And he reigned over all the kings from the river ܢܝܪܐ 5104 even unto the land of the Philistines, and to the border of ܡܪܝܡ 4714
Isa 27:12 And it shall come to pass in that day, that the LORD ܢܝܪܐ 3068 shall beat off from the channel of the river ܢܝܪܐ 5104 unto the stream ܠܢܐ 5158 of Egypt ܡܪܝܡ 4714, and ye shall be gathered one by one, O ye children of Israel. (I just can't help but noting the poor use of verbiage in this passage)
When 2471 "Joshua" says what he says in Jos 24, there's no doubt he is talking about 3476 and as they (Abraham, Terah, and Nachor) dwelt in 4427 or "Haran", which is 3417 3411, the people known to be just on the other side of the 3476 is the 3476. Nachor's son Bethual is even called a 3476 in Gen 28:2. The 3476 people are always translated as Syrians and 3478 as Syria, but I assure you the 3476 and 3478 of the Bible and the Syrians and Syria of today cannot be the same.

If we are stuck in the Middle East for location, we can't reconcile the maps to the Bible. The land of Syria extends from what is today called the Golan Heights and Lebanon to the Euphrates as its northern and southern borders gradually constrict until they meet at a small stretch of the Tigris. Except for a few cities like 3478, 4627, 3478, and 3478, (2 Sa 10:6), which were always areas of strife, the 3476 dwelt 3476 "from over the river", (2 Sa 10:16). This 3476 is, as just proven, 3476. The translators of modern Bibles know this. This is why they always render 3476 as "Mesopotamia", except once in Psa 60:1, where its rendered, "Aramnaharaim". Both of the titles used for translation are confusing and misleading. Is this an accident?

What does Merriam-Webster say about Mesopotamia?
1 region of southwestern Asia between the Tigris and the Euphrates rivers extending from the mountains of eastern Asia Minor to the Persian Gulf
2 the entire Tigris–Euphrates valley

I just don't know how that's possible. Aren't we told that Assyria = 3476 occupied the northern parts of this region and Babylon = 3476 the south? Even if we go with today's map of Syria, that's hardly Mesopotamia. Maybe the kjv didn't look very well at the maps when they decided 3476 was "Mesopotamia".

The thing is, the Psalms are loaded with cross-references to other books. In the case of Psa 60:1, we have a reference in 2 Sa 8 and 1 Ch 18. Lets look at all three:

Psa 60:1 To the chief Musician upon Shushaneduth, Michtam of David, to teach; when he strove with Aramnaharaim 3476 and with Aramzobah 3478, when Joab returned, and smote of Edom in the valley of salt twelve thousand...

2Sa 8:3 David smote also Hadadezer, the son of Rehob, king of Zobah 3478, as he went to recover his border at the river Euphrates 3476. 2Sa 8:5 And when the Syrians of Damascus 3478 came to succour Hadadezer king of Zobah 3478, David slew of the Syrians (in 3478) two and twenty thousand men. 2Sa 8:14 And he put garrisons in Edom; and all the Edomites became David's servants. And the 3068 preserved David whithersoever he went.

1Ch 18:3 And David smote Hadadezer king of Zobah 3478 unto Hamath, as he went to establish his dominion by the river Euphrates 3476. 1Ch 18:5 And when the Syrians of Damascus 3478 came to help Hadadezer king of Zobah 3478, David slew of the Syrians (in 3478) two and twenty thousand men. 1Ch 18:6 Then David put garrisons in Syriadamascus 3478; and the Syrians 3478 became David's servants, and brought gifts...
1Ch 18:13 And he put garrisons in Edom; and all the Edomites became David's servants. Thus the 3068 preserved David whithersoever he went.
These are all parallel passages: Psa 60:1-  Aramzobah = 2 Sa 8:3, 1 Ch 18:3- Zobah. Psa 60:1- Aramnaharaim = 2 Sa 8:5, 1 Ch 18:5-6. Let me simplify... what these three parallel passages are telling us is that  \( \text{dmwq} ^{1834} \) (which we are told is Damascus) and \( \text{arm nerym} ^{763} \) (which we are told is Mesopotamia), are one and the same. Let it sink in. I wouldn't say  \( \text{dmwq} ^{1834} \) is the fullness of \( \text{arm nerym} ^{763} \), but certainly the one is within the other. That really begs the question: If there is no deliberate deception at play here, why not translate \( \text{arm nerym} ^{763} \) as "Mesopotamia" in Psa 60:1, as in every other occurrence? Is it because the moment someone cross-references these passages they'll realize what I've just demonstrated: that there's no way Mesopotamia and Damascus are synonymous? Is the reason the Bible replaces \( \text{arm nerym} ^{763} \) with \( \text{dmwq} ^{1834} \) because as Isaiah the prophet wrote, "For the head of Syria \( \text{arm} ^{758} \) is Damascus \( \text{dmwq} ^{1834} \)" (Isa 7:8)? So, as was pointed out earlier, if only a few \( \text{arm nerym} ^{763} \) cities were on \( \text{ywral} ^{3478} \) side of the \( \text{ner} ^{5104} \) and the rest, including \( \text{dmwq} ^{1834} \) were on the other side of the \( \text{yrr} ^{5104} \) and we know Damascus isn’t in Mesopotamia and the \( \text{yrr} \) is \( \text{rrx} \)... well, as usual their whole model falls apart.

In Conclusion

Let it be known that I am certainly not unsympathetic to those who may find themselves having strong negative reactions to such large paradigm shifts as Palestine not being the Land of Promise. When I first encountered a very few authors suggesting Palestine was the wrong locale I thought it would be relatively easy to prove them wrong, and yet here I am. I did not choose this road. It was chosen for me. One may not ignore what they are shown and hope to go on to other things with any degree of understanding. So, now this is my road. I don't regret it nor do I do it begrudgingly. I do this with the full knowledge that many accepted historical records bear witness against me, but I choose to bear witness to the Word.

Man is predisposed to desiring a puzzle to be solved, a mystery to be understood, a motive to be outed. Its part of our nature. Why? "It is the glory of God to conceal the word, and the glory of kings to search out the speech." (DRB). Speaking of \( \text{yeuwo} ^{3091} \text{emwyh} ^{4899} \), Paul writes in 2 Ti 3:16, "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness". That, and He, is a mystery as well. Many mysteries has He left for His children to be found out in His time. The keys to eschatology lie within our understanding of the beginning and of the ages past. The great \( \text{yeuwo} ^{3091} \) has woven such marvels throughout His Word, is it any wonder that \( \text{yeuwo} ^{3091} \) would speak in parables and thank the Father for not revealing the truth to many?

But this, now, is no further mystery. This is clarity. The word was not meant to be a mystery for all time, but a light is shown upon it in the appointed day. It is now that time. And what has the light shown to us herein?

1. The light has led us to understand that this land of \( \text{klon} ^{3667} \) was given to our father \( \text{abrem} ^{85} \) and his progeny for an everlasting possession: Gen 17:8 And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan \( \text{klon} ^{3667} \), for an everlasting possession; and I will be their \( \text{aleym} ^{430} \).

2. The light has shown us the parameters of that land: Gen 10:19 And the border of the Canaanites \( \text{klon} ^{3669} \) was from Sidon \( \text{xydn} ^{6721} \), as thou comest to Gerar, unto Gaza \( \text{oze} ^{5804} \); as thou goest, unto Sodom, and Gomorrah, and Admah, and Zeboim, even unto Lasha.

3. And again we were shown the promised borders: Gen 15:18 In the same day the LORD \( \text{yeue} ^{3068} \) made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt \( \text{yrr} ^{5104} \) unto the great river \( \text{yrr} ^{5104} \), the river Euphrates \( \text{yrr} ^{5104} \).
4. We've seen Gaza "גزة" is at the southern extremity: Jos 15:47 Ashdod with her towns and her villages, Gaza "גزة" with her towns and her villages, unto the river of Egypt "ברעם", and the great sea, and the border.

5. We've also seen גַּזָּה is in the north: Jer 46:6 Let not the swift flee away, nor the mighty man escape; they shall stumble, and fall toward the north by the river Euphrates "ברעם", and the great sea, and the border.

6. In Deu 11:24, Jos 1:4, and Exo 23:31 we've witnessed פּוּפִית re-commit to the promised borders from Gen 15:18 and 17:8, and in Num 13:21 we see the parameters the spies searched out: So they went up, and searched the land from the wilderness of Zin unto Rehob, as men come to Hamath.

7. In Deu 1:7 we saw where they were directed to go: Turn you, and take your journey, and go to the mount of the Amorites, and unto all the places nigh thereunto, in the plain, in the hills, and in the vale, and in the south, and by the sea side, to the land of the Canaanites הָמוֹן, and unto Lebanon, unto the great river "ברעם", the river Euphrates "ברעם", and the border thereof.

8. We saw לְדָנַן and מַיָּה continually associated with the northern border: Jos 13:5 And the land of the Gibeonites, and all Lebanon, toward the sunrising, from Baalgad under mount Hermon unto the entering into Hamath. And also, Num 34:7-9: And this shall be your north border: from the great sea ye shall point out for you mount Hor: From mount Hor ye shall point out your border unto the entrance of Hamath; and the goings forth of the border shall be to Zedad: And the border shall go on to Ziphron, and the goings out of it shall be at Hazarenan: this shall be your north border. And again, Jos 1:4 From the wilderness and this Lebanon even unto the great river, the river Euphrates "ברעם", all the land of the Hittites, and unto the great sea toward the going down of the sun, shall be your coast.

9. We saw נַחֲלָה defeat נַחֲלָה 1909/1928 when recovering his border at יְרֵמָה: 1Ch 18:3 And David smote Hadarezer Hadadezer king of Zobah unto Hamath, as he went to establish his dominion by the river Euphrates "ברעם".

10. We saw that רְבֶל was listed as the third marker heading south on לְדָנַן east border: Num 34:11 And the coast shall go down from Shepham to Riblah, on the east side of Ain; and the border shall descend, and shall reach unto the side of the sea of Chinnereth eastward:

11. We saw that רְבֶל was in לְדָנַן 2Ki 23:33 And Pharaohnechoh put him in bands at Riblah in the land of Hamath. And, 2Ki 25:21 And the king of Babylon smote them, and slew them at Riblah in the land of Hamath. Furthermore, we’ve witnessed both the king of מֶלֶךְ בֵּית אָבִית and of מֶלֶךְ בֵּית אָבִית take control of the יְרֵמָה yet sit in judgement at רְבֶל: 1Ki 8:65 And at that time Solomon held a feast, and all Israel with him, a great congregation, from the entering in of Hamath unto the river of Egypt "ברעם".

12. We've seen ""םוֹפּוֹר"" directly paralleled to מַיָּה which, again, is south of מֶלֶךְ בֵּית אָבִית (which we are told is Damascus). 1Ki 4:21 And Solomon reigned over all kingdoms from the river "םוֹפּוֹר" unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Egypt מֶלֶךְ בֵּית אָבִית. And the parallel: 1Ki 8:65 And at that time Solomon held a feast, and all Israel with him, a great congregation, from the entering in of Hamath unto the river of Egypt "ברעם".

13. We've seen that מֶלֶךְ בֵּית אָבִית is claimed to be Damascus but cannot be, (as it is neither in Mesopotamia nor on the Euphrates/ברעם), and it is north of רְבֶל and thus north of מַיָּה: Eze 47:17 And the border from the sea shall be Hazarenan, the border of Damascus, and the north northward, and the border of Hamath. And this is the north side. And, Num 34:9-11 And the border shall go on to Ziphron, and the goings out of it shall be at Hazarenan: this shall be your north border. And ye shall point out your east border from Hazarenan to Shepham: And the coast shall go down from Shepham to Riblah.

14. We've seen that to say ""םוֹפּוֹר"" is to say ""ברעם": Jos 24:2 Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood מֶלֶךְ בֵּית אָבִית in old time. 2Sa 10:16 And Hadarezer sent, and brought
out the Syrians \(\text{רָמַה} 758\) that were beyond the river \(\text{רָמַה} 5104\). (\(\text{רָמַה}\) is beyond \(\text{רָמַה}\)). Exo 23:31 And I will set thy bounds from the Red sea \(\text{רָמַה} 3220\) even unto the sea of the Philistines, and from the desert unto the river: \(\text{רָמַה} 5104\). These references to \(\text{רָמַה} 5104\), and others, are easily proven to be \(\text{רָמַה} 6578\).

So, now we’ve seen every possible parallel verse, subtle clue, and outright ironclad statement contained within the OBRY scriptures to help us understand this specific portion of geography of the land given to our father \(\text{לֹא} 185\) and to us. We’ve now seen more than enough scriptural material to come to the conclusion that \(\text{רָמַה} 6578\) is certainly not, and never was, the Euphrates of today.

Yes, it leaves us with a vacuum. So, where is it? Well, it certainly is a good sized river that runs westward to a great western sea. It certainly has three siblings that all sprang from the same source river. Very few situations like that exist today, but I do know of at least one. I also know that most passages alluding to the Redeemer King to come are followed by descriptions of us being brought back to the land in latter times by the working of \(\text{רָמַה} 3068\), not to be confused with the working of Rothschild. I know the land would remain desolate (desolate does not equal desert) for many long years. I know that all the cities, including Jerusalem \(\text{רָמַה} 6726\) would be leveled and no future inhabitant would even be able to tell this great empire was there. I know the surrounding lands and kingdoms will be inhabited by the descendants of Israel and Judah, not because they must war on countries full of peoples (as the imposters are now doing), but because \(\text{רָמַה} 3068\) would, and did, desolate all the lands. He gave the land much time to lay fallow, in ruins, to decompose, and to clear the memory of our failures as a people when we had our Redeemer King put to death.

In slavery we left, in slavery we returned... our memories blank and histories rewritten. Someone has gone to great lengths to hide from us the land promised to us: rivers and harbors altered, dammed, dredged and rerouted. Massive areas of lands are claimed and governed by the revolving pack of wolves in power under the auspices of "protecting our natural beauties" while they pollute anything or place that suits their agenda of acquisition of wealth. While their soldiers and surveyors pushed westward to spy out the remnants of what still remained their publishers followed their academics and archaeologists into the distant lands of Egypt, Palestine, Jordan, Mesopotamia, Lebanon and Syria, claiming to trip over ancient Stella and unearth whole libraries of tablets linking that land to the Bible. The Smithsonian financed western US exploration while buying up or stealing by threat every OBRY artifact unearthed by farmers and developers, (the Smithsonian currently has no records of any such matters). Free Mason and Kabbalist Joseph Smith introduces an alternate history/religion which, to this day, has it’s adherents off the scent of the true meaning of all the American artifacts and archeology they uncover. The ghostly remnants of great cities still cannot be entirely erased from the North American landscape. The regime that has had power in the Land has destroyed more breathtaking architecture than they've built.

At this point, I will digress. Many people have a hard enough time processing the fact that Palestine and the Middle East are incompatible with the Bible, much less to comprehend the Americas' role in world history and the black hole of information surrounding her. I can't offer you the explanations and criticisms of absolutely every source that would run contrary to the Biblical information I've shown you herein, but that's where I was counting on others to dig in. I've seen enough to affirm that all of it is a house of cards.

I'm certainly not presuming to tell you what to believe, but if you believe the witness of the Bible above secular, controlled, often demonstrably altered history I can point the way to understanding the Bible apart from other sources we were taught as historic parallels, but were, in fact, just stories. "Just a story!", clamor the critics. Most of whom haven't spent a full hour in total actually reading the Bible. Just a story? It is THE STORY: the record, the law, the genealogies, the nations, the covenants, the prophecies, the account of \(\text{רָמַה} 3068\) and mankind and the \(\text{וָדַע} 120\), his transgression, his
descendants, the seed-lines, and יָרָאַל 3478, the children of His promise. It is the record and promise of our redemption, our resurrection, and our return to the Land. Maybe Esther is just a story, but the whole of the so called "Old Testament" is our history, geography, language, prophecy, and promises.

The whole truth, is ordained to be told. The enemy is destined to come to naught and light, peace, and love will dominate men once again. This is one ray of that light, but the more rays that are added the greater will be our ability to see. For we know that "the creation waits with eager expectation for the children of God to be revealed" and moreover, "it will come to pass that, in the location where it was said to them, ‘You are not my people,’ they will be called ‘sons of the living God.’"