

September 23, 1951

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Pray. Oh God our Father, we come to thee this afternoon, thanking thee as we begin a new year, for the opportunity of studying thy word. We ask that thou will illumine our minds as we study, That thou will show us thy truth. Help us to understand the meaning, the deep things of Thy Word. Help us to see what is definite here and to stand upon it. Never to be pushed aside from it for any reason, by any cause. And oh our Father, help us not to read into it what is not there, very carefully distinguish what is taught and what is not taught. Lead us in these things and help us to use it for thy glory. In Jesus name. Amen.

Now last year, Dr. Buswell suggested that he and I should hold a panel course together in Eschatology. And in that class, he would deal with New Testament discussions and I would deal with Old Testament discussions and we would take up some of the outstanding features in that field and I found it very stimulating and I learned a good deal that I hadn't known in the material Dr. Buswell presented and I had an opportunity to present some of my ideas and find out if they were true or not. (Laughter) by class) So I found it very worthwhile indeed. And at the end, as the year draws to a close I hated to think of it coming to an end so I suggested to him that we hold another panel course this year. That we do the same thing this year, with a different subject. I think that as far as I am concerned it is a subject in which I have much less knowledge about, than the subject we discussed last year. I think that probably a good many things in this course, that I have worked on in the past; I have been not very much aware of the relationship of this certain material in Hebrew. And I imagine as I bring some of these things, Dr. Buswell will find certain material that he had not connected up with Hebrews before. So I feel that this year, perhaps we have less of background between us than we had last year and of course (2) might have gained more of new insight than we did last year. On the other hand it is a little more of an experiment than last year, because last year we were in a field in which both of us had done a great

deal of work. I did much less work in this field than last year. This is not a course in which we have a set of well worked out lectures with (2½) for you to take over and think about as we give them to you. Nothing of that kind. It is a course in which we get together to study the Word together and to work into it. And to compare insight from different viewpoints. And to see how the spirit of God will lead us as we go forward into the work. Now Dr. Buswell is going to take the New Testament for his field in it and particularly the book of Hebrews and deal with the Greek. Of the book of Hebrews with the teaching and ideas and discussions presented in the Book. But it is not simply a course in Hebrews because the purpose of the course is not to take up the problem of understanding Hebrews. That is a very vital problem, which we could easily have a course in that for a semester of a year which would be very much worthwhile.. So our subject this year, is a little bit aside from that length of (3½) great deal. Our subject/^{this} ~~year~~ is the relation of the ^{HEBREWS TO THE} old Testament. It is specifically the quotation in the book of Hebrews from the old testament. And what is the relationship of the passages referred in the old testament to the discussion in connection with the book of Hebrews. The thing that brought me to this subject was the observation which I have been making over a good number of years not in connection with the book of Hebrews but in connection with other portions of the New Testament, of its relationship to the Old Testament. It is a problem which is quite a burden to quite a lot of people. How does the New Testament quote the Old Testament? We say that every word of God is true. We say we must be very careful in handling the word of God. Yet, the New Testament seems/^{often} to quote the Old Testament in different terminology. than that which was required in the Old Testament study. Very often, the language seems to be quite different and it is quite hard sometimes to see exactly what Old Testament quotation is being presented in the ^{New} Old Testament, and it raises a problem in some peoples minds. A ^{problem} about verbal inspiration

A problem about verbal inspiration. Well that problem we will look into as it in this course in so far as passages in Hebrews but that specific problem is not our main interest. Our main interest is rather the matter of the interruption of the Old Testament in relation in meaning of the New Testament. I saw an article a few years ago that a good friend of mine had written on the Verbal Inspiration of the Scriptures. And he said in it, that the fact the New Testament considers the Old Testament as verbal inspired is proven by the fact that Paul built the whole argument upon the fact that a certain word/^{is} in the singular instead of in the plural in the Old Testament. And then he went on to say that another equally strong evidence of verbal inspiration is found that Christ himself built a whole argument on the fact that certain word in the Hebrew Bible was in the present tense. Now the writer of the article might be excused from that making that statement not from Hebrew . But I am sure anyone here reading that ought to be quite shocked because if he had to give the present tense in the 13th verse, I sure hope that (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) in knowing exactly how to get it. Well now we look into the two instances that that man give and I think they were good examples of the very common way of treating the N. T. interpretation and the Old Test. and it is a method which is after all a common method of the uneducated person dealing with Scripture in general. He picked/^{it as} a series of model. The series of separate sentences. And if it makes no sense, he ignores it and hoot from the lot he picked adverse here and a verse there and he studied these few verses and he studied the exact meaning of these particular in each verse and then he builds up his thinking on these particular words and without relation. As a rule to the context of the verse. It is a series of mathematical statements in (7) You take one of them out by itself and you study the form to see what it is. The method is carried to the extreme I think as far . I was attending a class some years ago in the University of Pennsylvania and a young fellow there had been coming down from a

school in New York to attend the class through the semester and toward the end of the semester he arose once and said, that he thought that we were missing a great deal by not paying attention to the teaching of the ^{Jewish} ~~great~~ rabbi about the meeting of the bridegroom. Now here he said, I will give you an example. And he turned to the book of Ruth and as you know, (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) and it came to pass, or was in the days of the judges a and he says, you read on and what do you find, you find famine, so it was. And he took up another passage ~~and~~ which dealt with some calamity, which began, I forget which passage. And it was in the days of something else another calami. Now the rabbis say, look. Both of these places which begin, and it was in the days of. Both places there was trouble brooding So when you see the phrase, and it was in the days of, it means other troubles are (8 $\frac{1}{2}$) a man presented this gem from the Levitical studies. (Laughter from class) I would include that in the studies of the Jewish rabbi to the Bible you would find occasional very intimate suggestion and there are some very fine insights but they are ~~very~~ varied in a great mass of stuff like this. Taking a word or a phrase and by the accent of it trying to build up truth. It is the same sort of thing of course that people do when they count the number of letters in a word and they spend their time counting the number of letters in words and in sentences and the number of different words and sentences and try to build up the truth of inspiration or something from spending any number of hours on that sort of . It is ~~trying~~ better spent than trying to get down to the meaning of it what is the teaching what does it mean that God is telling us through these words. Well now that is the tendency (9 $\frac{1}{2}$). It is treated as a series of magical words. And say exactly what do these words, ^{mean} just by themselves, paying no attention to context and do all sorts of things which perhaps would never improve English. And many commentators will tell you that that is what the New Testament writers did with the Old Testament. We read in the Old Testament of, we read in Matthew that after the death of Herrod, Joseph and Mary came back In order that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet out of Egypt (10)

Now we say the prophets talk about Israael and about Egypt in the days of old. And there is nothing in the world . But they say, Matthew simply found some words, listed out of context to fit with something in the light of (not plain) (10 $\frac{1}{2}$) A few of the New Testament writers interpret the Old Testament in that way. Do they miss the phrase out of context or do they insurp it in such a way that you find a real part of the Old Testament and see how it it exemplified in the matter with which they are dealing. I have often found cases where a it will say as it says, and then they will quote a phrase and you can't see how the phrase proves it when he's given . At least it seems to me. But in studying the original I have found that exactly the same subject is being discussed there that is being in the New Testament passages. And he is drawing a set up and he is not quoting a word and saying this word says this, therefore but he is reminding us of Old Testament passages which teaches us and he is reminding them of that teaching by quoting a word or phrase or perhaps a but it is a reminder of Old Testament teaching not simply a quotation of a word or a particular letter or particular sound of that particular word or that word taking a part from context (11 3/4). Now I referred to these two incidents which I found in this article and I wrote to the author about it and was very gracious to see that . That the first case was doubtless we are all familiar with the fact that Paul says that , he says not being And therefore the promise is of Christ. seed as of many but seed as of Christ. /Now people say, well its because he used the singular word seed and not the plural seeds, therefore is your verbal inspiration , he builds his argument upon the fact, the word is singular and not plural. Actually you know the word seed is always singlar. It is never used in the plural unless you are meaning seeds of grain. You can say seed and you can go out and plant your seed /you don't plant your seed singular

And a man has a great prosperity (End of H 1)

(Begin H 2) When this man received my letter, he wrote me back a very nice answer and accepted the imphasés of the matter, however he said/^{he thought}that possi bly I shouldn't be too hard on him. His error. He says that he pointed out that some of the and some of the greatest apologies (Very mush static) (2 1/4) And I was amaz adthat some of our great scholars and their writings used verbal inspiration . Then we sho ld have known better. Men whom we revere and honor very highly and it just shows how the best man can simply copy some bodyelse . Even thought about the fact because we certainly knew and would have immediately realized the argument was rather . Well now I found

an occasion when I mention the suggestion that the New Testament is not basing its arguments on the exact wording of . But it is basing its argument upon the context and thoughts

that are expressed in the Old Testament passages. ~~I sometimes found it to be~~ I sometimes found it to be quite

Some quite antagonistic some quite aroused (3 1/2) and it seemed to be so ingrained in thought

The Bible is verby inspired. It is absolutely ~~inspired~~ true , it is absolutely

therefore, if it is verby inspired every word and ev ry accent or every letter must be

important. Therefore it is tremendously important the thing you base your argument on is the words and letter. Letters . It is verby inspired , every word of it is true

The correct way to understand words is ~~to~~ in the light of context and the correct way to see

what a passabe means is to see what the whole passage is talking about and any particular

group of words of context may very definitely show the thought of the whole passage or any

particlar group of words in the context may need to be understood in the light of the context.

Because no group of words in English or any other language is absolutely ~~un-~~ambiguous. It has

to be in the light of context. And so I have found many instances in Pauls writings,

where he quotes Isaiah and it seems to be almost (4 1/2). if you take it as just the word,

but if you find out what Isaiah is talking about you will find out he is talking about exactly

the same thing that Paul was talking about and Paul is . Now that being the case, I have

not studied this in the Christian fashion, I have not been studying the New Testament,

but studying Isaiah and other Ol Testament passages that I have looked up in quotations

and have come to this conclusions in many instances. But if this is the case, it ~~can~~ ^{is} be

expected that it will also be the case in Hebrews. Now Hebrews has more quotations than

almost ~~more~~ any other New Testament book. Hebrews is of course a book which of all

books, links together the Old and New Testament and so it seems to me that in going into

the bo ok of Hebrews we would find a good many points in this question, we would be right

in one direction or the other, therby understanding ~~the~~ ^{of both} Hebrews and the Old Testament

passages which begin to (5 1/2) . ~~So~~ we will look throught the book and get general ideas of

the meaning of Hebrews from Dr. Buswell and with careful examination between/^{he is to give}the particular

problems which he thinks will valuable for us. And we will take up the Old Testament passages

with particular, trying to see exactly what the argument is and what is being done ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ Hebrews

and then to see in what is being done there. And how the, how the two different testaments

are put together. Along toward the latter part of the course, there will be a period of time when I will have to be away. And in that time Dr. Buswell the Old Testament (6 1/2) (Not Plain) And I will hate to have to miss those but ^{perhaps} something like that ~~can~~ to be dealt with the second time than we ^{special problems} particular the / ~~than-we-can~~ . I think for Organisations class we will do the same thing we did last year. That is today we will be glad ~~for you to take it~~ ^{to have you take it} ~~of the five~~ on any one of the five basis you want. (6 3/4) You want to take it as undergraduate as one hour credit, that would mean one hour in class and two hours study and ~~that would be~~ which would be the same as two hours in class and one hour study, so you have very little study to do. Just enough to keep up with us in the discussion in class. That would mean one hour credit. If you want to take it with undergraduate credit with two hours credit that would be two hours in class and four hours of study outside. Or if you would like to take it for one hour graduate credit the two hours in class would represent one hour in class and three hours in class. (Laughter from class). and two hours in class. Or if you want to take it for two hours in graduate credit, it would be two hours in class and six hours outside study. And there is plenty to do when you study. There is all the Greek and Hebrew and you have ^{the Hebrew and} Old Testament passages and then you have commentaries, both on Hebrew ^{and} ~~of~~ Old Testament passages and particular discussions, you can give us the of what you work on and how you spend your time and if you run out of material utilising the time we have on material Dr. Buswell (Laughter from class) Well now I think that is a brief introduction to the general problem we have to face this time, the general subject with which we have to deal is quote. Now, I imagine the next thing is to get an idea of what is this book Hebrews. What is it talking about, who wrote it, what is its purpose. I suppose Paul wrote an inspired book someone else wrote it as not. (Laughter, class) It is to find out what the book is about, what its general problem and what the situation is and then to see how each passage fits in. And then we have find quite a few quotations in the first chapter. Some of which has a very interesting angle. ~~Maybe we should let~~ Maybe we should let Dr. Buswell take over for a little while. Thank you Dr. MacRae, I anticipate the great accusation of learning in my case . And this will be a very profitable course to me. And there are some quotations ^{right} here and I am anxious to get through with my little part of this day and turn at least a part of the time back to you , Dr. MacRae, if possible. I agreed to say a little about authorship background and probable definition. of the Epistle to the Hebrews

My personal training in Hebrews is of the more or less extremely radical type , consequently my own opinion is of the rather extremely conservative type. (Laughter from class.) You read about the man whose wife was drown in the river and the searching party went and searched down the stream for her, but he said, you didn't know my wife. (Laughter from class)..

I had the book of the Hebrews in the summer of 1917 in Chicago under Goodspeed. I had just got away from the University of Minnesota and had four years of Greek, but it was pretty thinly diluted. The Greek, I found out when I got to graduate school, though I had worked hard enough I took the beginning Hebrew, Rapid Reading Greek and the Epistle to the Hebrews. All at once and the Rapid reading Greek, we read ten pages a day, right through the hot ^{weather} ~~days~~ of the summer. But I still found some time to put on the Epistle to the Hebrews, I really did ^{10 1/2} read ~~this~~ / Bisbies Bibleography and some things on the other side. First I'll give you the radical view which ~~could be~~ ^{GOODSPEED REPRESENTS} 10 1/2 . Now when I say the radical view, of course the liberal are all divided up among themselves and there is no one view but ^{GOODSPEED} ~~Gispies~~ view will illustrate the view of the radical. ^{GOODSPEED} ~~Gispie~~ was a big coward. I don't mean to class him with some of the radicals. He was reverent and respectful toward historical doctrines I sometime get to feel that he himself ~~and his doctrines~~ in his heart was a believer. Possibly he was. He was a careful meticulous scholar. And among other things he was very patient. with preference to beginning student . All my life I have always rushed in where angels feared to tread. I belong to that class of people. And I argued and argued and argued and I argued some more. Gispie was very polite. I don't see how we got through the summer without exhausting his patience but I got an A in his course. and that proves that his patience wasn't quite exhausted. This means of course that the Epistle to the Hebrews had a considerable amount of ~~both~~ Old Testament background. But he was very positive that it was written to the church at Rome, Not to any group of Hebrews particularly, He argued that in the church at Rome there was a sufficient background by the reign of Domician in the 90's so that these off-hand illusions, these quick passing references of Old Testament passages could always have been readily absorbed ~~by~~ / this more or less Gentile church written to Rome. I could never quite get it through my head why he was so positive it ~~was~~ written to Rome but he used to insist on it from all possible angles so naturally I came to the conclusions that it was written to the Hebrews and to the church

at Jerusalem, not to the church at Rome. As to the authorship, of course the conservative and the liberals are in great doubt about the authorship. He simply says nobody knows who wrote it. It might have been written by Pricillas. On that thought it could have been written by Aquilla. ^{Harmon} thought it might have been written by Pricilla until he found some aspects of that would indicate a womans writting. But ^{Goodspeed} Giespie didn't make anything of that. ~~It / / / / /~~ Didn't think there was any ~~thing~~ way to come to a conclusion but he thought it was addressed to the church at Rome. He finally found a very interesting coincidence in the sixth chapter and in the conclusion of the fifth chapter rather when by reason of time he ought to be teachers to have need of someone to teach you. He thought that in the ninth/ties the church of Rome would be regarded as an old established church. And he thought that here that the author to the epistle to the Hebrews was approaching the church of Rome because he did not take a shepherding attitude toward the other churches and so that possibly the prestige of the Roman church was advanced by this epistle to the Hebrews but of course Church History won't go on the Bishop of Rome gained more and more power and finally claimed to be the (End of H 2) (Begin H 3) put these together Here you have in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Y who ought to be teachers and then presently you have first clement and then addressed to the church at Corinth. And I know how we used to back and forth around it now here it is a wide open door and why shouldn't we walk into it. Here is an admonition to a church to teach and the next thing you know Clements from Rome is writing a letter to the church of Corinth of which Clements sounds his church to take up the letters which Paul has written to them and Clements proceeds to give them good and Christian advice So written to Rome in the ^{reign} ~~dominican~~ of Domincian he identified the persecutions ^{referred} ~~identified~~ to here in such a way as to make that a case for the time of Domincian. The Epistle to the Hebrews, stimulating the church of Rome to take its leadership and finally stimulating Phonus to write his epistle to the church of Corinth. Peter wrote such a beautiful little sequence there that he was very fond of out that which he thought was a course of events. As to the exegisis of the book that is the main message of the book, ^{Goodspeed} Giespie had very little respect for it although since the 1 1/2 he was a careful scholar and he tried to be fair as he could with his viewpoints. He had exactly the opinion of the author to the epistle to The Hebrews which Dr. MacRae has reflected and he ^{thought} ~~fought~~ the author ^{was} with such a one as the Jewish rabbi frequently were.

He regarded the Epistle to the Hebrews as the type of Alexanderism, a type of fine spun allegorical interpretations. He put it all on that rather superficial thesis. I don't mean to picture him as a scoffer but in his very methodical meticulous manner he would go on try to show how superficial were the interpretations which the author of Hebrews sets forth. Well I remember I wrote my term paper on Alexanderism and the Epistle to the Hebrews and I took that the the opposite point of view. I said this is not even an argument. It is an appassing appeal. These illustrations which are supposed to be merely superficial allegorisms are not arguments, they are illustrations, they are something to move the hearts of men. It should be regarded as an [?] appassionate field. And I think it registered a little bit because he and Burton were very close together and a little later I heard Burton use those words. Not an [?] argument but an appassionate field. Now how that came about no body knows. In the illustration in seeds and seed of course he referred to hthat in discussing the epistle to the Hebrews. Seeing what identical argument that is. A Collecti ve noun and then he argues on the basis of the noun. Well I said, that is not an argument. It is an illustration It is a neumonic device. The fact that it stands in a singular form helps yuou to remember that ~~the action~~ ^{it actually is} is fullfilled in one of Abrahams seed. And I heard Burton use that same phrase. I can feature how teachers do sometime sit down and joke about what the students are saying. Anyway I had that satisfaction to hear my own argument reflected back to Burton. Yet Burton ^{4 1/2} We often rail against the liberals. ^{mire} were great scholars, I'd ~~advise~~ ^{advise} them ~~greatly~~ ^{greatly} tremendously for their bredth and their ~~chance~~ ^{attempt of} of fairness and they were very humble men They were the kind of men who were big enough not to even listen to a students arguments and that takes a considerable amount of br ^{older} for/men such as they were at that time. The, as I say, I wrote my term paper to show that were illustrations, these were literal allusions using that as a technique for terms I mean not literally but they are illuminating Up there in New York we had the American Scientific Affiliation, I wish you could have been there And one of the speakers in Psychology brought out some parallels from this to that and someone else jumped up and tried to ear him to pieces and said your argument isn 't sound and his answer was, "What I said isn't either true or false, its illuminating. It is simply a drawing of a paralled and if you don't see any analogy within the argument, it doesn't prove that A is B or that C is D but throw slight on the situation. In illuminating illustration is not exactly the same as a sojestic argument. ^{SYLLOGISTIC} But there are of course arguments in the

epistle to the Hebrews but it is a very impassioned illuminated ⁶ setting forth of Christ as fulfillment of Old Testament ritual in such a way that now the (6) died and risen again the figures are left empty. The Old Testament is ^{PROPHETIC} ritual is missing in increpacy and now these people should turn back to Judiasm and from the knowledge of Christ. They would be turning back to an empty shell. So much said for ^{Goodread is} Caspary's view. liberal view regarding it as a highly sophisticated reventicale argument addressed to the church at Rome ~~with~~ stirring them up to take the place of leadership and causing Clements finally to write a letter to Corinth and causing Rome to step out and claim a place of leadership. On the other hand during that summer I have looked into a good many commentaries since I rather convince myself that this was written by Paul to Jerusalem. Now don't go out and quote me on that but some of the very best fundamentalists think that if you think Paul wrote Hebrews you ~~are~~ just are an ignoramous. I did one time years ago at the Canadian kezie venture a thought that Paul might have written Hebrews. I heard two Bible teachers arguing outside my window. They were arguing ^{ones} which/could put me down as a wor He says (73/4) Like Cambell Morgan says, Noone believes it anymore. It settled it, So the argument against Paul in is very strong entrenched in the minds of conservative and liberal as well. For anyone to say Paul wrote Hebrews is to put a tag on him. I don't think I have any right to wear. Dr. MacRae has suggested any argument for the Pauline authorship should not be based on ^{A PRIORI} authority consideration. Now I wouldn't get into any argument myself, I don't know where Dr. MacRae stands on the thought of apostolicity. But to me apostolicity is not one of the great criteria of inspiration of scriptures. ~~Maybe~~ ^{RE A HERITIC IN THAT} I may ~~heard enough to~~ ^{RE} guard but I stand ready to be corrected. This surely sets forth Apostolic thought and it is in harmony with apostolic teaching. You have to bring in Luke you see under Pauls mantel/and then you have to get in the author to the ^{epist} ~~book~~ of Hebrews/somewhat or other but those who put great weight upon that apostolicity can still get the author to the Hebrews covered up the same way you get Luke and Mark and therefore even if you put great weight to that argument of apostolicity, still you don't need to claim to Pauline authorship on that ground. ^{A PRIORI} ~~8 1/2~~ ic grounds should not come in our decision and object of matter. The question of the authorship of a book is a tangible question. It is in the visible world, It is evident or it isn't evident. And in the case of the epistle to the Hebrews there is not very much evidence. At least whatever judges we come to must be based upon tangibel data. On the argument against Paul and authorship as I understand it comes under two headings One is

literary style and the other is the condition in which the author puts himself in the beginning of the second chapter. As to literary style I feel that we have a full and adequate answer. There is no strong contrast of usage between Paul and Hebrews. Some have tried to show that there were ~~faces~~ ^{forms} used in a different way. But it is thoroughly within the Pauline usage so far as I can see. Now I'll try to go through with that argument. It isn't as though you had one man speaking in one dialect and another in another dialect. For one man with entirely a different set of forms is perfectly obvious that Paul had the Rabbinical vocabulary that is ^{TO SAY} (11) he knew and understood the method of the Rabbinical teaching of his time. He was ^{Gamaliel} (11) But it is obvious that Paul had it ~~in~~ ^{within} his reach to deal with even artificial arguments. If that is what you take these to be, which I certainly do not take them to be. But it is equally possible that Paul could deal in that vocabulary in a different way, in an illustrative way. So the question is finished college style for Paul who was rugged and sometimes not polished in his method of writing. But it is said by those who go into deep matters of detail, that the 13th chapter of Corinthians is in the same literary style as the epistle to the Hebrews. It is finished and polished and yet Paul wrote it. ~~Paul~~ Paul was a traveler, Paul was an ~~active~~ active missionary. And Paul could pace up and down a room and ~~pour~~ pour out his heart and dash off a letter to the churches in Galatia just before he started to Jerusalem for the council of the 15th chapter of Acts and he could say As I said before so I say again, and repeat himself and drive it in and not bother to smooth it out but as clear positive, gives a message as white hot sparks drop off from the ends of controversy I don't remember what commentary I got that phrase from but its a good one. (Laughter from class) It ^{is not} ~~with me~~ ⁽¹³⁾ but for / ation. But I picture Paul writing the epistle to the Hebrews in his own apartment in Rome with a little leisure and time to refresh and time to look things up and draw up a more rounded type of expression. Just the kind of thing I should expect Paul to write. It is on Rome by the way of the little phrase on the end. They ~~of~~ of Italy salute you. Which ordinarily means the people live in Italy. So it would come from Rome. They of Italy salute you At least he had some data from the (13 3/4) showing that they are of a certain place. Sometimes means a group of people living in another place who come from the former place. I think a notation a letter written from Alexandria That if there was any

group of Italians living in Alexandria ~~1777/78~~ they of Italy who live in Alexandria with etc. and etc. So Guespie has this written somewhere away from Italy so he claims to include a greeting of they of Italy. They of Italy salute you. We are to figure out every little group of Italian people they were in the background is very plain. But to take it ~~w/ll~~ as written from Rome during Pauls first Roman imprisonment when he had time to reflex ~~when~~ Luke was polishing up his Gospel. (End of H 3) Begin H-4 The question of the literary

style. How a still sharp magenit is based on the second chapter. On this account it is necessary for us to give the more earnest heed to the things we have heard lest at anytime we ~~drift past~~ ~~we~~ ~~passed~~. For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just punishment of reward, How shall we escape if we ngglecting so reat salvation which began to be spoken by the Lord and was confirmed unto us remus? first person plural, was confirmed unto us by those who heard him. by bearing witness ~~by~~ with signs etc.

Now the argument is that the author of Galatians who claims do do penance from the Jerusalem group . But others said that this is confirmed at once by a man that heard him. If judgment has force and ~~has been~~ should be duly weighed but I feel that if you read the ~~nations~~ ^{Machen's} origin of Paul's religion you will be convinced as I certainly am, but as Paul did not derive his Gospel the meaning of all these facts from any Jerusalem ~~by~~ crowd.

But the holy spirit of God bore them in upon his consciousness as soon as he realized that ^{In 000's was Kupios} (Greek) (1 1/2) I am Jesus whom thou persecutest a voice from the glory and he answered ;

Lord what wilt thou have me to do? ^{As soon as} ~~It is only~~, He got that through his head ^{then} ~~and~~ he began, ^{ARABIAN} ~~and~~ he accepted the Lord & the holy spirit in his own studies in ^{Damascus} ~~First Damascus-Arabia~~ ^{then} ~~and~~ ^{& back to Damascus again,}

so that the content of the gospel, the message that he preached didn't come from anybody in Jerusalem but as to facts and evidence and narrative, he ~~had~~ seen Christians die and ~~had~~ heard their testimony. He was present at the martyring ^{Donny} of Steven. He lived 'n Jerusalem

It is thought that he may have heard Jesus preach when he was a student. It is very possible that ~~he~~ ^{if} had. You can't be crude but as to the content of facts, in speaking of it from that point of view, Paul very well might readily say it was confirmed unto us ^{BY THOSE} ~~by~~ who heard Him

You can see that there is a difficulty there. Paul in Galatians is writing from a point of view of his apostleship. My apostleship is not derived from an ecclestical set of potentates. And so his gospel is not derived from Jerusalem but here hhe word began to be spoken by the Lord and it was confirmed ^{UN} ~~then~~ to all of us by those who heard Him. (3)

So I feel that here you have no argument against Paulian authorship. ^{THAT} There is no ^{con} ^{How} conclusive argument. Why did he not begin ^{Παυλος αυτοτολος} (Greek words) ^{3 1/2} As he does everywhere else. Always Paul and apostle and always ^{con} including some usage of the word Grace.

Well there again you have an answer that he was the apostle to the Gentiles. And in writing this treatise for the Hebrews, he wish to emain ~~un~~announced. or at least he isn't anomonious because he writes familiarly Timothy is going to be released and ~~the~~ But he does not call himself an apostle because he was the apostle to the Gentiles. Now as to whether it is written from someplace else outside of Rome to Rome in the reign of Domician or written from Rome to a distinctive Jewish community, probably to Jerusalem those are choices of view. If Paul wrote it all right, ^{so on} if Paul didn't write it all right. I personally and very privately and without stirring up any war over this question, having gone through the arguments on the other side, I still think you could make that a case for Paul, but I don't like to say that until I have plenty of ^{time} reasons to explain my reasons why. If you ssay I said he is under speed and believe that Paul wrote it, that still might show that it is just a cass of stubbornness. But that doesn't matter whether Paul wrote it or not, to me I think that he may have written it. One thing seems to me

very clear. It was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Christ, if he were on earth ^ω could not be a priest. ^{οὐτων των προσφεροντων κατα πνευμον} (Greek words) ^{5 1/2}. There being those who offer gifts according to ^{the} law. I'll never forget ^{how Roadspeed took that} he was a perfect gentleman and he used to walk back and forth and he would go and set down over on one side and then he would go and set over on the other side. and he would rub his chin and he would think, Why Mr. Buswell, that is only a little phrase, only a participial phrase. And he would set down and ~~cross~~ ^{But} his legs, ~~Why~~ after all ~~that~~ ^{are} these little things, ~~was~~ significant (Class laughter) and then he would stand a little bit of a participial phrase which says, There being those who offer gifts according to the law. Well ^{how are you going} I'm not going to crawl out of that? And as we have an alter where ^{as} they have no right to eat who serve the present tabernacle. But he said it is the tabernacle, ⁺ not the temple and that is true. It is the tabernacle all the way throught. But they who serve the present tabernacel, have offered gifts according to the law rather obviously mean the Jewish temple in the first century A.D.

at least. (Response from member of class) ^{Dr. Buswell!} ~~1/1/7/7/7/7~~ Huh? (Answer from class member)
 Dr. Buswell: "Oh brother, i wish I could remember all these references." Class member: "1319."

Dr. Buswell: Godd for you! Here is a man to have. I never could keep up with the references. ~~They~~ are all here. You'll find it all very readily I'm sure. There being those who offer according to the law and then we have ^{an altar} ~~another~~-where they have no right to eat and usurp the present tabernacle. So it must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem. There are several slight allusions to the temple that is going on. The temple service is going on. One of the students who was on good deep side of the argument dragged in the fact that the Jews in Egypt had ~~attempted~~ ^{Elephantane} a temple. ~~Allegante~~ I believe and the ritual going on and that that ritual continued for some time after 70 AD. But Goodsby ruled that out. He said that was true but he could not have reflected that particular stream of thought because this certainly comes from Jewish orthodoxy and he never would have regarded that. The, as a proper temple of God according to the tabernacle law so he ruled out the Egyptian temple that the Jews had there. It was written before the destruction of Jerusalem and this is my last point Dr. MacRae on this heading, It seems to me that very clear that it was written to a Jewish group who in danger of falling back into Judiasm. Now, that being the case the thing which is minimized and said to be obsolete and inadequate and superceded by the better is not the ^{genuine} ~~general~~ religion of the old Testament because the genuine religion of the Old Testament leads straight forward into Christianity but the thing that is ~~said-to-be~~ minimized and said to be obsolete is a turning back to the Old Testament as an empty shell after Christ is come don't you see? So you have here all Old Testament history and then the fulfillment in Christ is by death the resurrection is sending into the glory, having passed through the heavens as the high priest, not of the copy of the tabernacle of the Mount but the high priest of the heavenly tabernacle. The actuality of all this foreshadowed is now fulfilled in the contrast constantly wraps us along is Christ institute is, Christ and Jewish leaders Christ is what it would signify for a group of Jewish people to turn back to their old testament forms and laws away from Christ. So then the great message of the book is to encourage Jewish professing Christians not to turn back into an empty and obsolete type of Judiasm. Now Dr. MacRae, is that that is as much as I prepared for today, Dr. MacRae: Could you tell us a little what the argument of the first chapter was? Dr. Buswell: The argument of the first chapter?

Dr. MacRae: Or the first section of it? Dr. Buswell: Well chapter one, one four presents Christ as the supreme revelation of God. In many portions and in many ways of old, God having spoken to the fathers in the prophets. Now you see there, the Old Testament is the Word of God. He is not brushing it aside. It is God's word to the fathers, by the prophets. At the end of these days, and I think that is significant this writer understands that he is at the end of a period of time, that he lived in a transitional epic that at the end of these days, not merely in these last days, at the end of these days, he has spoken unto us in his signs. Then you have son of God and the prophets of God. There isn't a slightest desire to minimize prophets but only to show how the prophets of God who gave forth the Word of God have led up to the Son. Putting the Old Testament in its true relationship to Christ. Now this is paralleled to what he says about Moses in the third chapter. Just to look ahead and put these together. So this was one of the prophets in that sense of the Word. The relationship between Moses and Christ is relationship between a faithful servant in the house and to [?] ^{12 $\frac{1}{2}$} ^{of the} ~~as~~ a house ^{also the} and ~~as~~ ^{the} builder of ~~the~~ house. So far from setting the prophets and Moses down here on some lower level of revelation I mean to say. They are the faithful servants, who gave the Word of God looking forward to Christ. Oftentimes people read these first parts of Hebrews. Christ is better than Moses, Christ is better than Aaron, Christ is better than Melchizedek and so on. And then they will quote John 1:18 the law was given by Moses. Now Moses you stand over there and you are off on that side. Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ and so we now in the Church have Jesus Christ and those poor people back there well, we'll keep them out of the lake of fire somehow and let them have a kind of eternal life but they are way down on a lower level. The law was given by Moses, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. Contrast. ~~Two~~ two different theologies, to two different religions. ^{CHAFFER ?} Schaffer said to me one time. There was no grace in the Mosaic system. no grace between Moses and Christ ^{that was a dispensation} (~~12 $\frac{1}{2}$~~) ~~system~~ of rigid law. A law was given by Moses, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. Oh I said, then there is no truth in Moses, either. Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. (Class laughter) ^{He didn't quite know} You think right now what to do, so he said nothing. (Class laughter) Now, law was given by Moses, the prophecies were given by ~~Moses~~, the prophets, the Psalms are written by David and other psalmists, the Gospels are written by the evangelists, the Epistles by Paul and others, the apolypse by John but all of Gods grace and all of Gods truth in all these ages, Moses, prophets,

Psalmist, evangelists, apostles, grace and truth for every ¹⁴³ ? , all of it comes thru Christ.

~~What is the relationship between Moses and Christ.~~ ¹⁴⁴ ~~Now~~ ^{if} ~~is~~ a true believer in the Old Testament and is faithful to his Bible and does what the Bible tells him to do, he is living in Christ. But if Christ had come and has fulfilled his ritual and now they turn back from

Christ into Judiasm. (End of H4) (Begin H 5) -As a question of ~~Literary style~~ The first chapter sets forth the glory of Christ. Student: ---legalism and the tradition plus the Old Testament

Dr. Buswell: Well, yes, Now Hebrews doesn't have much to say about the extra biblical legalism

Did you find much in here, Dr. MacRae? There was of course a good deal of adding to the Old Testament but in tradion to the elders and from what is reflected in the Gospels and ^{Christ's} discussion

with them, Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy. Of course hatetthine enemy is not in the Old Testament. and that sort of thing. But, yes it is Judiasm without facts. which regard the Old Testament legialistically. That is warning against. You take just exactly the

analogy as wer have it in the church today Now whatever our denominations, we believe in Christian assembly. We believe in the expounding of the Word. We believe in taking up an offering and carrying on certain work and we believe in baptism and we believe in the Lord's

supper. Now all of those things we believe in as ~~of~~ a vehicle of worship. We don't think we get so many merits by going to church, or serving on a committee or getting baptised or

taking the Lords supper, now a~~t~~ suppose Christ is taken out of the Chruch and then they say, I believe in the Church. Well you have just an empty shell. You have outward form, baptism

form of the Lords supper and assembling together with , there was a name of a (2). But the annalogies is exactly the same. There is no thought in the Hebrews of minimizing the true

religion of the Old Testament as taught by the prophets. But finding out what a terrible thing it would be for this group of people who profess faith in Christ to now turn back to Judiasm

as a religion, without Christ, Yes. Well Dr. MacRae ? Dr. MacRae: Would you like to go on until you come to the first reference? Dr. Buswell: All right, I'll read right down to it.

There are eight characters of Christ, which I think are homelitically very beautiful but they are not directly related to the present study we are doing here, but I'll enumerate them.

Whom he appointed the heir of ev rything. There you have parralel references in Col. all things are made for him. ~~It~~ t/ Second, Through whom he made the worlds or the ages, Christ is the creator, John chapter one, Col. chapter one. Third, who being (Greck word (3 1/2)) He is the

Whom he appointed the heir of ev rything. There you have parralel references in Col. all things are made for him. ~~It~~ t/ Second, Through whom he made the worlds or the ages, Christ is the creator, John chapter one, Col. chapter one. Third, who being (Greck word (3 1/2)) He is the

brilliance of the Glory of God. You take a concordance study of the word Glory of the Gospel
 John sometime, and it will be very illuminating. Christ is/very brilliance of the glory of
 God ^{Kai Χαρακτης τῆς ὁμοιωσεως} fourth: (Greek words) $3\frac{1}{2}$ And the exact likeness of his substance. This is where
 we get our catholicism definition. There are three persons in the god head, the Father, the
 Son and the Holy Ghost, These three persons are one god, the same in substance ^{Χαρακτης τῆς ὁμοιωσεως} (Greek words)
 equal in power and glory. Fifth: Upholding everything by his powerful words. The word Christ
 is the word of God. You see, he spake and it was done. and he commanded and it stood forth.
 Upholding everything by his powerful word. When he had made a cleansing of sins. There of
 course you have the full word of justification and sanctification. He sat down at the right
 hand. Now there is your first allusion.. And that is quoted more fully in the balance of the
 chapter. Having proved to be, Now this is Goodsbys translation, anonymous, having proved
 to be as much better than the angels as His name, by his lot is better than theirs. Now I
 remember how very well how Goodsbys remarked on that word ^{γενομενος} ~~Anonymous~~. Still taking the
 author of the epistle to the Hebrews is a very dry superficial technical, ^{rabbinical} ~~reverential exegesis~~
 He said, this person the god of Jesus is turned to absolute deity. There can be no doubt of
 it. In fact some of these are ^{Goodsbys} ~~Goodsbys~~ words, he says, for the end he fairly screams at you
 Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday today and for ever. ^{having him} Imagine speaking, that is fairly
 screaming at you. ^{as though it were} ~~There is ever~~ a technical superficial interpretation. I kept my shirt on
 and then he came to this. He said, Now it is ^{it} ~~clear~~ clear that whereas ^{γροναλ may mean its become} ($5\frac{1}{2}$) it has variety
 of meaning there frequently it seems a thing proves to be what it is through testing and this
 writer, ^{Goodsbys always} ~~Goodsbys~~ used to stop and say, now I am not a preacher, I am an interpreter of literature.
 That was his ^{opinion} ~~phrase~~, I am an interpreter of literature, and as an interpreter of literature,
 it was his ~~opinion~~ opinion that this writer intended us to read having proved to be as much better than
 the angels. Well, I just about shouted Hallejua. That's right. ^{γενομενος} It proved to be in all these
 testings it isn't that he was promoted like ^{Jesus} ~~Ictus~~ and nocyrus for all their sufferings, were
 promoted ^{and made} ~~in~~ gods, No! he was proved to be ^{in the days of his flesh} $6\frac{1}{2}$ what he eventually is. As much better than
 the angels as his inherited name is better ^{than theirs} ~~than~~. Which of the angles said he at any time
 thou are my ~~debt~~. My son, art thou today have I generated thee and again I will be to him a
 father and I will be to him a son. And he again brings us to the firstborn into the world that
 all of the angels of God worship him. Now I'm getting on back to, (Dr. MacRae: What about

that today have I generated thee. Dr. Buswell: (Greek words) --(?) Yes, (Greek) that this I take from (Greek) γεναω to well the word beget doesn't mean anything in English, does it? To generate is the literal meaning, You mean ~~that word~~ ^{the application} (Greek) Yes, Well now I am getting on new territory. alright, I'll stick my neck out. Dr. MacRae, knows more about these references. In the second Psalm you have ^{of} the picture which ~~are~~ the coronation of the King. He is a full grown man He is a child of God and as the king receives his crown, God proclaims, Thou art my son. This day have I ~~th~~ generated thee. Now there he stands, a fullgrown man becoming king in a public way. This is applied in the 13th chapter of Acts to the resurrection of Christ. And here I think it is in the mind of the writer, connected with his second coming because he presently reduced the thought of the second coming when he again brings first born into the world. At any rate it is connected with his glorification. And so I understand this to mean that as in the second Psalm, the Lord proclaims the sonship of the king in a special way on the day of his coronation so God the father proclaims these, the sonship of Christ in a special way in his glorification. Now take the catacism definition of his glorification, He is rising again from the dead, ascending into heaven sitting at the right hand of the father, coming again to judge the quick and the dead at the last days. So that is my understanding of it. It could not be a time reference to the literal generation of the son. and he would not be the eternal son of God and in the Psalm and in the setting there ~~th~~ ~~it~~ it isn't that ~~that~~ is the time when this man begins to be a son of god, but it is a time when he is publicaly proclaimed. And those words would be perfectly natural in the coronation of the king who of course is a child of God all the time but is proclaimed now and so in the resurrection and glorification of Christ, these words would be a very appropriate application. Student: as to the conditions that would pop up today as far as the son of god being incarnate? Dr. Buswell: I can't see any possibiltiy of referring into the virgin birth. In this context. To which of the angles did he ever say, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee, Of course I have a rather radical idea there. But I won't set up a red flag about my radical ideas, but I do not think that Christ is ever called son of God because of the virgin birth. He is the eternal son of God. There is one passage which seems to be an exception. Therefore that which shall be born of thee shall be called holy (ageon, neuter), then ^{εγιον} ~~then~~ ^{follows} ~~then~~ ^{Si. Deo} (Greek words) 10 1/2 which is masculine. Because of the miracle and the miraculous guarding of the mother of Christ. That which shall be born of

thee shall be called holy. He is the son of God and that is the only passage ~~of~~ ^{relationships} you can call
 bibleical all the others seem to be clearly referred to as his eternal ~~licenship~~ ^{relationships}. He never
 became the son of God. In any ~~ontological~~ ^{ontological} sense. He asways is the son of God. In the first
 chapter of our book, Behold him. ~~at~~ ^{at} the end I have a long footnote in fine print, for I took
 account of all the cases ~~with~~ ^{in which} with the root ~~gin~~ ^{yeu, yevea or yeveaw, or any form of begetting} (greek words $\lambda\lambda\frac{1}{2}$) or being born for that
 matter. Christ is called the first begotten from the dead in an obvious metaphor ~~he~~ is the
 first one to arise from the dead in immortal form and he is called the first born and he has
 the right to ~~$\lambda\lambda\frac{1}{2}$~~ ^{primogeniture} always. In ~~morgenie~~ ^{morgenie}, I think the word ~~is~~ ^{the thought of origin} completely lost and all that
 you have left in that word is unique ~~inventions~~ ^{of precious}. And so this doctrine of origin of eternal
 generation, ~~to me~~ ^{of the son} is just out. Student: — the identity of the eternal son of god having
 come into the world for a specific purpose. Dr. Buswell: He is begotten of the Holy Ghost
 and he is never called the son of the holy ghost. The holy ghost is never called the father
 of Jesus. Do you see what I mean? Student: Dr. Buswell: I guess I don't get your point.
 Do you get it Dr. MacRae? This day have I begotten thee. when he is a fullgrown man in the Son
 would ~~be~~ ^{mean}, would not mean any literal ~~anothological~~ ^{ontological} beginning but a proclamation of the relationship.
 That is the way I understand it. Student---. Dr. Buswell: A men. (Laughter)
 Dr. MacRae; As Dr. Buswell has pointed out, the author of the book is trying to show the
 superiority of Christ. Not the superiority of Christ in the future as compared to something
 that has been in the past, but ~~as~~ ^{the} superiority of Christ who in and through all things and who
 was present in the past but is not made manifest in special ways. The book ~~again~~ ^{begins} with, the
 goes right back to the Old Testament. You notice in the very first verse. He is basing his
 arg ment upon the Old Testaemtn so God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in
 time past unto the fathe s by the prophets tying it right up. God as the author of the Old
 Testament. God has given us these teachings. God who has now gone a ~~step~~ ^{step} further in his
 revela ion. He has in these last days spoken by his Son and then he goes on to show how the
 Son is superior to all of these other elements. These others which were expression of him
 which were made for his revelation. Which were forrunners, preparing for him. But to go back
 to that which is inferior. Not to that which is wrong, but that which is becomes wrong if it
 is attempt to usurp the finite place, to take the place which it shouldn't have. And so
 he gives us as he ~~pointed out~~ ^{pointed out} in this second verse, this wonderful list of statement of

and so he gives us as he pointed out in this second verse this wonderful list of statements of the greatness and glory of the son of God, but then he goes on to specifically to the argument about angels. And that takes us to the end of chapter two. The fact that Christ is superior to the angels. But the thing which doesn't seem to particularly important perhaps today. Because angels today are considered by the modernistic world as something that belongs to superstition of one medieval idea and we conservatives are so rightly occupied with the very central thing of the scripture that we don't bother with ~~the~~ ^{much about} defending the angels. We always forget them and so angels are pretty much forgotten today. But the Bible teaches us the reality of the angels. Teaches us that they are real and that they are important that they are powerful. That they are God's messengers. For us the thing today is to remind and to convince us of the fact that the angels really do exist. And consequently the argument in chapters one and two here is in the main as far as we are concerned simply as historical argument. Shadowboxing as far as we are concerned because it is not a problem today.

(Eng of H - 5) (Beginning H-6) it reminds me there of a real phase of it. Now in ^{our} Protestant world these two chapters are largely ~~of~~ ~~of~~ ~~of~~ ~~of~~ ~~of~~ of historical value. But it is true that we have a large Roman Catholic church in this country, and we have other countries in which it is much larger than it is here. And I imagine that the saint worship would be in the same level ^{with angel} ~~as~~ the ~~saint~~ worship, as far as this chapter is concerned. They are taking the lesser and putting it in the position of the greater. They are making an els and saints mediators they are praying to them. They are putting them in a position in which they do not deserve and one of the most important things in dealing with a Roman Catholic is not to show that the angels are not ^{great} or that the saints were not great people but to show that Christ was far greater. And that is what he is doing here. He is not running down the angels in anyway but, yes, Dr. Buswell: The Greek Orthodox says here that [?] library schools, very highly in demand came to a faculty position on our faculty. We asked them about his theory and the angels. well he said we should ask Mary to pray for them. but he ^{Columbia} graduate (1 1/2) ^{are} a teacher, ^{MacLean} yes, Greek orthodox, ^{MacLean} yes, (Class laughter) And so these two chapters then would have a very great relevance then in our dealing with the Roman Catholic church and the Greek Orthodox church. And with various other groups and probably some of ~~the~~ our modern cults also there would be a relationship. How about ^{Mormons perhaps} modernism? Dr. Buswell: I would say

Shintoism , the emperor right in there with the penalty of the virgin Mary and all that.

in the position

Dr. MacRae: Yes, so any Morman that puts the creature/with the creator would ~~be~~ drive us back to a careful study of these two chapters. in which he is stressing the superiority of Christ to the angels or to/anything which god had created at all. and so he he introduces it in verse four that Christ is so much better than the angels and he is by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. i think that' that if lyou ask the average reader what does this kmean that he is by inheritance obtained a moe excellent name than they, i doubt if he would have much idea of what it really would kmean. dont you think that what it means is refering to what is said of christ in the scriptures that He is put on a highter position than the angels. That he is given these titles in verse three which do not apply to the angels. He has given hese statements in the Old Testament which he quotes. As to say thatthe first four is the key verse wf what follows and what follows is the illustration of the examples under the statment in verse four/ Christ has a kmore excellent name . He has greater things said about khim. A anme in the general secne of the descriptive terms used of him and the things said about khim. And then he starts in to enjmerate some of these things that are said about christ. And there immediately you come into the problem of course Will the average person reading the old tesxtament coming to these statments will lhe think that they are talking about Christ at all? Of course the modernist does not think so of course, very definitely. First one he quotes is , as Dr. Buswell has appointed out is ~~nothing~~-- the senond Psalm of ~~which there-is-~~ for of which of the angels did he say at any time sThou aret my son, this day have i begotten thee. and i will be to thee a father and I will be to thee a son. Tkfhe first of them is much less of a problem than the senocnd. The second quotation goes into some very real and interesting problems. But the first we should look at first thou art my son, this day have i begotten thee/ and that of course is quoted from the second Psalms and in studying the Psalms probably one of those in which we have least difficulty with considering it as an messanic song, which is the second Psalm. Our problem comes when we have songs that have statements in them which do not seem applicalbe to Cjrist. And other

statements which are very definitely to Christ and if you know how to draw the line. That is a real problem and in the second Psalm we have no such problem. I should say that probably ~~some~~ Psalms two and one hundred ten were the three which clearly Messianic of any Psalms in the book. They are the three which there could be little difficulty in establishing the fact that is is definitely Christ of whom he is talking/ Now this second Psalm we, the problem not being a great one in this connection we won't spend a great deal of time on the Psalms. This one in which we could spend a great deal of time with much interest in various phases of it and imagine Dr. Harris says so in the portion of the poets. Those here who have had that course. He did spend a good deal of time on this didn't he so that those of you who haven't yet had poets will either have it this year or next year and will have the discussion of the Psalms of a whole with him. Yes?

Student: In relation to the Messianic Psalms, do you hold the same ^{theory} period that Dr. Young holds that it is a portion of the Psalm which is fairly quoted as being Messianic than the , that the probability is that the whole Psalm is Messianic

Dr. MacRae: I don't know as I would call it a theory. I should say that that would be a very natural. now you didn't give us a definite rule on it. You said that if a part of a thing is quoted as Messianic than that is very probably the Psalms as a whole. But I think that it is only logical that if a ~~thing~~- part is quoted as Messianic than it would be a presumption that the whole is Messianic I wouldn't take it as a natural rule but I would say that it creates a definite assumption in that direction and you have to find contrary evidence before you 6 1/2 Well now in this case the song is definitely quoted as Messianic back there in the New Testament but as you read the Psalms there can be little question of it anyway it is one of the three, I'd say one of the clearest I'd say those three are the clearest of all the Psalms as being Messianic. And of course the picture which is given there is a picture of the kings in the earth and the rulers taking council against the Lord and against his messiah. And so we have a picture on a very wise scale. You have a picture with many nations involved. You have a picture of great forces trying to destroy his power but you have God looking upon it with derision. And vexing them in his sore displeasure. Saying,

yet I have set my name on my Holy hill zion. And then you have the king speaking in verse 6 of course is the Lord in heaven speaking and verse 7 is the king speaking. I will declare the decree, the Lord has said unto me Thou art my son, This day have I begotten thee. Well not quite clearly that is something that is ~~said~~ said to a child the day it was born. This day have I begotten thee you don't beget the child on the day he was born you can't speak to him on the day after he begotten. He would have to be a great, long, long time after begetting and after birth and after before you could apply this. The statement makes utter nonsense as applied to a child when it was born. Or begotten in a physical way. It is quite clearly used in a figuratively way and must apply to something else. Thou art my son. This day have I begotten thee. Well you can't speak to someone you have just begotten in a physical way sense but you have begotten him in some sense in which he can now speak of, in this day I have done it. Thou art my son, this day have I evidently put thee in this position This day have I accorded to thee certain position, a certain standing, a certain promise. Now the whole context of this account is clearly not in connection with the creation of the world not connected with the life of Christ at his first coming to the earth. It doesn't seem to have a relation particularly to the resurrection of Christ that is at the resurrection you could tell him what these other events might perceive immediately. But they haven't. There has been a long interval in between. And the uprising of the nations against him which has he is going to destroy will seem to be something that is still future and so is Dr. Buswell suggested this would seem to apply to the bringing of him into the world. a second time. Through the establishing of him through the actuality in the position which he has been principle before the foundation but which he earned specifically by his death on the cross and the destruction of the power of Satan there. Mr. Dorsey? Dorsey: ^{Would} ~~Does~~ this ^{a good example of the place} ~~be identical with the place~~ where the ^{tetragrammaton} ~~second~~ is used to explain the holy ghost the father and the son in verse 7, the Lord has said unto ~~me~~, we have ^{the tetragrammaton} ~~a touch of~~ and then again in verse 11, to serve the Lord with fear for his trying to ~~himself~~ (9 3/4) Dr. MacRae: ^{Yes, that is} ~~the tetragrammaton~~ but not certainly a suggestion a definite suggestion that he is the Lord but not

a proof,

because verse eleven could be referring to God the Father would feel and kiss the son. It could be referring to the two different persons separately. So I wouldn't think you could prove that by this instance here but there is at least a suggestion. And so the verse that is there quoted is here used in a Messianic context in the context of one whom the Lord is putting in a position of supremacy over all the earth of one who is going to dash the nations into pieces like a potter's vessel is going to receive the nations as his inheritance and to rule the uttermost parts of the earth one whom the nations are exhorted to kiss lest he be angry, kiss the son, lest he be angry, that is rather hard for the modern Jew to interpret. Buttenleisure, of the Hebrew Union College has a commentary on the Psalm in which he says this word son here must be an Aramaic word used, used as the word bare, the Aramaic rather than the Hebrew but he says he must mean it rather in the other sense of the ground, kiss the ground. doesn't have any reference to the ground at all. Kiss the ground lest he be angry. It is a very specific reference. The sonship of the Messiah, the deity of Christ. But of course that is not included in our reference in Hebrews there, It is merely quoting this verse and so the important thing to note is that we do not have much problem here because our ~~problem~~ song is quite definitely Messianic. ^{And it is} The Psalm which is used pointing to the glory of Christ and him coming into this position great great, ^{greatest prominence of certainly of no greater intrinsicity than} (11½) ~~and~~ the greatest thing which he has already done, the victory at Calvary and his resurrection. But that which is externally greater that which is more manifest, in the universe is great when he takes over the power which is he then is won unto himself. And so the Lord is saying, of him, thou art my son. This day have I begotten thee. That ~~is~~ statement of course he never makes of any angel, no matter how exalted or or any saint, nor of any one who does a great work for God. He never deserves a statement like this. Though it is a very proper quotation to take from the Old Testament. As the more excellent name that he has obtained and made to take as showing his superiority to the angels and saints and to any created being. Thou art my son. This day have I begotten thee. Then Now the next one is a much greater problem. And again he says I will be to him a father and he shall be to me a son. Now who is he saying

that about? Your reference there is II Samuel 14. When you look at II Samuel 14 you will immediately say, what has that got to do with Christ. You read that it is the promise that Nathan has given to David. And Nathan says in verse 12 when thy day be fulfilled, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers and I will set up thy seed after thee which shall ^{proceed} ~~feed~~ out of thy bowels. And I will establish his kingdom he shall build an house for my name and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father and he shall be my son if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men but my mercy shall not depart away from him as I took it from Saul whom I put away from before thee. And as you read that you can be Solomon the successor of David who built the house for God's name who established the temple who controlled for 40 years over the kingdom with no adversity with no barriers or warriors to fight as David did, who reigned for this long period to the end of his life. Who prayed to God and God offered him a gift and he said I am but a child I don't know how to direct these people, give me wisdom and God gave him wisdom and he said in that very same verse that if ye commit iniquity I will chasten him with the rod of men but my mercy shall not depart from him as I took it from Saul, of course that is exactly what happened. Solomon committed iniquity he went astray from God's will for him and God sent a prophet to tell him he was going to take away two thirds of the kingdom away from his son but for David's sake he was going to leave it in his ~~sons~~ hands as long as he lived. And after his death Rehoboam lost the kingdom and it was given over two thirds to Jeroboam and Rehoboam had only 1 tribe left. And so this exactly fits Solomon but like the writer of Hebrews had to use it of Christ.

End of H-6 Begin H 7 Like Daniel. He had a problem there. This re-
 to Christ. What right does the writer of Hebrews have to quote this word about Christ. And of course we have some historical development there. We have among the Jews, the expectation ^{of} ~~which~~ the Messiah, the expectation of a greater son of David who was to come he had that before the time of Christ they were looking for one looking for a messiah looking for one who would be a son of David and in whom prophecy would be fulfilled. This ^{did not} ~~is~~ simply ~~not~~ grow out of the air

it was developed by the later prophets who comes and goes out of the teachings of the later Old Testament but it was the expectation that there would be a greater son of David. And of course in this promise to David there are ^{other} certain statements which clearly look beyond so b thy house and thy kingdom shall be established before thee. Thy throne shall be established forever. This goes beyond just the immediate time. And of course, we know that the kingdom did continue for 300 years after David's time and then we know that after that it was understood the promise was there and 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ (Coughing in class, could not hear) that it would be reestablished and the root of Jesse would again take root and grow up and that there would be a continuation of the kingdom of . I feel that the interpretation of this passage and the two or three parallels to it which we have should be considered with the connection which Moses made about the great prophet. You remember that when John I tells us that when Jesus was in the wilderness that the representatives of the Pharisees came to him and said who are you and said are ye that prophet and he answered No. What did he mean by that prophet? The, we are expecting that there would be specific prophet who would come. a great prophet , the greatest prophet. It was, He was looked for as one who was certain to come but as you read the passage, where Moses spoke about that prophet, you wouldn't think that he was necessarily going to be one specific prophet In fact the first impression we get from the statement is quite the contrary. It gives you an impression of an continuous line of prophets, rather than one specific prophet. I don't have that one specific prophet, I don't have that reference right here, Class: 18, Thank you, 18, I had it opened right to the page and didn't look at the right side of the page Now the problem there is where are the people going to do after Moses passes from them? He has in Deut. 18, verse 9 he has forbidden them to consult wizards necromancer or or familiar spirits. And after he forbids them to go to these and try to find what they should try to do from diviners etc. he said in verse, As for these the Lord thy God has not suffered thee, so to do, Why? Because the Lord is going to give them their guidance in a different way. The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thy brother ^{like} ~~like~~ unto me

unto him ye shall hearken. According to all that thou desiredst the Lord thy God in Horeb . When they heard the ten commandments given and they said let me not hear agin the voice of the Lord thy God. Neither let me see this great fire anym more that I die not that kthe Lord talked to Moses . He says and the Lord said to me, they have well spoken that which they have spoken I will raise them up a prophet from among their jbrethren like unto me . Now very clearly then the first thing that he is talking about ther e is the fact that Moses was the mediator between ~~whom~~ Gods and the people bringing Gods word and there is to be a continuation of that service. That there is to be another prophet after Moses That there is to be a continuation of prophets and you will find that stressed in verse 20, following, the prophet who ^{shall presume to speak} is-to-speak the word in my name which I have knot commandced him to speak, that prophet he shall die. And you ask, how shall we know the word the Lord has spoken when a kprophet speaks in the ~~name~~ of the Lord, in certain conditions. He is talking to them here about the means by which God is going to lead them in the future and he is discussing the coming of prophets after and yet as you read it, lyou see that in the language there is a singular term used and an impression given that he is knot merely speaking about the succession of the prophets but that this succession is to find its climax in one greatest prophet of all. SOne will be the prophet like unto Moses. God spoke unto ~~the~~ MOses face kto face. Others he sooke to lin visions or dreams. There is to be a succession of prophets and they are to watch and to judge ~~and~~ who are corrupt prophets and false prophets but there is to be one prophet who is to be the great prophet. SHe is to be a prophet like unto Moses. And to use in the ~~time~~ of, like we are looking for what prophet and wondering and asking, is this that prophet? They asked John the Baptis Are you that prophet? No I am knot that prophet. I see here the description of the continuing line of prophets, suggests a climax of one great prophet. And similiarly the ^{promise} ~~clause~~-about David son, talks about Solomon, but then he says that the line, the throne will be established forever , the dominion will continue and the kpromise carried on thru a succession of signs into one individual climatic sign. kNow inneither case is thatkabsolutely clear in the context blut there

there is a parrallel between the two and it was so lintrepret tht later by the Jews and the kNew Testament shows that that is the correct intrepretation of it that both lines are to reach a climax and the great true prophet and the true son and of course are actually the same one and so lhere the author of kHebrews here is quoting this fact, I will be kto him a father and ~~I/will/be~~ shall be to me a kson. It is applied in a figurately sence a/s~~pp~~/ kto Solomon. But it is kapplied very specifically to the one who is the greatest son of David The one who is the climax of ~~6th~~ the line of David. (Student speaks) Yes, that term double reference is a bad one. (Class laughter) Well all terms are bad, all terms are misleading. they are feeble attempts to get at a ie ideas. but double reference is usually applied, means that one thing designates two unrelated matters. SNow very often there are predictions which prescribe a number of things which are related, specifically included together or they describe more particularirly a series of events something that goes forward through a definite sequence. A procey doekn't have to one individual event but it relates to one scene. Ist is one subject. And that one thing may be a series which goes forward and reaches a climax or it may speak in the plural and say, kthere will be teams and so forlth. And there can be a whole series. But when he says there is one king he may be refering to a succession but he wouldn't say there will be a king, mean a king of Israel and a king of Egypt. That would be doouble reference. S SYou have two unrelated or just similêar things represented together in one plrediction. That is what I'll call double reference acnd consider absolutely wrong. (Student speaks; One thing is the fact that the son means king?) No, it is the sons of David. It is a line of succession. SKings who are descendants of David. And this line is to reach a climax. in one great assign just as there is a succession of prophets who mediate God's message to his people and this line reaches his climax in one great (8¹/₂S) It is very diffferent from saying that when he said a virgin will conceive and bring forth a son it would refer to somebody living in that day and also refer to the of Christ. The two would be absolutely unrelated and there would be nothin to tie them together. If he were to mean there was to be a xsuccession of virgin births, one from the start now and there will be z whole series of them, reaching

a climax of the most important. That would be a unit by concept. To say it describes the son of Hezekiah and also describes a future one is absolutely the unrelated and just introduces confusion. (Student: when he says if he commit iniquity I will chasten him with the rod of men? Would you say that is just one aspect or ?) No, he is specifically speaking of Solomon or of others of the line. He is saying that in this line, whenever you find iniquity committed there will be punishment but that is not the reason removal of God's mercy. The line continues and God's blessing continues on the line. To the very end and it reaches its climax in the one who of course doesn't commit iniquity or can't commit iniquity. He is the one who not merely in a figurative sense but in an actual literal sense, God is to him a father and he is God's son. Of course I pointed out and I stressed the fact that it is in the same verse. It says to him I am a father and he is to me a son the same verse if he commit iniquity. Of course as a matter of fact the verses are not in the originity. The point here comes right after. It is together. You have any further comments on this? DR. Buswell: I been thinking of an allergy, suppose somebody would say that the senior professor of committees to Faith Seminary would always be thus and so and when the rapture comes he would be caught up, there would be a single prediction of a line of individuals and only one individual in that line would fulfill the last point. But any number of people over a thousand years could fulfill ~~it~~ any point. Dr. MacRae: Yes. Dr. Buswell: So this is clearly a prediction of a line of people who are descendants of (11) some of whom have sinned. Dr. MacRae: Yes. Dr. Buswell: The type that is in that line and the fact that he doesn't sin, is another fact ~~but~~ ^{to} Dr. MacRae; Yes, I think it is very vital ~~that/when/it~~ ^{to} distinguish when we pose to double fulfillment we don't ~~mean~~ ^{groupings} that just everything is just one individual quote. There may be ~~two things~~ together of predicted events. There will be wars and rumors of war We have one war and that is not the end. We have many but a prediction can include many events or one Its is the related ~~of~~ unified idea it doesn't combine two unrelated things in one prediction. When you do that you reduce it to nonsense. Yes? Student: Do you think that the Hebrew reader here could see Christ in this? Will we have the benefit of his (11½)

Dr. MacRae: I think they did. I think before the time of Christ, they were looking for the son of David who would be the great Messiah. Student: Would you see it in this passage here? Dr. MacRae: I believe so, yes. I don't know whether they could immediately at the time when Nathan wrote it, I don't know whether they would have seen it immediately then but as the years go by they saw it differently then. They didn't ~~then~~ feel it was definitely ended with Solomon but it was the continuing and they thought it would more and more reach a climax/ ~~That~~ in one greatest of all. Student: Then you feel then it was thought then that it was possible then for the Jews maybe to see Christ (12 $\frac{1}{4}$) Dr. MacRae, Oh yes, definitely. If it wasn't then Christ ~~is~~/certainly was unfair. Terribly unfair because he rebuked them on the Emmaus road so sharply He said you fools and slow of heart, to believe all that the prophets have spoken ought not Christ to have suffered these things and entered into his glory. Now if they shouldn't have been able to look at Psalm 22 and see that the crucifixion was there, why it was utterly unfair for him to rebuke them. (Student speaks) Yes, from a child he had known the holy scriptures which are able to make you wise unto salvation. It's there and it should be seen, except that Satan blind our eyes. Or as our own laziness blinds our eyes. Keeps us from seeing things that are there. Yes? Student: Well last year, Dr. Harris mentioned of the Truman? (Loud class laughter) (13 $\frac{1}{2}$) Dⁿ. MacRae: another was of would it not? Student: MSacRae: Zechariah, not Jesus Christ. Student: SDR. Macrae: I think we better read Zechariah. S (Class laughed) Dr. Buswell: Well Ezekiel certainly looked forward with the coming of ^aDavid who would be the Messiah. Dr. MacRae: Yes, very definitely. Prediction (14 $\frac{1}{4}$)0. Well I think the this a is a division point here. This look ahead for a moment briefly. Verse 6, I would suggest whether you are taking this for one hour of undergraduate credit and so I have only one hour study to do for next time or whether you are taking the two hour graduate ~~with~~ ^{I have} /6 hours of studying to do for next time. But in either case, you take verse 7 and verse 6 here and compare the Hebrew with this, compare the text and see exactly how he fits together with the Hebrew and the Greek. What is Paul telling, what is the unknown author of Hebrews ^{quoting from} telling some where he says, let all the angels of God

worship him. Where is the quotation taken from and is the test exactly compare or is it/ there a change in it. Study that problem and you will find an extremely interesting problem there. And then look ahead through the chapter.. Interesting problem there. (End of H 7) Begin H 8 --- Now any of you who don;t have the report in on what work you did for today, be sure and get it in before you leave for I'll need it for our records at the end of the semester. You have up to the other days. We have reached in our discussion of Hebrews one, this six verse. And we are discussing here Chapters one and Two whether Christ is greater than the Angels. or what is his relation to the angels. Is he to be compared to the angels? And we note that the writer of the Book does the only thing which can be done in trying to find an answer to the question of this type. He looks for facts. He looks for data. Now if you want to know what people in the United States think of President Truman , you go to call on different people and you inquire from them and you get opinions from them. As to what they think of him. You could sit in a room by yourself and not listen to the radio or read the newspapers and you have no way of making a proper judgment on the matter. If you want to find out whether it was Leif Erickson or Columbus who discovered America, you will have to look into everything. See what there is that can throw light on it. Now in a case like this, when we want to know what is the relation of Christ to the angels, we are dealing with a situation where human beings know very little about it. Human beings know a very small amount of the glory of Christ and what human beings know about angels is very little indeed. And so there is one way to get evidence on it and that is to go where the facts are. Well now if you could go into the inner courts of the government of the universe, and speak to those in control there, you would very soon get a very clear and exact answer. But none of us has access to those places , we have no means of getting that sort of evidence. There is one sort of evidence we can get on any question we can get like this and that is what are the facts that God has revealed in his Word? And so the writer takes us to the only place where the facts can be obtained. Any questions as such. The only place where such facts are available at all and certainly the only source which any

dependable evidence on such a question could be secured. He takes us ~~and~~ to Gods Word. And he looks for facts in Gods word. Well we cannot be satisfied like simply with saying, weell here is a passage that states it. That settle it. We must examine the passage and see ~~whats~~ if it really does settle it. We must see what they are actually talking of. It is very easy to lprove anything if you are just jgoing to take evidence out of content. If you are jgong to take evidence and intrepret it kany way you want to. When I was in college I went on a debating team once. Which was sent on a tour across the country. And we had a questin we jould debate either side of, positive or knegative. And there was one man on our team who was not a particularly good thinker but was a good orator and so he had the same speech. He was the second speaker. And he would give these great prinbiples and ksome beautiful ~~phrases~~ ^{illustrations} and he was avery ~~removing~~ elequent address only if we were on the affirmitive he would say, STherefore ladies and gentlemen you will see that this hal has to be done and on the negative he would kend up by saying Therefore ladies and gentlemen you see it is utterly limpossible that such a conclusiokn could be reached. (Class laughter). Well the speech was exactly the same for either side. Weell there is a great deal of argument like that. You take the facts and you say, Therefore and if people liek your presentation of facts kthey say lyou must be right. But the question is ~~why~~ how jlo the facts prove it? What is the relation of the fact to it? We want to investigate it and see whether the evidence actually supports the view that is presented. And so in this case, the facts which we have availabe on this question, Of course kHebrews is part of the inspired word and therefore its sstatements all are facts to lus But it is written in the first place to argue kwith people of the at that day and as it came kto them. it presents facts taken from the only place that facts could be seclured from other ~~sources~~ porltions of the Divine Word/ And so we want to look at the facts and see what they are and do they prove this? Well he says in verse s4 that Christ is better than the kangels as he has a mluch more excellent kname than they by inheritance. He says in that which has been handed dwon to lus and perditions and the things, the hinheritance that God has given us in his Word. There is an

name there are statements, there are reputations about Christ which far surpass anything that you will find about any of the angels. And first he says no angel ever had a statement made such as Thou art my son, this day I have begotten thee. Well we notice that this is in the second Psalm. And the second Psalm is very definitely addressed to the messiah and the Messiah rather quotes these statements of God to him, thou art my son this day have I begotten thee and so the Messiah then has a position which no angel anywhere represented as enjoined. And then he quotes from 1 Samuel from the statement which is made about David's son pointing forward to that great son of David, the Christ. I will be to him a father and he will be to me a son. No such statement was ever made about an angel. The third piece of evidence which he gives, he quotes. He says again when he brings in the first begotten into the world. Now that is not the order of the Greek. The Greek seems to be and when he brings in again the first begotten of the world he says: And let all the angels of God worship him. Well not what is your evidence that he says this when he brings in the first begotten of the world and at what bringing into the world does he say it? These are two rather difficult questions. I think perhaps thought the the first one should be examined first. Do you think Dr. Buswell that the position of the 6 1/2) proves anything there? Dr. Buswell: Well yes, I argued with Guesbie on that And he overcame me. Dr. MacRae: He did? Dr. Buswell: directly into the verb and if it were following the rhetorical transition it would have to come first in the sentence. I thought come again when he brings the first born into the world he said. Dr. MacRae: Yes, that is what the authorized version is Dr. Buswell: Yes, Oh I didn't remember that. Well anyway its calling right into the verb it is . KI gave up on it. Dⁿ. MSacRae: Yes, you feel then that the (Greek words) (7 1/2) rather than with the Dr. Buswell: It is quite strained if you have it otherwise. (7 1/2). Dr. MacRae: That is a matter of course of induction and seeing instances when we can one way or the other It might make it quite difficult search to find them. Commentators seem to differ somewhat from us, did you know that? Whether he brings the firstborn again into the world or hears another citation. Now one thing certain in favor with the authorized version rendering is the parallel with the previous.

Wouldn't you think? He gives one reference and then he says again and now he gives a third reference and the same word follows as usual. Dr. Buswell: Yes, Following the same scripture as in verse 5. Dr. MacRae; Yes, undoubtedly and here you are continuing the series. / aren't you? Dr. Buswell: I think That is the way I argued with Guesby, last summer and he said then it would have to be a type of typology. Dr. MacRae: Yes, but evidently the translators of the authorized version did not think so. What about the revised version? The revised version says, and when he begin bringeth ~~the~~ the first born into the world he saith, Of course it affects the thought of it a good deal. It, Dr. Buswell: The Psalm there it refers to the angels at the time of the birth. Dr. MacRae: Yes, and a great many commentators have taken it that way. Dr. Buswell; Well that is very sensible but Guspie ^(9 1/2) friends he will then bring. Dr. MacRae: Yes well if we are to adopt that view, then it cannot refer to incarnation. can it? Dr. B: No. DR. M: How about the resurrection? DR. B: Not here. In Acts 13, oh no that is the (from the end of the if the his argument as being the DR. MacRae: So that you would feel that would definitely represent the coming again., not the incarnation. Dr. Buswell: Yes, this question using with the adverb you know in theology we thought. Dr. MacRae, Yes, it would make a big difference in the interpretation of the word. Dr. Buswell: Yes. Dr. MacRae: Did anyone find anything on the other side of it? Student: (11 1/2) Dr. MacRae: of the second coming. Student: Dr. MacRae: Matthew Henry took the incarnation. Student: (Class laughter) Dr. Buswell: Dr. MacRae: Does anyone have the Latin Vulgate with him? It shouldn't be hard to get it is it/ D^{rr}. Buswell: It is we had to go bookstore and he didn't have any idea. (From 11 1/2 to 12) Dr. MacRae: Well if then the position of the fallen is to lead us to say this refers to the bringing him back to the world. Leading to the second coming. That is a very interesting note isn't it stressed To have the second coming thus stretched--this early in the book of Hebrews. And if that is the case then this--let all the angels worship him should be from some passage dealing with the second coming. Where did you take it from SMr, Student: Well (13) Dr. MacRae, Well that wouldn't make a very good source for evidence would it? It was ical editions put in by the Jews. I don't

see how it could be . That would be like throwing a hint. You were saying
 It might be good evidence as to what people believe in some church or what
 the authors of ^{Hinduism} ~~h/h/s~~ or but it wouldn;t be turth or fale of the gospel. The
 state,emt would be from the Word. Student Another student: It would have
 to be taken from the rather than (14) Dr. ~~Buswell~~ MacRae;; The writer
 of course, as he says, this is proven that would have to be authority abut as lyou
 say it would not be impossible that somebody would say, well now here is the
 viewpoints we have and should give them that home advice. I would think it
 unlikely that there would be an atonement argument in between the strong

I would think it would have to be separate. Right among us/ Supposing that
 I would say, that as proof that the election was going to be in November 1952,
 the next election for the Presidency. ~~There is a book~~ And supposing I were to
 say ~~there is~~ well the constitution says it could be every four years in
 November and then I would say It was held four years ago or three years ago
 and ~~you~~ eleven and so on And now I would say and now I heard someone say
 down the street as I passed by Well, I wonder who will be elected president
 in 1952. Well now this thrid one ouldn;t be evidentd that of the type of the
 other two that are in. SIt would be very strange for me to put it right in the
 middle of it That would give it separately with the other and it wouldnt be
 so bad. (End of H 8) (Begin H 9) So that the idea of this being an h
 argument it does not impress me that it is at all impossible for the author
 of the book to use atonement as an argument. Twice and the apostle perhaps

but I wouldn't expect ti to be right in the middle of a series the scripture
 that wouldn't seem reasonable would it? Dr. Buswell: Well it says when it
 again brings the second book the first part of the word he says so and os
 so I don't think sthat would be a form for as some it would be almost identical
 with Daniel and it seems to be about the and actual time of the Lords returning

Dr. MacRae: Now there istwo questions that Dr. Buswell is taking up. The first
 one I think Dr. Buswell is taking up the more important argument than the one
 I gave. It , I think he agrees it would not be impossible that they might use
 atonemnt argument but the terminology her doen't sound a bit like it. When
 he brings in the at the time of the second coming he says, now he doesn't say

it is popular and suppose the people had, it usually is usually God. He points to it as a definite statement of what is going to happen at the time of the second coming. And that certainly would sound that he has evidence of it. So that would hardly seem to be an statement but a natural scriptural argument. The second point he brings up as to the source of it, there are two suggested sources. Now one of them he says does have a relevant subject matter to the second coming. It would fit with it. Well someone would say, well the other one had all of it. But the sources from which it is supposed to come are two suggested sources. And one of them is Psalm 97 and the other is Deuteronomy 32. Which of these sources is closest to ~~these~~ this here. Mr. Shepard: I think Deuteronomy 97 is because (2 1/4) DR. MacRae: In the Septuagint, well of course this is Greek and Hebrew is different from Greek anyway, so your Greek couldn't be identical ~~with it~~, with the Hebrew anyway. But the Septuagint of Deut. is exactly like this, while the Septuagint of the Psalms is somewhat different. And so that verbatim it fits better with the Septuagint of Deuteronomy than with the Septuagint of the Psalms. Mr. Student: (2 3/4) Dr. MacRae: What did you say, it is identical with it? Not the same form, not the same word. (3 1/2) Dr. M: Oh you mean in the Well up in the up left hand corner is the letter S. Yes. The commentaries mostly say it is identical with the Septuagint in Deuteronomy and you mean with the Alexandria, the Alexandrian manuscript. But manuscript B differs from it so that Student:- Dr. Buswell: in Psalms, (4 1/4) which is the Dr. MacRae, the very end of the verse. DR. B: (4 1/2 to 5) Dr. MacRae: Well you have the angels also there. So the Deuteronomy seems to be a little nearer it, in the Septuagint. But the difficulty ^{is} ~~is~~ there is no Greek corresponding, no Hebrew corresponding to it. Well of course it is possible that it might have been in the Hebrew and been lost. That is not impossible. But we cannot jump to that conclusion without hesitation. Student: Do you think the writer of the Hebrews (S 5 1/2) Dr. MacR:

And it usually seems to be considered that it is nearer Deut. than to the message of Psalms. That the phraseology is a little more exact with Deut. but the trouble is it is not in the Hebrew at all. While in the Psalm the phraseology is somewhat different. form that than it is in the Hebrew

Student: (69 to (6½) Dr. MacRae: Oh, well you mean that the all was elsewhere used as Septugent but that would be a matter of looking. But the two passages and the Psalms both of t them are speaking about manifestations of God's glory. and neither one of them speaks specifically of Christ. does it? I don;t think either of them has a specific mention of Christ. Deuteronomy 32:43 says rejoice all lye nations with his people for he willavenge the blood of his servants, and will render bengeance to his adversaires, and will be merciful unto this land, and to his people. And the Septugent adds and let all the angels of God worship ~~him~~. And that would certainly be pointing forward to a great overthrow on Gods part which seems to be represented here as something surpassing anything in ordinary circumstances. And therefore probably related to the esthalogical situation. And therefore would seem to fit with this second coming. It certainly is no reference in to the first coming. Now in the other one, in Psalm 97 the , Dr. Buswell, will you take Psalm 97 as entirely speaking of the second coming. Dr. Buswell: Well it is not a figurative but it seems to me to be very clearly as a at the presence of the Lord ^(8½) we shall see his glory It certainly fits in with the second coming . Dr. MacRae: Yes, it fits in but is it a prediction of a specific or is it a general glory of God. Dr. Buswell: (9) in Hebrew . DR. M: Wouldn't necessarily . Either of them could be used. DR/ Buswell: Yes it depicts to me my question would say in poetry that second chapter of Daniel and the book Revelation It is a glory coming That is why I (9½) . DR. MacRae: Yes, now how about verse 7, what attemkpt do you have in the beginning of the verse? Do you have that ? SPsalm 97, Dr. B.: At the second coming of Christ (10) Dr. MacRae: Psalm 97, That it could be they will be confounded, couldn't it, something to be the impeffect I think would fit a good deal better I think kthan the(11) idea as translated into the English. But I really think that fits better End of H 9 ~~Dr.~~ Begin H 10) Dr. Buswell: coming of Christ . Dr. MacRae: The Old Testa,ent speaks of the Lord as coming in Yes- Christ. Buswell: Yes, is coming at this particular glorious time I remember a number of others (½) Dr. MacRae: Is that definite enough to make it S? Buswell:Wel

about the 93rd Psalm. You would never know man sincere says he was and of the Hebrews we know that what this passage is talking about that in II Samuel, is the second coming of Christ or otherwise we might only infer it

Dr. MacRae: So it works both ways. It is not/a circle but works both ways. ^{reasoning}

It is not reasoning a circle but it is getting ~~reasoning~~/ some indications here and some there and putting it together and getting a conclusion (Some class laughter) Mr. Leonards: I was convincing of the Lord(1 1/2)

Dr. Buswell, Well as you read Psalm 97 you would know whether it is refering to a chronological event or to magnificent event it could very well refer to a pictured event. But now as to the book of Hebrews, ~~that~~ and then back to the Psalms and also take Daniel 7 and Revealtions 4 and 5 and I think you will say Oh that is what he was talking about . It begins to be a picture of His second coming. Student: But that is all the subject / Leviticus . Dr. B: We l that is all there is to it. Take Daniel 7 It says that Browning said at one time that a certain form of the earth reminds me of a certain scene near Oxford. And Browning said isn't that very strange, Now that is what I had in mind when I wrote it. So you can't always tell' from a poem the exact og s(2 3/4)

But as for other references looking back it certainly fits the second coming of Christ. Student: Yes but doesn't that break doen our argument of last wheek when you could see in the Old Testament the second coming thru the passages regardless of the New Testament intpretation. Busweell: We willnot argue that out this time. Dr. MacRae: Well I don't think I gazve that as an absolute rule, I think I said that you will find that it isn't a matter of grabbing a few words but you will find that as a general subject, involved is the same smbject as the New Testament is talking about. Now I did't mean to say that it will always be perfectly clear just from studying the Old Testament passage alone. But certainly in g the great bulk of cases it would be clear from that alone. Now in other cases it might be that you would have to have your NewTestament to get your final answer but even in those cases it might be that the- by further study of other related old Testament ^{passages} types you could have gotten that answer without the New Testamnt. I didn't mean to make it a blanket statement

that you will always find. It is but you don't find the content. You wouldn't find that the old testament is talking about something else. -You than what the New Testament is talking about. Dr. Buswells point is here that we have a statement where there are great beautiful images but as to the exact significance of them sometimes it is a little hard to draw it together and to be absolutely certain. And here in the New Testament it gives you the key which fits it and shows that's what it was. Buswell: If I understood my passage Isaiah 25:8 Death is swallowed up in victory. Now just from Isaiah, you will never would know that that refers to the experience of those who are alive at the second coming of Christ. But Paul in II Cor. tells us that that is what it means. A sudden developing a swalling up of mortality by life and now you look back at Isaiah it is just exactly what Paul says. Student: Dr. Buswell, could this Psalm 97 be any sense a late Psalm and (5) in Deuteronomy What do you mean a late Psalm? Well, a written passage MacRae, after a time of Student: Well a late Psalm Septuagint put it into Hebrew say he is writing A.D. 2 . MacRae: I don't think it would be that late. (Class laughter) MacRae. Some take it the other way around. Some that it that the Septuagint in the translation which the Septuagint made of Deut. 32 that the translator of the Septuagint was familiar with the 97th Psalm. And that he saw that the two ^{were} ~~was~~ dealing with the same subject and in the Greek that he simply enlarged along the thought. By introducing words which occur in the Psalm in the same subject in that point in the translation in bringing out the idea from Deut. Chronologically that would seem to be better than to put the Psalm after it. After the Septuagint. But the two are dealing with the same thing it is possible there is a relationship between the two but it that is between the Septuagint of Deuteronomy. And the statement here. It is possible and so Hebrews ~~see~~ you see is quoting a passage which was familiar to his readers from two places both of them dealing with the same subject. That could be, just like you might say, Is ~~is~~ Solomon the prophet and quote two passages in the old testament and not restrict yourself to one of them. They both have them in the general context are similar and you might be referring to the general idea rather than to the

simply to one of the two passages. But are the, I think then that we recognize that it is a valid argument. for the supremacy of Christ over the angels/ That all the intermediate beings all the subordinate beings are called upon to worship him and it is a scriptural argument whether it is based upon the Psalm alone or upon Deut. alone assuming it was in the Hebrew but it was lost later or whether it was based on both. But then the 7th verse he is not giving an argument further about Christ. He makes no further reference to Christ in the seventh verse. But what is he trying to do in verse 7? Mr. Blomquist? Student? What is he trying to do? MacRae: Yes, what is the purpose of verse seven? Is it to quote an old testament passage on the supremacy of Christ of the angels? Student: Well, it would seem to do that. MacRae: What does he say about Christ in verse seven? Student: I think it is verse 13, MacRae: Verse 7?

(8 3/4) What is the argument of verse seven? Student: Is it to tell what angels are? MacRae: Yes. Dr. Buswell: Verse 7 is an and verse 8 is the (9). On the one hand he regarded the angels as so and so but on the other hand in regard to the son, so and so. MacRae: Verse 7 and 8 have to be taken together. If you take them together, verse 7 and 8 show the superiority of Christ to the angels. Verse 7 taken alone is just with the angels. Dealing with the first half of the comparative. He is merely showing what does the old Testament say about the angels? In verse 6 we have the angels and Christ wrapped together and Christ superior to the angels demonstrate. Now in verse 7 we have the angels long to be called with the ^(9 1/2) ^{treatment} creatures of Christ and in verse 8

But what is he saying about the angels here? Mr. Dorsey, what does he say about the angels here? Student: He, MacRae: Mr. ^{Shedd} ~~Shepherd~~? It seems to be another statement of contrast that the angels are plural that they are ministers that they are flames of fire therefore not eternal with a son in that a minister is (10 1/2) Dr. MacRae: Well in all probability except the spirits How do spirits show superiority? Student: Of course th (11) I do not know that that is a mishap but that might be part of the . MacRae: Yes, Dr. Buswell: Student: (11 1/4) there as speaking of anels or is he not speaking of wind or / Dr/ MacRae: Well the subject under discussion is angels isn't it

of wind or / Dr/ MacRae: Well the subject under discussion is angels isn't it

We are dealing with angels . Now you are raising the question whether they author of Hebrews is a verse that is (11/3/4) all to the discussion, whether it has kanything to do with it, Student: If it is not it kmight be just a small notation, and if it is why-- MacRae: Yes. Buswell: That could be the argument that the Septugent why do you make the wind his his and the fire his messenger, slys the commentaries (12) . Student: How is that again? MacRae: The wind his angels and the servants his kmessengers and flames of fire Student: Do you take the Psalms: Buswell: Yes, it fits all the way around and it the inferiority of the angels. I'm not inclined to think it is impossibl A goodkmany of the liberals won't go with Gilispie but kon that but it says, MacRae: They won't go on with Gilispie? Buswell: No, I think the fact i the Septugent fersion does not call (13) Does anyone have that? Revised standard version MacRae: Does anybody have~~d~~ the revised standard version/ It would be interstin to see what he did with that. I've never, myself been able to see exactly what sence this made in the authorized version translation. The angels who says he makes his ange~~s~~s spirits What does that mean to make the angels spirits Well it they are spirits already, how do you make them spirits, They were created ~~angels~~ spirits as soon as they were kangel~~s~~ weren't they? I mean you might say of a man he makes his son a leutenatnt colonerl. (class laughter) well that maybe sons before they were colonels. You wouldn't say he makes his son boys that wouldn't make sence. Mr. : Ist gives the translation according to Hevrews when (14 1/2) Dr. MacRae: Yes, well I'd like to look into that but first I'd look into the words in Hebrew first. That is a good question Now I'd like to take that up. I thought I'd like to look at He rews first (End of H 10) | (Begin H 11) The authorized translation version here who makes his angels spirits . I just ~~never~~ could see any sense to that myself. The authorized version translators were great men who must have had some means to to and I have heard of some people today who feel it is almost a kpoint of orthodox. And since this is If ~~this-is~~ the correct intrepretation of it. he makes his angels spirtis but I've all my life wondered just what does thatmean? How do you make angels spirits? You might say I'll make alll the members of this trib men

How can I make you men? You are men already. How can anybody make you what you are already. You are already that. As soon as you began to exist, you were a male human being. How can you be made into man? Mr. Stewart: (1)

MacRae: You mean creates his angels as spirit? Student: A prophetic view. I mean telling you what he is going to do, His son is the king but when contacted with the angels, the angels are made spirits. Dr. MacRae: But the son is made spirit too. God is (1 1/2) I don't see how. Student: MacRae: We;1 probably from the Holy Spirit. They are spirits. Student: (13/4)

MacRae: God is a spirit. (Class laughter) Student:; I think that probably interesting here is Gilispie here. He says the same thing. Dr/ MacRae: I don't think he got it from Gispie thought. //(Class laughter) (Very loudly) angels as compared to similar to what the angels do in heaven. DR. MacRae: Only that goes back to the Psalms because this is taken from the Psalms. and we must go back to the Psalms. Student: Oh I see. Dr. MacRae: PSretaining to the Psalms and we want to do that for the contact there. Yes. Student: (2 1/2)

MacRae: Some commentators try to make out that the one that has the article must be the ~~first~~ first accusative but I don't see the logic of that at all. I was reading a commentary which insists that this says that if the messengers of him or the angels of Him, the other ways are spirits. So he says it must be who made the messengers of him to be spirits. It can't be who makes spirits to be the messengers of him. Well I don't see any logic to that whatever/ I don't see why you can't take ~~id~~ some pebbles just pebbles th take hundreds of them take ^{any} idiom, of random and stake them and make them to be the support of my table. I can't see why the article shouldn't be with the second just as well as with the first. It all depends which one is definitely is the (3 1/2) But that is an argument I found in one commentary which is probable It doesn't seem to be. I'm afraid that in English we put the directive accusative at the first. He made him king. We shouldn't say we made king him/ in English. But English is a language which ~~lwr~~ rests heavily upon order/ in view of the fact it doesn't have. In most languages they have endings that is not the case. The order arrangement of English is a recent development

I wasn't earlier. We have it that is it almost a rule in English that the object must immediately follow the verb. In most languages it can come before or after the verb. Anything can come between. And in the Hebrew, you can say the man killed the horse or the horse, the man killed. You can change the order any way you want it. The order doesn't . I don't see how the order is going to prove it. If you follow English order, it would be like he makes his angels spirits. Because that is the order it should be. But it doesn't seem to be me that that is the rule of . Dr. Buswell: Yes I would agree to that and further I would say that even if you stick to the supposed rule, he makes his messengers wings. I make my hearts an airplane. (Laughter) He makes his messengers wings and his servants ready to fight. That is God is not dependent upon the angels. If he wants a messenger which he can take the wind and make that his messengers. So you could stick to the order that his angels is the wings his servants like flames of fire. Student: Yes. Buswell: If you are talking about taking one thing in place of another. ~~Dr/~~ MacRae; He said he would make his horse an airplane. Buswell: Yes. MacRae: You think people would understand what he meant if you said that today? I if you wrote it without any verbal effect ? To make his horse an airplane that they would understand that you meant you made an airplane of your horse? Buswell: That is an question you get from Washington from the department. He had to ride that horse. (6) That is the reason I make my horse an airplane. MacRae. I don't think you can do that. (Class laughter. I thought you said you make an airplane of my horse. F/ Student" Forgery you can get away with that.. (Class laughter) Dr. MacRae. I think it has become the rule of modern English that the direct object follows the verb but it is not just the other language. It is the English device. And orders carry meaning. I don't think it would have I'd be a little skeptical that if you used that sentence in English that people would understand what you meant. Student: I think I could understand. MacRae:, Well, now let's look back to the Psalms and see what the Psalmist context of it. Your one hundred and fourth Psalm there, what is he talking about there? Is he talking about the second coming? He is talking about

creation. And about in a broader sence even, he is talking about Gods control over nature. Isn't that the big subject. N^ot specifically in creation ~~it~~ I lthink perhaps, but his control over nature in general and all throught the Psalm you have various elements of nature talk&d about. One after another. Well now you come down to this God covers himself withl like as to a garment stretches the heavens like a curtain lays the beams of his chambers in the water makes the clouds his chariots. Walks on the wings of the wind and in our authorized version continues. He ~~m~~akes his angels spirits his ministers falamin flaming fire. Who lay the foundations of th e earth that should not ~~be~~ removed forever. The fourth verse just jars our context, it seems to me in our English there He all of a sudden goes off with an entirely different subject. Before and after he is talking about Gods power over anture and then all of a sudden he says he makes his angels spirits and ministers a flame of fire. Talked about angels and ministers when before and after he is talking about winds and f undations of the earth and waters and clouds and a word that translates spirit can just as well be translated t wind . is the regular common word for wind and I impagine its a very word used in the verse before. the wind. And so it would seem that the context in Psalms 104 would fit much more reasonably when he talks about what he soes with the water how he walksmon the wings of the wind how he makes the winds , makes winds hiskmessengers and a flaming fire his ministers. He uses all the forces of ~~knature~~ nature for his lpurpose. It seems to make perfect sense in the context and the othe~~s~~ seems to introduca a different idea and to me not a very intellibagel idea to make khis angels spirtis. A If I said that I did mly best to make you spiritual well somebody said why do you do that, they have been spiritual ~~all~~ the time. It wouldn't be any kpoint to it. If you were allready. Ist would ~~be~~ ksomething you were in need of if you make his angels would even apply that sthey were angels before they werespirits. And to me it doesn't make any sense as it is I think the authroized thranslators must have had some idea ^{that} ~~but~~ I haven't been able to grasp . But I don't se what it is. Student: Is this go directly to Septugent? MacRae: Yes. Student:(9 3/4) Yes. Student: (10) MacRae: Well, I don't think the order ~~m~~matters. in Hebarew or Greek . In

either Hebrew or Greek, you can switch your order around. It is only in English that it matters. That order is an instrument of designating precise origin. Dr. Buswell: With the translation, it would be best to re-arrange the order. Dr. MacRae: I would think so, Yes. That would impress as it, yes, because in English the order convey meaning, while in Greek and Hebrew, order is a matter of emphasis rather than meaning. or at least primarily that. There is of course a more or less normal order they can depart from it as they feel like it but not affecting meaning only affecting emphases. And so the meaning of verse 7 would be why the Lord wants angels he can just take some winds and make them into angels. He can use the winds for his messengers. for his angels. His angels are not such an exalted thing,, He couldn't take the wind and make it into His son. He wouldn't take a bit of fire and make it into the son of God. But he makes a fire a minister. He uses winds for his purpose. And the angels are in that category. The angels are in a higher class than wind, they are spirits but they are in general in that category. They are a created being which he uses for his purposes. And therefore much inferior to the son of God who is himself much superior to all created beings. So that the meaning it fits perfectly in the context. Even though it isn't a a right and direct statement. Angels are inferior but it conveys the idea here that you can take wind and make them Just like Christ say, you say you are children of Abraham why God can make of these stones, children of Abraham. In other words the children of Abraham were a thing that was created of God and subject to his will. Not like the son of man who was ~~subject~~ was not the son of God, who was not created but was himself God. It is an interesting problem, this verse it is strange that this other translation is so very common, I still think there must be some ideas that is in it that I haven't grasped as yet. But it doesn't seem to fit. It seems to me that this idea fits perfectly in the context both of Hebrews here and of the Psalms. Student: In this context here could it be considered Hebrew priority that Christ ministered to the angels? MacRae: yes Student: (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) Perhaps not precise identical but Student: (13) the others had of ministering to him? MacRae: Well I think the ministers here is simply the servant. And he does what he wants done. Dr. Buswell: turns

it around and says he takes angels and he makes them into wind. There is
 he takes angels and makes them into fire. Instead of taking the
 wind he ought to take an angel and make it into a wind or fire or whatever
 purpose he had, But for the son, he didn't do that he had (13 1/2)

Dr. MacRae: I am pretty skeptical there. It is interesting there as to idea
 of when he actually makes an angel into a wind or fire. Student: Student:
 Dr. Buswell: Well,

he refers to Exodus 3 where the Lord speaks from the burning bush. DR. MDA Rae:
 Well what does the angel have to do with it? That was the Lord wasn't it?
 That was the Lord he made a fire there wasn't it? Student: (13 3/4)

Dr. Buswell: Well I think it is strange that the wind and the (13 3/4 - 14)
 Dr. SMacRae: that the Lord was not (14) not in the fact.

Dr. Buswell: I think you are quite right there, the order of the
 is that they are reversible. I don't know who (14 1/2)

Dr. MacRae? We } } is there further discussion on this verse?
 Student: Well you were wondering just what was the (14 1/2)

Dr. MacRae, Yes, well lets here it. Student: He makes his angels
 winds and his ministers flames of fire. Dr. MacRae:

you have the American Standard or the Revised Standard? That is the
 American isn't it. That is the translation made about 40 years ago. The

Revised is the one made about 3 or 4 years ago. Buswell: Exodus 3:2 says
 and the angel of the Lord appeared to him and exclaimed angels

being a fire. MacRae: An interesting idea, but don't support the answer
 I notice Montgomery well he says he makes his angels into men and

~~traces~~ of fire (15) (Eng of record - H 11)
 (Begin H 12) at the first half. of verse 7. Now the second is verse 8.

And unto the son he says and where do we get this quotation, unto the son
 Where would you take that from Mr. Classo? Student: It is from Psalm 45

Dr. MacRae: Psalm 45. Well some of you have, I believe had this Psalm with
 Dr. Harris last year, 45, How many of you were? Well how many had it last year?

Three. I don't think you would't have caught up with this year of course.
 Student: No yet. MacRae: There is a very interesting Psalm that is 45 Psalm

but it is very definitely the Messianic Psalm. And there are many interesting problems we could take up about this Psalm but I think it is doubtless one that will be kdesolate in detailing a kPoets course, so we wouldn't need to take it up here. How much of this Psalm is supported here? Two verses aren't there? You have verses 8 and 9 are continuously taken from the Psalm verses 6 and 7 Thy throne O God is for ever and ever. Certainly a strange thing to say of man Thy throne O God is for ever and ever. The sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness and hatest ^{iniquity} ~~iniquity~~ Therefore God thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. The it would seem that whoever the Psalm was addressed to it would seem to be striving very tremendous He is God, Thy throne O God is forever and ever. He is God and yet God has anointed him. He is God and yet he is one whom God has anointed. we seem to have ~~more than~~ a pretty close teaching of the more than one person in the Godhead there wouldn't you? In that Psalm in the Old Testament. Thou lovest righteous and hatest wickedness, therefore God, Thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. It is a tremendous statement about Christ pre-eminence. He A statement which the writer of Hebrews points out o you could't find a parallel to any relation to any angel anywhere. Thy throne o God if forever and forever. I was interested in Damascus to visit ~~ed~~ the Mosque there . It was one of the great early christian churches and then when the Mokhammands conquered they took over this Mosque and this church and made it into the great M (3) mosque there. And they tried to do away with all the Christian ~~symbols~~ symbleismas. in the place and make it strictly a kMosque. But in recent years when quite a bit of the fanaticisms had died down this was ~~many~~ many centuries ago when they made the change and recent years there was discovered up on the side of it a place that had been overlooked, an inscription of thy Throne O Christ is forever and ever. And thy dominion endureth for ^{all generations.} ever-and-ever. There were these ~~Greek~~ words in Greek letters. Remaing on the side of these Mosque through many centuries and were still there. And in 1929 when I was there it was shown as a courtesy. to visitors. ~~I don't know if it is still?~~

I don't know if it is still there today or not, When I was there last year, it was on a Friday and they were having a big service there and that is not a day for any Christian to go around and watch. I didn't take any chance to go and see if it was still there or if it had been eradicated. I notice in (4½) that were there were signs praising on a role, twenty years ago. They have been eradicated. SIN the confusion of war and everything, the Peoples have been busy eradicating referednce to on a role. So in the minute in recent years the Moslems (4½). It was very interesting to me to find this expression. in the Greek capitals there with the name Christ inserted there on that line in the point to the fact that his kdominion will be reestablished and will cover the whole earth. When he returns and so here we have this statement which is taken directly from this Messianic Psalm. It is a statement about the Lord, praise of the Lord in the Psalm and here the writer of Hebrews points out the, it is never said of any angel you have loved righteousness and hated iniquity. Therefore God will anoint your head with oil of gladness above your fellows. The reverse of it he said, There was an angel who loved iniquity and hated righteousness and therefore God had condemned him eternally. God is opposing him. We have the converse in the case of an angel. We have the no angel receiving exultation like this and no angel being spoken of as having been accepted or a throne. So this eighth verse 8 and 9th verse here gives the side of it in exultation of Christ in contrast with the 7th with its showing its inferior position with the angel that they are ministering spirits. That even the wind had to do the work of angels. And then in verse 10,, Dr. Buswell; The way Goodsby tried to get rid of verse 9. He took up the odds in predicate nonnominative, Thy throne is God for ever and ever. And he argued God is your high power God is (6½) God is your shield, God is your throne. So. DR. MacRae: It is quite a different figure isn't it? God is our protection. God is our refuge, God is our Rock, God is our throne, now what does that mean? And now some of the literate students, they just wouldn't have that, they were just not satisfied. (6 3/4) Backs that upon God

God's

Several days, he just harped on it. That thy throne is forever and getting rid of the deity of Christ. Dr. MacRae:; And I noticed the American Standard version has a footnote here . Under this. Thy ~~th~~ throne O god is forever and ever and has a footnote, or Thy throne ~~th~~ is god forever and ever.

If there were several things in the American Standard version that were rather disappointing. It, I have just ~~as~~ many things pointed out in the American Standard version that could be criticised in the Revised version. Yes:

Student; I noticed the word God there has the article (7½) There are other indications as Dr. MacRae: Now what is he speaking of and where?

Student: In the eighth verse in quotations. Thy throne of God has

and Dr/ Buswell: That is (8) Dr. MacRae:

The common to use the article was not of the . In the Old Testament it is quite common that when you addressed the king, to call him the king

in the . A very common expression. in the Old Testament. You don't say that in English but the Hebrew is different, it is Now with the Greek would be influence by the Hebrew or would that be a common

Greek Hebrew? ~~It is/n//~~ Dr. Buswell: Is is not uncommon is grad a Greek

(8 3/4) . Dr. MacRae: Now in verse 10 we have another reference and what is the quotation there? Where is he quoting from in verse 10?

Mr. Pink S: ~~verse/2~~. Psalm 102 ~~and/10/1~~ Dr. MacRae: How many verses does he quote, Student: three of them 25 MacRae: Psalm 102 . Now what

evidence do you have in Psalm 102 that is in mind? What evidence ~~that/~~ do you have that that is simply not an address to God? Student: For the whole thing

is (9½) about the bones and to (10) Dr. MacRae: You have

many Psalms that have similiar specimens which are simply the Psalms. You mean this whole Psalm is Messianic? Student: Yes, in just reading it over.

Dr. MacRae: Do you get that impression Dr. Buswell? Psalm 102, there are many others that are very similiar. Student: I looked it up in the

Bible dictionary just yesterday and ~~the~~ list of Messianic Psalm. Dr. MacRae:

On what ground? Student: (10½) in New Testament . Dr. MacRae. Oh New Testament in Hebrews to 11) These three verses here are wonderful

expresion of what the permance of God in relation to His creation. They shall

perish, but thou remaineth. They shall wax ~~old~~ as a garment but thou ~~shalt~~ art the same and thy years shall not fail. It is a wonderful expression of Gods permanance and God's unchangeableness as compared with the temporary ^{character} with his deeds and his works but just what right does the authro of Hebrews have here to quote the verses and say they are adressed to Christ.

Student: Hopkins says that the paassage in the Psalms is not quoted by Hebrews it just proves that from scripture it speaks of Jesus but rather that everything that is spoken of God can be spoken of Jesus Christ, for they both ^{exist} are eternal

against that the thing that is (12 $\frac{1}{4}$) Dr. MacRae: Yes, You would think it would be almost unnecessary to write Hebrews if you start with that point wouldn't you or if you say Christ is God, everything you say about God you say about Christ then why on earth does those two chapters say ~~about God, -you say about Christ~~ say he is superior to angels? I mean if lyou already say he is God and everything you say about God is true about him, then it would seem rather unnecessary. It would seem that the whole matter is already covered unless you have the situtation where you have people who admit that Christ is God and yet they don't carry it out. They don't like the point They admit these facts and yet they proceed as if the angels are divided (13).

I suppose that is . They admit the facts about the supremacy of Christ and then they go ahead and worship of angels and saint. and it might be that just to take from their own book and own writings and quote them about Christ and about God would seem to be a computation of the whole passage regarding angels

It might be that would be quite a revision of things out of ordinary to quote ^{adopt}

(13 $\frac{1}{2}$). It might be necessary to ~~drop~~ that for the ~~simple reason~~ condition but I'd rather not do it unless it is necessary. It sounds as if he is arguing ~~for~~ rather than that he is just be simply drive home what lyou already know. Mr. Leonard? Student: If it isn't the Messianic Psalm

could that be a (14) MacRae: Yes, if it isn't a Messianic Psalm we would almost have to the end he quotes from . If you already take

of anything you can say about God is true about Christ. Dr. Buswell: I wonder if isn't in verses 19 and 20 of the Psalm? For he hat looked down from

behold the earth to longing of the prisoners to loose those who are appointed to death. Now in the coming of the Messiah to deliver the people is a pretty well established figure. When the Psalmist 14½ is not Christ he prays for deliverance from this one who is to come as the deliverer. He

the one who is (End of H 12)

(Begin H 13) Dr. MacRae: It is an interesting idea and the Psalm is addressed you say as creator and as deliverer and the evidence that he is the Messiah would be of the . Dr. Buswell: Yes . Dr. MacRae:

Well of course in Exodus, we have a good deal said about how God looks down and hears the groaning of the people and says I will go down and visit them and see their condition and will deliver them and all that but t he don't have mention of Christ specifically in that connection. Dr. Buswell: No. (½)

that being Christ as going forth as whole. MacRae: In connection with the Exodus? Buswell: Well I don't know this particualry Exodus

but in other passages in wh ch God comes down to earth but it is generally I think . MacRae: So you would think the evidence that this is Messanic, Gods looking down upon the earth and seeing the need and going to do something about it. That would indicate it is Messanic? Dr. Buswell:

Yes, I mean the of the Isaiah passages. the one who comes to deliver the prisoner is a Messiah. DR. MacRae: Well we'll put that down as specifically speaking about the servant of God, not speaking specificall about God, but God's servant. Student: Isn't this a little different deliverance

Jerusalem (1½ to 1 3/4) Student:

The whole picture seems to reach a climax in verse 22 and it seems to be Messianic the people are gathered together to serve the Lord. And then you go on and here he is MacRae: Yes, that verse 22 as a ~~very interesting~~ (2½)

But that would look forward to the second coming. Now you have here in Hebrews, you have the three verses quoted and of old thou hast laid the foundations of the earth . Hebrews says, thou Lord in the beginning hasth laid the foundations of the earth. The words Thou Lord are inserted they are not in the Psalm at all. Of old thou hast laid the foundations of the earth. But he is

speaking to the one who is going to come down to declare the name of the Lord in Zion. When people are gathered together in his kingdom to serve the Lord so that would tie it up with the Messianic with the Lord's action on this earth so that would give the ~~one/who~~ / want to the author of Hebrews to use it as a symbol as an indication of the superiority of Christ to the angels.

Student; Where did you read that? MacRae: Verse 22, "From under the Lord behold the earth, verse 19, "Twenty, to loose those who are appointed to death" 21 Declare the name of the Lord of Zion and his praises in Jerusalem when the people are gathered together and the kingdoms to serve the Lord. This is not yet happened. It is something which is turned out which is something that the Lord is going to do and then addresses the Lord who is going to do that and says "Of old hast thou laid the foundations of the earth. They shall perish but they shall perish but thou shalt endure. So he addresses the one who is going to bring these great changes to pass on earth which is Christ and he addresses him with these declarations of his power and his unchangeableness. Mr. Nilson, In verse 18 he speaks of hearing his Glory (4½) as reference to visible appearance of the Godhead in flesh. Dr. MacRae "Yes, verse 16 would fit in further with that suggested a conditional evidence of it. Yes I think verse 16 would fit in very well with that. And verse 15 of course: "The heathen shall fear the name of the Lord and all the kings of the earth thy glory And so those verses would seem to establish that he is speaking to the one who is going to come to this earth and to make these great changes. The one who is not simply God as a spirit but God incarnate in the flesh. So that it would seem warrant then to quote these verses as directly applied to Christ and his eminence. So we have looked at several cases here we have reason at first sight to think they might be simply general statements but on examining them more closely we have seemed to find that in each case there was evidence that ~~that~~ in the Old Testament passage itself that they actually referred to the Messiah and they dealt with Christ. And therefore show Christ in contrast to what he says about the angels. And then he adds one more quotation about Christ. But which of the angels did he say at anytime Sit on my right hand until I make your

enemies your footstool. He certainly never said that to any angel. Well when did he ever say that to Christ? What make syou think khe ever said that to Christ Mr. YOUNG? Yes Psalm 110. One of the three clearest Messanic Pslams in the whole Bible. The Lord said to my Lord sit dhou upon my right hand till I make thy enemies thy footstool. Quoted by, did Peter quote this on the day of Pentecost? Yes, Matthew 22, the Lord quoted it. The Lord said to my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I kmake ~~thy~~ kenemies thy footstool. Why did David call it Lord, very clearly it shows the deity of the Messiah, it shows the supremacy of th Messiah. The whole Psalm is Messiaznic, It would be very interesting Psalm to go into so see just how it is just Messanic there is no other elemtn in it whatever. It entirely relates to the second~~d~~ kcoming of Christ and it is the Psalm of course kthat has in it that very imporlnt verse, Thou art a priest after the order pf Melchidicek which is in no sence a New Testa etn invention. It appeared already in the 110th Psalm.

~~It~~ as a priest after the order of Melchidicek but here you have a set up in the 110 Psalm. Mr. Student: (7 3/4) verses of 11 and 12

MacRae: Verses 11 and 12 were part of the quotation, 10, 11 and 12 were in Psalm 102 ther only there they were only two verses and here they are three verses but they were, the whole thing was one long quotation . the 102 Psalm and so the 13th verse is the last quotation which we hae in this chapter.

Them we have the 14th verse which sums up what he said about the angles. Are they not all minstering spirits? In mind the two words we had aback angels back in verse 7 spirits and ministers. Are they not allministering spirits sent forth to minister to them and you shall be heirs of salvation. In showing the great importance of the angels and yet they are subordinate in position in contrast in position withn Christ. Why cannotkbe compared with him. They are in a different catagroy altogether. QNow, our second chapter of course

continues with this same ~~psalm~~ (9) WITH THE MATTER of th~~a~~ angels and it has an interruption for a as we so often have it in Hebrews/

Now do you think there is more we ought to go into in the first chapter or do you think that covers it? Dr. Busweell: The references in Isaiah are a little interesting different. Isaiah 50 verse 9 and 51 verse 6.

Dr. MacRae: Isaiah 50 verse 9. Buswell: And 51:6. MacRae : And 51:6. Lets look at those. SIsaiah 50 verse 9. Now how does that connect. Oh you mean and they shall, lyou mean in the latter part of it. It is similiar to this statement. Now of course I kthink we can say that Hebrews is quoting difently from the 102kPsalm. verse 10 to 12. He is not quoting from Isaiah but Isaiah has a similiar expression. a very interesting similiar expression. Now Isaiah verse 50, verse 9 Behold the Lord God that help me, who is he that shall condemn me. Lo, they shall all wax old as a garment. Moth shall eat them up. There he is comparingthe temporary quality of human being with the permance of the Lod The human being will waxold as a garment. Now of course it is used of the creation over here in Hebrews, of course includes human beings . Dr. Buswell; In 51:6 is particularly. MSacRae: 51:6 is closer than ^{50:9} 59, Lift up your eyes ~~to-the-earth-beneath-~~ to the heavens and look to the earth beneath. For the heanvens shall vanish away like smoke. And the earth shall waxjold like a garment. That is the same expression that is in 59. And they that dwelle~~th~~/ therein shall die in like manner. But my salvation shall be forever and my righteousness shall not be ab ed. A very strong stress upon the same note of the permanance of God. Dr. Buswell: Would you say that in literature you would think there is a relationship. On Isaiah is a interesting Psalm the Psalm or Isaiāh? (11½ to 11 ¾)

Dr. MacRae: Which is earlier? The Psalm or Isaiah? (Class Laughter)

Student: 12 (Class laughter) DR. Buswell: Y^u would think there is a definite quotation back of poet there, ~~back~~ from one to the other.

MacRae: They shall ~~w~~ll wax old as a garment. The phrase is used in Isaiah ^{50:9} 59 and 51:6 andkPsalm 102: 126 and Hebrews 1 to 11. The very samekphrase: They sahll all wax old as a garment. It is certainly a definite relation there. Which is earlier , the Psalm or the Isaiah herejis pretty hard to say.

Studetn: Tfhe Psalm is David's is it not? MacRae? Is it? Student: 12 ¾

MacRae: I don't think there is any evidence that the Psalm of David. Simply say the prayer of the afflicted. That would be. Some of you, those of you who are taking from ¹³ (1770) that would be interesting for you to look into for to see if we can find any light on the ~~of~~ this ~~scripture~~ question in relation and time. Particularly with the Psalms. In the Psalm which is written. Soem commentaries on the Psalms might have some interesting suggestions

Mr. Shepherd: Don't you often find that an evangelist is well versed in the scriptures using scriptures through two, three general conversation? Wouldn't that be true of Isaiah? and with David and use it as some expression?

(13 1/2) MacRae: Yes, that would depend . Now there might be some hints in discussion of the Psalms as to some 14 investigation. I don't know. There might be some interesting evidence as to whether it is an early or a late Psalm/ For I don't think many of the Psalms are ^{really later.} ~~late~~ Much later than Isaiah. There are some which seem to speak very difinitely of this condition but not a great many. I doubt if any of the Psalms are later than 500 B. C. Certainly 400 B.C. But there were several of them which were I think as late as 600B. C. Maybe a little latter. Well, do you have any further discussion about this first chapter Dr. Buswell? Well if you haven't, maybe you would like to start on the second chapter. I don't think there is so much in the way of quotations right at the geginning of it. More perhaps. Would you like to take it for a little? (End of H 13)

Dr. Buswell: (Begin H 14) / We start with two, is that right? MacRae: Yes.

Buswell: On this account it is necessary for us more especially to give heed to the things lwhich we hazve heard, lest of the omen we should drift away. Here is touch of subjunctive. of the deponent. Lest we should drift away or to ~~because~~ to drift away to take it strictly as a passage. And of course there is a great evangelistic text. How shall we escape if we neglect, lest we drift away. I don't ned to ~~stop~~ stop on that and of course it is like this in exegisis but for popular emphasis, it is tremendously important. How shall we escape if we neglect. We ought to (1) for if through the word spoken to angels. Now there is the problem ~~how~~ ^{Paul} refers to the word

being established

because the covenant, the Mosaiac covenant/to Moses at the lhand of angels

Now here you have a reference to angels. I'm not conscious to more than the one not more than these two passages where the Sianic covenant is select to thae been established by angels. I cna't find any reference to the angels in the actual story of Moses. So best I can do Dr. MacRae is to say it is a reasonable interests that since these angels are the servants of God and fo course the naturally infers that God would use the angels in giving Moses these tables of stones and the rest of it. The tables were carved by Moses by the finger of God.

George L. Robinson used to point that out as a contradiction but of course it isn't a contradiction. I heard a preacher the other day say that Nêchodemus was a man of great muscular strength because he came through the garden carrying a hundred pound weight of spices and the word is he came carryig it. Well when a man of that station came carrying, the word to carry might be like they use in the south. I'll carry ~~it~~ you down to the station. Simply

(2½) does mean to carry so lyou don't need to picture

Nicodemus carrying it kon hisback. You don't need to picture the act of the physical finger of God writing on those stones nor the actual chisel of Moses carving those stones. And all I can think of is it is just a reasonable inference that it was through angels. I don't have any other light on that. The angels,

when we read Hebrews in rapid reading class, that quuestion always comes up and I haven't any further answer ~~but~~ so these words spokent through angels was steadfast. (3) that is it proved to

be strong, steadfast. And evry transgressiön an d disobedience received its jsut retribution, how shall we escape. Future indicive, how are we jgoing to escape? Neglecting so great salvation . Now ther again is your evangelistic point. ~~It/Is/~~ Which we don't need to stop on but is perfectly clear. Then this to me

is important exegetically as as between the old and the new testament. Christ being the minister of the circumcison and so on, so great salvation which took ~~ist~~ its rights to be spoken or began to be spoken. (4)

Began to be spoken by the Lord (4) This great salvation was spoken by the Lord. Where I ~~s~~think we must say that the content message of Christ is identical with the content of the message of Paul when in Phillipi.

When the jailor said what shall I do to be saved Paul said believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. When the Jews in the synagouge in Capernium said what shall we do that we may work the works of God, he said this is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. It is very common for people to say there is no gospel in the ~~book of the Hebrews~~ teachings of Jesus. No gospel in the sermon on the mount. Well I , you could go on and on, but what is the meaning at the conclusion of the sermon on the mount. You men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles? Simply you must be born again. And that is the message of Jesus. Or the two foundations. the sand and the rock. What is the message if it isn't the secret of the righteous life is in the building on the foundation faith in Jesus Christ. So this great salvation began to be spoken by the Lord and was confirmed to us by those who were at hand. We have the historical points that we have at first in connection with the authorship that the author puts himself with the second generation. I think a very good case could be made out if this does not exclude Paul.. I would just say a word of caution though. Since this is a practical matter like if you should go into the pulpit with no neck tie or something like that, you would hurt some peoples feelings. If you just talke around loosely about the Pauline authorship of Hebrews you don't do any good. You put yourself down as an ignoranous I would be a little garded. I mean this for prattical reasons. About talking about the Pauline authorship of the book of Hebrews. I personally believe that it is probable that it is ^{but} , but I just don't like, expect guardially and where I have plenty of chance to go throu the data. I do not think that this excludes Paul. ^{Although} /Most of the teachers will say of course, this ~~roots~~ ~~is~~ Paul out. Confirm that to what is heard by him. (6 $\frac{1}{4}$) I think the fact, the outward facts were confirmed to Paul by witnesses and by what he had himself thought as he persecuted the Christians. And heard as he percesuted the Christians. But I think that still t safeguards Pauls statement that his message which is of course the mean ng of the fact was not given to him by any man. Yes, sir? Student; Here it speaks of the salvation being spoken first by the Lord, now of course it wasn't begun at the time of Christ. The message kw as the same from the very beginning wasn't it? Dr. Buswell: Well, yes, however as Paul in

I Corinthians, in II Corinthians 3 says, we use great boldness. We will not veil our message. In one respect we will not be like Moses. Moses was getting the message in the fact in and in symble and was great-profitable-for-him-to- it was quite proper for him to veil his face and it was quite proper for him to temporarily to break those stones and weight at all. We are proclaiming the actuality the atonement is finished. I think your point there is very good, that the message of salvation by faith was preached to Abraham but in a sense this message now again is spoken by the Lord. I think there is no contradiction there but there is a state of meaning that should be safeguarded. In the sense that it is a past accomplishment and Christ in his resurrection could show his hands and feet as evident of his having (8) died for our sins in that sense that salvation now will be given to be spoken by the Lord. But salvation by faith certainly didn't take its chronological beginning in the year 30 A. D. Student: What is the problem there in verse 3 with the Pauline authorship? Dr. Buswell: The problem about the Pauline authorship is in the phrase, confirmed unto us by them who heard him. In Galatians Paul is very sharp in saying that he did not get his message from any man. And here this writer says it was confirmed unto us by them that heard him. It sounds (8½) as though it excludes Paul. And a great majority of people think so. Of course you might draw a lesson right here. Which is important in all Bible studies. That language is not symblelogic. Words are not great term. You can find cases of a verbal contradiction. Of the word (9¼) is part of the works of the flesh and yet Christ is characterized by zalof. And Paul had great zalf and Be anxious for nothing. And Paul had this great care of all the churches. ~~And he~~ And he sends Epechrius who will take care of you with all with exactly, the same work. And this-- does this principle of symatics or linguistics that words have shades of meaning. There is a godly veil and there is a fleshly)10) There is a godly care and there is a fleshly worry. And the same word is used in both, so in one sense Paul got his message confirmed by visible testimony. In an entirely different sense. He didn't get it from any man. Student: What would you date this book of the Hebrews? Dr. Buswell: Well,

I am compelled to believe that it must have been before the destruction of Jerusalem. Student: Well even though it seems as though he is writing just many thoughts of resurrection too (10½) . DR. Buswell; Well yes but yes. confirmed unto us by them who heard him. If Paul wrote during his first Roman imprisonment just suppose that as a theory, the bulk of the Jerusalem church would be the rising generation at that time, wouldn't they. Christ was crucified in the year 30. Now this is clear down to first Roman imprisonment in the late 50's, where do you put the differences in chronology. I don't know just what you have been taught there, but anyway, the rising generation was composed of both of these churches. And this day confirmed unto us by those who heard him does not exclude the idea that ^{there} ~~we~~ still are some of the witnesses still with him. God bearing witness with signs and ~~teresteen~~ (11½) that is furnishing events and divers manifestations of power and gifts or apportionments of the Holy Ghost according to his will. There you have the primary ~~cles~~ ^{1/2} given as evidence in the establishment of the church. I guess we will have to stop right there. Dr. MacRae: You have the, you know how much time you have depending on what kind of credit you are working for but even if you have very little time look up all the references. in Chapter 2 for the old Testament Get at least an idea what they are and what their general subject is. DR. Buswell: Down to in chapter 3 or just 2 MacRae. Yes and there are several others in the chapter and ~~and~~ you might at least be sure what they are to the rest of the chapter and look into them as much as you have time. Student: 12½ about our work in chapter two? Dr. MacRae: I don't think we will get past chapter two, next time. There is quite a little ~~in~~ that chapter. but look up the references particularly. (Class dismissed.) Don't forget your report everybody. I can't give you credit for it if you don't have it. Well, what if figure is for one hour of graduate credit ~~you/are/~~ two hours study outside and for 1 hr. graduate, 3 hrs. outside so that in this if you want to take one hour of undergraduate credit, come to class two hours and one hour study outside. If you want 2 hrs. undergraduate credit, that would be two hrs. in class and 4 hrs. study. If you want 1 hr. graduate credit, one hr, and 3 hrs. study. it would be two hrs. of class here

(Begin H 15) Dr. MacRae: In verse 5 we continue with the subject as we were looking at in the first chapter, the supremacy of Christ over the angels. I don't think there was anything more in those first four verses that we needed to linger over was there Dr. Buswell? Then in verse 5 we referred to the fact that unto the angels, Christ had, God had not put the world to come into subjection. It was not the angels who are to rule in the world to come. Now how do we know that the angels are not going to rule over the world to come. What reason should there be to think but what they may rule? over the world' to come. What evidences are there to the contrary? What does it have to do with the argument? And what is your answer Mr. Stewart? Student: (1)

MacRae: Oh alright, you want to go back to something else for a minute before we take up that. Alright lets do that and by the time we are finished that others will have a good answer for us on the question I just raised . What was the

you were going to raise? Student: Well, first of all, what is the meaning of and what does it mean to . MacRae: Yes, now those are good

questions and I'm glad you asked them after the sound scribe is here because Dr. Buswell is here and I wouldn't want to lose his answers. (Class laughter). So will you come up here and answer these , please, Dr. Buswell?

I don't mean to take a long time on them there are not an study here but they are good to know the facts. Dr. Buswell: I think they-are-simply an event evangelistic emphasis that now is the time and we must give heed lest we be lost

What shall I do to be lost? Nothing, just drift along. And maybe that isn't your question. Student: Well, then you would ~~think~~ take this to mean the

power in Roman as our lives (2). Buswell: Yes, I think so, yes is that all. Student; Paul ~~must~~ identify himself in that message so and he

doesn't consider himself as a saved person and he didn't consider apostles as capable of drifting off. Buswell: Oh now I never thought of that. Don't you think

we use the first ~~person~~ plural so commonly in talking to people that it simply means all these people nowadays, ~~and to the~~ must if we haven't. I never thought of the writer identifying himself in danger of being lost. But I can see how it might be taken that way. § Well now just off-hand, ~~maybe Dr. MacRae~~

never having thought of it before, maybe Dr. MacRae has thought of that, I would say it is very natural to identify yourself with people and I would say we must do it if we havent already do it, done it, (Class laughter) Student: Doesn't that verbal doesn't that involve a people to whom it was written if he writes strictly to Christians as some people- say, well then that would sound . D^r. Buswell: Well, I think it is just alike all the epistles of Paul. That he writes to a group that makes profession of faith. Presumptuously who are believers and as I see it Paul always raises the question whether there are some unsaved people. Well-in any church and this ^{epistle} people-is writiten to a group who as a group are in danger of going back to Judiasm so it isn't just a q^uestion. No. Student: Would it be true of Paul if he went back and forsook all of Christ and went back to Judiasm it, he would be lost asuming of course that it was true that he was really saved in the first ~~pl~~ place. Buswell: Yes. Studetn: I don't think he would exclude himself Anyone who was. Buswell: Yes, in that sence. Yes indeed. I never thought of that before Dr. MacRae: a bit I khave had people/surprised that I have spoken in chapel of the possibility of someone there or that some of us are quite , that some of us might not have accepted the Lord actually. That we might have been carried along with the enviornment in which we have been. We might have said thw kwords we have heard other people say, we might have had the desire to be well geguarded by our friends and we might have really had an emotional feeling ~~pl~~ and thought we were doing the right thing in making a public profession of faith in Chirst. But if it isn't from the heart, if we have not personally accepted him as Lord and Savior and really placed ourselves at the foot of the cross, and ~~we~~ receive ^{of sins} remission/through him then we are lost. I am sure I have said that in approximately those words 50 times in the course of the histroy of the seminary. And will say them 200 more times if the Lord tarries, because I feel that it is (class laughter) of extreme importance, but I don't th nk the we, my usejof the we would imply that I thought there was a great probability that I was one of those that had not done so. The, nobody could guarenatee that I had, anymore than I could guarantee that ~~I~~ of you. It is only the Lord who knows who are his

own. We can only judge by the outward appearance, and we could be wrong about anybody. And certainly to the group to which Paul wrote, it would be very strange ~~that~~ if someone were not mere professors. It is true in any group probalby true lin the Seminary. Well now the, it was a good question which was raised one which was not in the main line of our thought in this course but it is the sort of thing we shouldn't pass by but stop and look at when it comes up. The , in part then of ~~the/~~ our important evangelistic application jere and then we continue with the main line of the discussion and the question was raised the angels are not the ones to whom God has placed the world to come into subjection, now how do you know they are not. What is the proof of it? What proof is there that God ahs not put the world to come under the subjection of angels. Would it not be altogether natural ~~if~~ ^{that} God establishes things right and does away with Satans power and he would delegate the angels to represent him to represent him and to rule and to control in the world to come. Well now' we might , first ask the question, apart from the book, just raide the question apart fromthe book of Hebrews, and thinking of the ~~book~~ Bible as a whole, what would be the first evidence that would come to your mind on the question, is God going to put the next age, the world to come, under the charge of the angels? Mr. Student: We find it mentioned ~~we/shall/bov/and/be/~~ land every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess for God has highly exhaulted. Philip. and Romand 14 ~~verses~~ ⁴⁵ . (7) MacRae: Those would show very definitely that Christ is going to be supreme. But then might not the world to come be in subjection to angels even if Christ was supreme? The Roamn Catholics worship Mary ans the queen of the angels. Constantly speak of her as the queen of the angels. Now might it not be Jesus Chrsit/^{reign} as the king of the langels. Might not the world ~~become~~ ^{to} be/^{put} in lsubjection to the angels under the leadership of the Lord Jesus Christ. Would you think of anything in Scripture which would raise difficulty with accdptance of that as a prodigal. Student: outside of the book of Hevrews, MacRae: Well, if the strongest thing you know of is in Hebrews, alright, but I mean if we werr not, ^{at present} studying the book of Hebrews. ~~What/you know/of/in-Hebrews-is-all-right. Would this be~~

Would this be the thing that would occur to you or would something else occur?

Mr. Student: Would Romans 8 where we are talking of his heirs and joint heirs with Christ refer to our partaking of power or whatever his dominion is going to be after. MacRae: That would at least seem to suggest it

Mr. Student: How about (8 1/2) MacRae: Of course that would be further refer evidences along the line of this Mr. Buswell spoke of Christ control and very important in that direction and yet, how can you say that he has not put it in subjection to the world to come, if Christ is going to control it through the angels. If they are going to be his underlords you might say. Would you really say under the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come.

Even that Christ being the supreme over you. I think possible that would be sufficient and yet I still asking this further Mr. Student: Several

times in all and in book of Revelation I believe it mentions that the saints shall or judge or rule over the angels, ye shall judge angels. or somebody else besides angels. MacRae: Yes, and then not only angels but the world to come. However Revelation 20 does it not teach that in the world to come we shall reign with Christ. That the saints shall reign with Christ in the world to come that is in the morning. And consequently if the saints are going to reign with him, that would not sound as if it was put into subjection to the angels. It would sound as if Christ was going to reign with the saints as his agents as his collators as his rulers under him and these other verses that you have mentioned and then of course that doesn't mean that the angels' wouldn't have any place they may have very important functions but the functions

would not be of rule ^{10 1/2} our lord, While if you say the saints will reign with Christ it surely implies that they will have a certain exercise in discretion in making decisions. Mr. Young you have a question? Student: (10 1/2) to 11 1/2)

MacRae: From whatever there would be in this world there would be certain analogy. And what there is in this world you are driving from the garden of Eden because man does not rule this world today. Satan rules today and Satan is a fallen angel. Yes? Student: in verse 14, angels shall be ministering spirits to those who shall be the heirs of salvation. Angles preference to us, MacRae: Yes, and if that is the case now, it suggests

that the world (12) that is a continuation and a somewhat different slant on the argument. Student: There is a passage, I don't know where it is,

All things are Gods and yet Christ . MacRae: Yes, It would be just a question how much you should read into those, in that phrase. Could possible be interrupted as interpreted as the (12 3/4) and then again it might be interpreted as so that I wouldn't put too much emphasis on that alone but it certainly fits in with the other suggestions. Yes, Mr. Smith. I see in

Col 2:15 where and vers 16 / MacRae: Well, that of course would be the wicked angels wouldn't it and that would show the complete victory over the wicked angels but it would not in itself prove but what the good angels might angels and become. Another student: Col. also speak of the angels

given the power of preventing the word or the (13 1/2) believe angels are . MacRae: Well I wouldn't think he could with angels. (14)

DR. Buswell: That is a peculiar (Eng of H-15) (Begin H - 16)

In this case, he spoil the angels but he humbled himself and caused the only powers to triumph through his cross. That wouldn't be enough just the angels

but ~~all~~^{law} of God, the heavenly stars and / MacRae: Well, in that case, it wouldn't prove anything the world Buswell: No. I think there is a point to

bring out that our reignings with Christ which Paul emphasized are future and we are not now reigning with Christ. We are going to reign with Christ

over this earth and we are going to reign with Christ and we won't be just as ordinary beings in . MacRae: Yes, very good and important in this connect

ion. Then he however does not give one of these arguments we have mentioned here He doesn't quote from Revelations, or from I Corinthians or one of these other

books. How many of them were written when Hebrews was written we don't know' which of them we might have conceivably have quoted from, we don't know, but

he does not quote from one of them here. But he does quote from the old Testament. And this quotation from the Old Testament, is taken from the

8th Psalm And so we ask the question, what is the 8th Psalm talking about?

And if you will turn back to the 8th Psalm, we have the question, If you were a Jew in the time of David, and they that recited to him the 8th Psalm what

would you think as the subject of the 8th Psalm? Mr. C/ I think the emphasis is

of the Psalm is the glory of the Lord as expressed in creation. MacRae: Yes the glory of the Lord as expressed in creation is the general subject of Psalms but now when you get to the last half of the Psalm you find that the verses 4 over to 8 form one stanza which deals with a certain part of Gods creation.

And what would you say it was talking about? Verses 4 to 8 Student: It seems to me that (3 1/2) ~~and then~~ it speaks of the glory of God and then he says even though he is so great and so wonderful yet he has speaks to ~~the~~ man ~~lpicks~~ takes man out to set his grace upon him. the Grace of God toward man.

MacRae: So you would say that verses ~~40~~ 4 - 8 are dealing with Gods grace towards man and what he does for man. Student;; in spite of his high position

(4). MacRae: Well is ~~man~~ ^{have} so insignificant in creation? Thou hast made him to ~~make~~ dominion over the works of thy hand? Student: NO . MacRae: That

is rather a great ~~place~~. Student: Well he raised him to that place. MacRae: He made him for that place. I mean he was never in a lower position. He is

David is speaking is ~~he~~ not , not of man as he is in Davids day, and he is says here is man in the world , he is ~~in~~ the world dominated by Satan, ~~he~~ ~~is~~

he ~~is~~ subject to infirmities of the flesh. He is subject to ~~the~~ ~~the~~ the curse that God has put on the ~~the~~ world , he is subject to all this misery

and yet he says, God made ~~man~~ to have dominion over the ~~works~~ of Gods hand and put all the animal creation and all the world under man. So he is saying

man was created a being with dominion over God's universe. But man is now a being ~~that~~ subject to Satan. It is practiaally what you said, only the time

order, I think you lhad just a little bit. The time order doesn't start with man ins and kput in life, (5) He makes him to be high and then falls.

And he starts with hlm the significance of man in his day. What is man that thou art mindful of him and the son of man that thou visidest ~~him~~. What would ~~he~~ ^{David}

ordinarily mean when he would say the son of man? Student: Ordinally ~~stated~~ ^{David}

MacRae: Yes, suppose David spoke and ~~Salomon~~ or Bathsheba, say, listen and David said what is man that thou art mindfjl of him and the son of man that thou visidest him. Who did Bathsheba thlnk he was talking about when he said the

son of ~~man~~? Student: I thnk David (8) man after flesh. MacR: What does

he mean when he says man? Does he mean David, or does he mean Solomon?
 or Bathsheba or who does he mean? Student: Man. MacRae: He means man in
 general and when he says son of man he means an individual out of the group
 Just as you read of Abraham in Genesis 18, that he ran, when the three men came
 he ran to the herd and he took a son of the herd . Doesn't mean that he got
 a calf that was very young necessarily, it might have been an old bull that he
 got. But what he got, was one individual out of the herd and it is quite a
 common usage in Hebrew to have the collective term which express something
 dener (6½) like man here, what is man? You don't mean what Mr. Kay, or
 what Mr. Dorsey, you mean man in general including. But when you say the son
 of man, you mean what is just any individual man and in Ezekiel the term is used
 many many times as a form of address. ^{one} What individual, just a man, son of man
 stand up. It is the common term used in Ezekiel for an individual man. Then
 when we get into the book of Daniel, we find that it is pictured there that
 to the end of the age there comes on a cloud of heaven one like the son of man.
 That is you see a form from the clouds of heaven and you look close at it'
 and you find that it looks just like a man, ^{like an} ~~that~~ an individual or of
 type of man, just one man. And then from the useage in Daniel, one like the
 son of man like an individual man but presented in that point in that great
 theological position. The term comes to be applied to the Messiah. The one
 who is like the son of man, coming on the clouds, so that term which was just
 an ordinary term comes to be a great term of exhaltation. which Christ used
 himself. with special preference. The son of man, whom Daniel saw, is going
 to come on the clouds of heaven. But originally, it means, just one out of

(8) and surely when David recited this Psalm in his court, the people
 in his court would think he was talking about man in general and any individual
 man as is represented as man in general. Or if not any individual man in
 then perhaps some particular man who will in himself represent most fully
 what man is supposed to be who will be an example of man. The man part is
 gone but that the first hearers of Psalm 8 here are the thousands here or
 the hundred thousands here are would think this is the Messianic Psalm. Personal

reasoning, extremely affectionable to say the least. DR. Buswell: Am I reading wrong here? What is man that thou art mindful of us? MacRae: No, the point there is that the that thou art mindful of, has the current object version (9), like the enerjective meaning like the Arabic enerjectic and then after that you can put us which adds a or him as who and (9½)

so us and him would be identical and mindful of us is a perfectly valid translation. It is only a matter of the judgment of asto which way it seems to be and whether is worthy of consideration and whether mindful of help would be the correct reading here. mindful of him or mindful of us, lyou can't tell

(9 3/4)

which it is. Buswell: And it also has the new MacRae: Yes, son of man that thou visidest us, ^{MacRae} Buswell: It seems to be very natural the son of man being singular . If man had us, it the son of man would have meaning. Buswell: thou art mindful of us or the son of

MacRae:

man that thou visidest us? And then of course it does not tense (10)

Now there, Buswell: Now that is singular. MacRae: And that would suggest the word naturally proves that that would suggest that the (10½)

And of course the That is unless you take it specifically and definitely Messanic. Mr.? Studetn: When you were speaking of the ~~Messanic/son~~ expression, son of man in Daniel, do you think then that

Nebechenazer did many fire burn? MacRae: Yes, I see one like the son of man. Yes? the son of God, the son of God , one who looked likekan angle.

Is is not son of man, as Nebechezer used it. I believe that Nebechnezer was an expert in Messanic thoughts. (Class laughter). Well now the Psāim is

then is if someone feels very strongly then that Psalm 8 is a direct messanic Psalm why he should be ready to give reasons for his opinion but it would

impress me that as David read the Psalms in those two versions, Highly intelligible that (11½) And so the question, Student: was it not?

MacRae: Well, Student: I have no way of defending my position but by going back over my notes about 4 or 5 years ago, and Dr. Harris said it was

Mesanic? MacRae: Yes? Well that must be (Class laughter)(12)

MacRae: What was I saying? I do not think that those who heard David is a Messanic Psalm and I am not saying it is a Messanic Psalm, definitely and

specifically a Messianic Psalm but I am saying that unless someone feels that absolutely certain that it has to be and must be Messianic and nothing else you should look at the possibility of its being a Psalm speaking of man (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) and that would impress me as being the natural approach at to these two Psalms Well now what does that do with the argument in Hebrews here? Let us suppose for a minute, Now lets suppose, Im not saying we will reach this conclusion but let us assume that Daniel here has no specific reference to Christ. That Daniel is talking of humanity. If that be the case, than has the author of Hebrews misused it? What is the author of Hebrews trying to quote? He is trying to prove that it is not unto the angels that God has put the world to come into subjection. He is not trying here to say God has put the world to come into subjection to Christ, not to angels. That is what he is saying. He is saying it is not to anels that he is put into submection and therefore he quotes immense that is put subjection to man rather than to angels it answers fully upon the point which he is proving at this particular place. Does that that help lyou? (Class laughter) I'm saying that if he proves that the world to come in not ppt into subjection to Christ or to angels but to subjection to men. That is all that he has set out to prove. For he says under the angels has he not put into subjection the world to come. It is not the angels to whom he has put into subjection, (End of H-16) (Begin H 17)

Hebrews is concerned it is not necessary that the verse be Messianic at all. That is not the thing he is specifically necessrily setting out to prove.

Student: the other quotations Messianic , where the people, they have a (0 - almost to 1)

MacRae Out of the mouth of babes the Lord has given men the sence to recognize the Messiah. That might esteem myself. Student: They were referring to the Messiah but the Psalmist is refering to the people who will recognize the Mesiah not to the Messiah, ^{MacRae:} for that is earlier. that is in the Psalm earlier. That is in the Psalm prior to the verses that speak about man quotations. (1) Studetn: all seem to take as Messaianic verse 14

(1 to 1 1/2)

MacRae: If that contradicts Hebrews then we know Paul didn't write Hebrews.

(Loud class laughter) Student: You might try verse 24 ~~1/2~~ and 25 where he must rule until he puts all enemies under his feet. For he hath put all things under his feet. The quotations from (2) MacRae: Yes, but that is false. (Loud class laughter).

Student: He is quoting something And he says and in that quotion all things are put under him and it is evident that God is accet to put all things under him. (2 1/2)

MacRae: Yes, well certainly it is an undoubtably lhe had some reason in mind Now of course your conclusion there is practically idlenticl to what we hve here. And when he says all things put under his manifest and all things under him hre when he put all in subjection and he left nothing ~~under~~ that is not put under him. They are both used ^{with} for the same verse. and arguing about th the same although from a different angle. But I think the quiestion of whether first corinthians there necessarily taken as messanic is not something what can be deceided at first sight. Student: (3)

MDzcRae: Where the Psalm is directly talking about Christ or whether he is talking about humanity which finds its exprssion and its example

Studetn: MacRae: as either of those two which something, eith viewpoint, Student: As a man in Davids day read ~~about~~ ^{Psalm} 8, he could read he would have to say about 8 he would have to say and yet, this hasn't been fulfilled. MacRae: Yes. Student: Or anyone we know, he would have to be reminded it it is a reminder of someone greater coming to fullfill so why wouldn't it be Messancic?

MacRae: It suggests that man is made to do this. God puts under mans feet. But then they would say well we don't do that. Therefore we wold say, either it is fullfilled in just has or else it is a greater fullfillment. Student:

So they wouldn't be driven to the esscetological field as the only way out they could go back to Adam, if they want . MacRae: For a while

Student: Psalm 8 is not directly aMessaniac but it expresses the true destiny of man which is the son of man and only through him can man ~~give~~ the idea

(4)

to

(5)

which was lost by Adam and thus regain and realize by punishment. MacRae: Yes, you see it comes out with the same thing, but the question is how you get there and there are two things. Here is one: That now in the old testament we are going to find all kinds of expressions about the Messiah and here somebody writes a Psalm he tells something about the Messiah and he says jthis is going to happen and it happens about the Messiah and that is that. We'll that is a possibility. And it certainly is a true situation in some instances. But I have come increasingly to think that it is comparatively seldom that it is quite exactly that way. That is that as I feel that the prophets and psalmists all begin with their own day in their own situation. They don't begin with God They begin with human beings and then they see Gods answer and they see the situation and they see what is lacking and see what is required and they see: what is required. They see what is involved and God shows them that the solution of it is found in one that is ~~is~~ 6 and so in this case it would seem that when David sat down to discuss the greatness of God and the ~~the~~ position of man and he saw that though man is very cunning today, God made man for great dominion and that is as far as he goes in the Psalm. He praises God for his greatness and for his wonderful goodness to man. But as he ponders over it, to think well man doesn't have this now, and so you reach the conclusion that there is something wonderful as to what the prophets get and what has happened involved in it and when when you go back to the Psalms and read it more carefully you find that he has an ultimate individual man. There is man in general but then there is the son of man and the individual man who is to be the representative of man in whom particularly this wonderful destiny would be realized. Only not inclusively. And in particularily and in other man as his associate with co-heirs with representatives. (7) Students! There is an interesting what is put under my feet, put all things under his feet and it goes on to say all sheep and oxen and beasts of the field and fowls of the air and fish of the sea and whatsoever passeth . You can parallel that with what is Gods blessing Noah when he came out of the ark. It is almost an exact parallel. ~~Say the~~ It says in the fairness of view and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of

and upon every fowl of the air and upon all that moveth upon the earth and on all the fish of the sea into your hand they are delivered. So if God said that to Noah, it has been accomplished. And it is refering to God.. ((8)

SMacRae: Yes, Into your hand they are delivered. And Noah as the replresentative man saved ~~them~~; the one who was delivered through the flood, the one who could be found as ~~it~~ ushering in lthe new age and bringing in the great age of right eousness. is one who could be expectdd to lhave dominion over all the beasts of the sea and over everythng. But instead of lhaving dominion over them as he should we find Noah very soon falling into drunkenness and getting into a siutation where he has to put a curse on his grandson and we find his descendants degenerati~~ng~~ to the point where Satan again ls in almost complete control.. And t man instead of having the dominion which is principle we have, in which a saved man is entitled, we find instead of that that he is in s~~ub~~jection to Satan and to the powers of wickedness and of slavery. Student: What was the verse mean then that God says to Noah these th ngs have I delivered unto you in the fear of him shall be up~~on~~ him. Does that mean~~x~~ that it nexcesarily has to have complete control of him all of the time? MacRae: No it kmeans first that man had a superior position. That God has made man to have dominion. And had ~~a~~ a superior position and it is recognized in general by the animal kingdom. and there is an attitudde toward the man on lthe part of the kanimal creation to be different in their attitude toward another being. There is a recognition that man is in principle the man. But he is the master at present only in pers~~on~~. He doesn't actually have the dominion over the fishes of the sea. He can destroy them but that is as far as he can go. Studetn: But whuld it be true of the Psalm dominion includes that sense of the term or would it mean kabsolute control MacRae: Well it means control. Not in the sense that you can stamp them out with your fott but/you can make them do what you want them to do. Man doesn't have that but it is like the c~~ross~~. In the cross, Christ destroyed the power of Satan. In the cross Christ put a hadd to Satan rule. He set the prisoner free. He won the creation away from Satan, in the cross. But twe don't find realized that. It was abeen app~~lied~~ only to individuals here and there. *John*

accept Christ and become heirs of salvation and even in their part it is only partially applied. But it will be completely applied sometime when Satan's power is entirely broken and destroyed and his dominion and power is taken away and everything that is done then is what Christ won through his victory on the cross. It is all through the atonement. But the fruit is not yet realized.

It is won in principle but working in (11) Student: Then during the millenium will man have any dominion over the (11)

MacRae: Well he told Noah that we would have. It seems

Student: What about the MacRae: Henry Bo

He doesn't say He does not say specifically that they are put under man but he does speak of everything on this earth. Well we have in this passage here which is quoted from Psalms and which as far as context is concerned as far as requires only to say it is not the angels who are going to rule the world to come. And it is the reason we know the angels are not going to rule the world because man is going to rule the world to come. And the son of man is going to rule the world to come. Well if now if man is going to rule the world to come, then the angels are not. and man here he says is made a little lower than the angels but is crowned with glory and honor and set over the works of God's hand and has all things in subjection under his feet but yet he says we don't see that. If all this is only a suggestion there is nothing not under him but now ~~we~~ we see not yet all things put under him and that goes back to verse 5, he says ^{under} the angels have you not put under subjection the world to come He has not made the angels in control over this world He said over the world to come. Well the Psalm seems to be talking about this one. ^{But the} ~~Thy~~ ~~is~~ ~~a~~ Psalm (13 1/2) speaks of how man is in control over everything and we see ^{isn't in} ~~isn't in~~ control over everything so we know it must be ^{dealing with} ~~the~~ world to come. Therefore ~~we~~ we know that the angels are not going to be in control ~~but~~ of the world but man.

Student: There seems to be no impression dealing with the control of son of man (14) from Ezekiel? MacRae: In the case of Ezekiel

it means just one man, just a man, and individual man, it is not mankind in general. It is called on a human man to stand on his feet to talk but call on one man, the son of man. He says here, an individual, collective from the noun.

That is all. But in this Psalm he speaks of humanity that he is not an individual, but the son of man that thou visitedst him. What does that word visitedst mean? Student: It means the idea of helping him. MacRae: Helping?

(15) Well what is the Greek word here translated Student:

MacRae: And what does that mean? It is not merely a

it is But the son of man is singled out for a

position of great importance and is not just (Eng of H 17)

(Begin H 18) Student: what we said about man before and now is in Christ

in that position. MacRae: Yes, he is brought down. Student: Is that

a little lower than the angels taken temporarily or conditionally, MacRae:

Temporarily? Student: Yes, for a little while. Some of them translate it

for a while, for a short time lower than the angels. MacRae: Oh, Student:

(1/2) is the word in the Greek that is translated of mankind, temporarily

and I think instead of positionally. MacRae: What do you think of that

Dr. Buswell? Well I suppose independent. Whether it is time or degree and

it can be taken either way. (1) will be in time or

in Student: MacRae: Yes, either way. It doesn't affect in

your interpretation. MacRae: No but it might so it is well to have the two

possibilities in mind. And if there is nothing in the text to illustrate

which it is well to have both clearly before us. So it could very easily

course in the point-of discussion we shall point to where it is extremely important.

Now Professor Corally who was professor in Higher Divinity School, in Harvard

University, in 1884, published a book and the quotations in the New Testament

And in this book he takes the Hebrew and the Septuagint and the New Testament and

puts them together and discusses them and he says of this one. He says the

Septuagint there is the same as the Hebrew except that it was the authorized

version and interrogation with (2 1/2) and incorrectly puts angel for God

(Hebrew never meaning angel) Hebrews is identical with the Septuagint.

You see he speaks very dogmatically about it and then he ends up his discussion

with saying that, he says that the author calls, verse 8 and 9 that absolute

supremacy over all things, spoken of in the Psalm is not literally true to the

human race but is realized to the full in Jesus. Who had to become man because

had been because of the subject of death ~~of~~ ^{crowned} in glory and honor. We can understand how our author full of the glory of Christ ^{hed} the announcement of it everywhere in the Old Testament. It is but a small thing along side of the nobleness of his ~~kgrowing~~ argument. But he falls into the literalness of his kind ~~and~~ presses into his service the incorrect rendering of the Septuagint. Well now is that a correct statement of the situation? What do you think of translating ~~elloheen~~ ^(3 1/2) as angel? For he says ~~ell~~ never means angel. He says, Thou hast made them a little lower ~~kthan~~ God. Student: (3 3/4)

to 4. MacRae: Two other cases in the Psalm. But of course one thing we know about it is that the translation angels is made by the Septuagint. Maybe 200 years ~~kbefore~~ the time of Christ. Now how can we say that ~~elloheen~~ never means angel if the Septuagint translators, 200 ~~lyears~~ before the time of Christ translated it that way 3 times. They must have thought it meant it.

How do you know ~~if~~ what that word means? Well you see what people think it means now somebody may be wrong in what he ~~believes~~ ^{thinks} but at least when there are 3 different passages, 200 ~~lyears~~ before Christ ^{be} translated angels you can't very well dogmatically say it ~~never~~ means angel but you can say it (4 3/4)

In the great ~~refers~~ refers to God, the great God. It is God in the abstract. If using ~~the~~ plural indicates abstract. God in a general abstract sense and represents our God. with God of . But now ~~if~~ a few cases where

is clearly used to mean the gods of the ~~The~~ heathen. Where it is clearly used to mean beings imaginary, not ~~existant~~, but believed to rule and exists or being actually in existence. God is supreme actually not the same. And so the word Alloh is used in ~~the~~ Old Testament clearly in a number of places

other than and it is not much of a step from using ~~elloquence~~ of spiritual beings wrong in worship. They use it for spiritual beings supernatural powers greater than that and yet inferior to god. And the Septuagint translators

thought that that that is what it means and (6) and the authro of Hebrews quotes it in such a way to give us the divine truth of that intrepretation. Do you have kanything to add to that Dr. Buswell? ~~By: I think~~

~~the instance~~ ~~passage is quite different from Gen 9 in this respect and~~

(6 1/2) Buswell: I think the instance of passage is quite different from Genesis 9 in this respect that commanding to be fruitful and multiply

commanded to fill the earth and subdue it and he is to have dominion. Noah is not to ^{given} have dominion. He is the upon all things and he is to have them for food. which indicates present origin but in Genesis 2 that puts in place ^{man} it

He never filled the earth and subdued. Obviously God intended for Adam cut short by sin has never yet been realized exactly ground of Hebrews saying the coming world has been got a given fact. That is has its purpose but never reached the point never reached it (7) God gave it to but he never got it. Student: that way, then you would say that the Hebrew passage prioritizes the passage in psalms. The passage in Psalms really means relation to the future and not the possibility of Davids saying, suffer thou

(7 1/2) Dr. Buswell: through Genesis except it is ^{of Genesis} Poetical and Student: You wouldn't be acquainted with the ninth again: ninth of Genesis

Buswell: No, I don't think so. The night-egon is a very unnatural situation (8) that you have it there Student: Well I thought that way as I read

the eighth Psalm. That David was in saying thou hast given us all these things

Buswell: But in the ninth of Genesis you have to put everything under their feet/ All things whatsoever he puts his fears upon the sensual but in the text of Genesis, he says: Rule you over all these things and have dominion.

The ninth of Genesis is to have power to keep and to oppose fear. but the second of Genesis is a glorious rule. A model marvelous concept how the world was ever going to come to pass. Now in the Hebrew it is a coming world so

that to fulfill the ^{S(8 3/4)} But the adoption of the seed of Abraham in relationship That word (9) .. And as it

stands there is Abraham. But in since then, it can be ^{And then we find the same} only fulfilled in that time. ~~And then the~~ MacRae: ~~And then the~~ ^{the apostles} thing where Moses said (9) Well

~~think that~~ how you going to know God will after I am dead, the Lord will raise up a prophet like myself. But if a prophet speaks what God has in command against Gods will do you know that he is not of Christ. You don't follow him Well in times it came to life (9 1/2) that Moses not only promised of the

same of the prophet . But that there was a climax in one who was a great prophet who was above all we are to hear. And Christ himself spoke of himself He was that prophet. So that in many of we find the idea ~~of~~ going forward toward and all of them centering on Christ. So then the as far as this point is concerned. Thou hast put all things in subjection uder his feet but now we see not yet all things put under him . Up to this point he has not specifically stated he ~~is~~ talking about Christ. You could read Hebrews 2 5 , 6 , 7, and 8 and think it is man in general that he is talking about. Not , he wouldn't necessarily be feel that kChrist is in view. But he is in view that it is kman and not kangels. ~~It~~ That it is to be supreme and there is a suggestion here that the son of man , the individual who has a special position, there is a suggestion ~~that~~ possibly some individual man is climatic one but then he goesdown in verse 9 and ties it up with Christ. Chrsit is that one. But we see Jesus . And now ournext quotation is in verse 12 and we have a few verses here of straight discussion. I wonder ff Dr. Buswell would like to take over. Dr. Buswell: Well, Dr. MacRae, the discussion in verses 9, 10, and 11 and in verses 14 to 18 are closely interwoven. Would you like to cover the quotations first and then ~~that~~ ^{take} the doctrines and see ^{the} ^{for} doctrine that Christ is not a divine being. And that he didn't take himself the nature of kngels. D^R. MacRae: Well I think pelrhaps lyou can take the doctrines first and take a little break right here. ~~When~~ ^{I've been} talk an hour and a quarter and get a little tired . (Some laughter)

MacRae:
 Dr. Buswell: Well, ~~you~~ you would like to go right to ~~the~~ the end of the chapter continuously and khave the quotation here or before or after. Buswell: W^{ll} either way. MacRae: Well lets do that. Suppose you go right ahead. State the chapter number and go back to the quotation. Buswell: Very well. But now we do not see all things in subjection unto him but we see him whole Either by a little indignity or for a little in time. whichever. was made lower than the angels or ~~made~~ less than the angels and Christ for a little time was humiliated and took his place of infer~~or~~ity to position not in any ofstential subordination but a and economic subordation. We now see ~~the~~ not only see

crowndd with glory and honor. In other words, as Dr. MacRae has brought out
 It is evident that the profenciency of Genesis 2 kand Psalm 8 can not kbe fullfill
 ed in the human ~~As~~ race as constituted at present. It is fullfilled in Christ.
 He is ~~the~~ one in whom mankind come to its truition. I have make quite a little
 of this point in handling Jonhn Dueweys humanism, Dr. MacRae. The Dwely Dewewy
 demands everything. And in his ~~ninetyth~~ birthday dinner kbe said our
 confidence is in ourselves. Man is the greatest thing. . Well my argument
 is that if kman is the greates thing, in the universe, then man is a pretty poor
 thing. But if man has a far greater destinly than man in Christ, we have a
 much higher view of kman than the humanist. The, we are not satisfied with man
 as man, The man as redeemed in the son of kman. And so we are not degrading
 man in ~~the~~ exhauling God, we are exhauling man when we are exhauling God.

Student: I think I think (13 1/2) Now is that question we can divorce

(End of H-18) (Begin H 19)

Is this ? Buswell: Well I imagine so. (Class laughter) At least during
 the Mellenium , the affect of sin will be removed from nature. The feriocious
 venomous character will be taken away. S/ Instead of the thorn , the fir tree
~~will be~~ instead of the brior, the myrtle tree.. They shall not hurt nor destroy a
 and all that and now we see Christ who was for a little, madelower than the

~~and all that~~ angels crowned with gold and ^{honor} (1 1/2). Now there is kan^d interesting
 question^{HERE} the $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ^{with} acusative (1 1/2) $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ τῆς $\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\sigma\eta\varsigma$ ^{TOῦ ΘΑΝΑΤΟΥ} means on account of. ~~the suffering~~

Does it mean for the purpose of or does it mean because of ^{as r} a past fact, on the
 basis of. There, I'll change it. Does it mean for the purpose of, or on the
 basis of. It is common to say that on^e the basis of his having se^t- suffered
 death he ~~was~~ ^{think} therefore rewarded aby ~~the~~ promotion. That idea to me is quite ~~a~~
 repugenant. I ~~guess~~ ^{think} not. I think it is, ^{crowned with glory and honor} ~~sound is growing older~~ for the ~~the~~
 purpose of sufferning death, in order that by the grace of god he might taste of
 death fro every man. That is to ssy that no created being, no angel, could hve
^{our} ~~the~~ place have taken. ~~Greek~~ (1 1/2) highest is _____

The loved one on the cross forsaken was one of the god head three. No created
 divinity, no created supernatural being could have offered a sufficient atone-
 ment. But he who is eternally ~~crowndd~~ ^{crowned} with glory and honor and it was he the

eternal son of God who suffered death. In order that he might offer a sufficient atonement. Now here we have a problem about that particular atonement which I think is unnecessarily dragged in. Augustine old statement was sufficient for all, efficient for the elect. And when we read he tasted death for every man, I don't see any use of whitening it down. It refers to the sufficiency. It doesn't in any sense deny the particular design of the atonement in election. His opponent must be infinite in value to atone for my sin. Because my sin was an indignity against God. And no angel could have offered a sacrifice sufficient to save me as one individual. He must be offered an infinite sacrifice, sufficient for all. He is crowned with glory and honor for the suffering of death.

Yes Sir: (Student) a little off the subject but would say that every sin is an infinite sin ^{2 1/2} against God? Well it seems to me so, that is, that's my impression of it, that for a creature to defile the holy character which His Creator has given him, is just infinitely wrong. Just totally wrong, and must take an infinite atonement, that's the way I feel about it, anyway. So, so this doesn't in any way effect the doctrine of particular atonement. And of course we see from many scriptures that the atonement of Christ had a particular reference, he didn't die in order that people hypothetically might happen to get saved, as the Lutheran doctrine is. (MacRae) He died to save a people and He's going to save a people, so that you have your particular reference. Yes Sir:

(Student) Well I had thought of the Crowned with glory and Honor as meeting the apparent deficiency of the 8th. psalm rather than the tasting death for every man. Not yet everything is put under humanity, but Christ is crowned with glory and honor. He has dominion over everything, and He always has had this dominion over everything. So whereas humanity does not yet rule, Christ is absolutely supreme, and he is now the Son of Man. But then (MacRae) with that interpretation you'd make your verse 6-8 almost exclusively man rather than Christ, wouldn't you? I think 6-8 refer to humanity (Buswell). Not, not Messianic at all (MacRae). Buswell: Rightly, simply, simply humanity without any just like the seed of Abraham. Until you come to Christ you don't know. It's a posterity of Abraham, and you know that something's going to happen there through the

posterity of Abraham. Then when Christ comes up, well He is of the seed of Abraham, and that's the ~~***~~ answer. So I think, I think verses 6-8 have to do with mankind as a problem(?) ~~(1/2)~~ Here is the obvious purpose of God that man should rule ~~and~~ the obvious fact that man doesn't rule. How can this be? adding in to the fact that ~~it~~ it is not to angels that the world is to be subjected, it must be a future world because man does not now rule. We see not everything in subjection to man, but we see Christ, crowned with glory and honor. Yes Sir: (Student) How does that tie in with I Cor 15 where it says that ---we're speaking of all things put under Him before He has ~~put~~ put all things under His feet? But when He says all things are put under Him, is that He is excepted which did put all things under Him, and when all things shall be subdued under Him ~~future~~, although yet in the future. Buswell: Yes I think that's a little different point of view ~~under~~ on the text. In I Cor. 15 Paul is speaking chronologically, and, of course, you have ~~the~~ the abstract reality. Christ ~~is~~ is before He went to the cross I have overcome the world, and He was just about to hang on the cross. He always has all power, and He is crowned with glory and honor. ~~(1/2)~~ He's the one who has it all, and He can reach out and take any time He chooses. I think that's the point of Hebrews here as I see it. We see him crowned with glory and honor. And now from the point of view expressed ~~in~~ in I Cor. there He is talking' about the accomplishment of the event, and Christ still is withholding His hand Christ still doesn't actually dominate everything. He potentially does but actually He's going to reign until He's going-to subdues everything enemy, the last of which will be death. ~~(1/2)~~ Yes Sir: (Student) Thinking about 5-8 as being reference to man, not everything put under Him, seems to imply that there ^{nothing} is ~~something~~ which, isn't definitely stated, for instance, death. Death is not put under man, and the 9th verse, it seems to me, that Christ takes the matter of death away. Buswell: That looks forward, yes. The argument seems to be, we cannot say that man has as yet dominion. It must be a future world. But already we see Jesus, who is crowned with glory and honor. Now then through the redemptive process, mankind is going to enter in and reign with Him. And of course the theme goes right on in the epistle to the Hebrews. We come to the general assembly of the church of the first-born, ~~(1/2)~~ and the consummation of the new covenant in which the

knowledge of God will cover the earth, and no one will have to say Know the Lord, for everyone shall know Him, and the consummation is still in the future, so far as redeemed humanity is concerned. Yes, that, that starts out now to carry it through. Yes Sir: (Student) On what basis do you relate the crowned through suffering? Buswell: I think that it is crowned with glory and honor for the purpose of suffering death in order that His atonement might be sufficient for every man. Now that is a debateable point you see. I take *διὰ* with the accusative in this case to be purposive, because it seems to me that here it refers to Christ in His eternal glory. Crowned with glory and honor for the suffering of death, so that, *ὡς* you see, by the grace of God He might taste of death for every man. Yes Sir: (Student) translate that "because he suffered death" Buswell: I know, that 's going to the humanistic view. I'm not saying it's impossible. In Philippians one, Wherefore God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name. Now surely in (9 3/4) and try to relate it to the Isis and Osiris story; that Isis and Osiris suffered so terribly that after they died the Gods deified them, and collected the membra out of their bodies from all over Egypt and gathered them together and deified them. Because they had suffered. And the old Dr. Hoffman was there and he pointed out that it is utterly different from the Isis story because Christ is presented there in Philippians as *ὑπαρκῶν* and *λόγος Θεοῦ*, existing in the form of God, before He ever suffered. (W) So that even in Philippians it isn't that He was promoted because of His suffering. He is exalted because of His suffering but He always was exalted. So there. Now I, I'm not denying that the *διὰ* here might be a resultative, but I think that the purposive is more consistent with the whole context, though it isn't the usual view. But as you go on here, the point is take through these chapters, that this one who died for is no created being. (W) This one is no subordinate deity. This one is not an Arian Son of God. This one is the eternal Son of God, through whom the worlds were made, you see. For it was suitable for Him through whom everything, on account of whom everything, and through whom everything, in bringing many sons into glory, to perfect the Captain of their salvation through sufferings. Now a question is have you a sudden jump and a change of subject or is Christ still the subject of

discourse. (1/14/4) We see Jesus, crowned with glory and honor, and so on, for it is suitable $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$. Now is the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ suddenly changed to God, the Father, I think most of the commentaries take it, or is it still Jesus? I heard A. T. Robertson lecturing on this one time, and he popped right out at me. I was way in the back seat, I couldn't hide. He said, Who does that $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ refer to? And I gave him my answer in fear and trembling. I said, I think it still refers to Jesus. You ought to know better than that. (laughter). He was a He cornered me after class. You ought to know better than that. (1/21/4) The voice from Louisville said that ^{12'w} why he's ^{12'w} takes And then they go by ^{his} ~~your~~ study afterward and they'd see him crying like a baby. (laughter) He was a very intense individual. (laughter) Well so A.T. Robertson's against me, but it isn't a grammatical question. It seems to me a question of reading the broad context. (1/21/4) Who is one, who in the context is described, the one on account of whom everything exists, and through whom everything exists. That's all just described in the first four verses of the fourth chapter. Through Him the worlds were made. He upholds all things. He is the heir of all things, so I would argue that the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ is still Christ. It is suitable for Him, the heir of all things, the creator of all things, the second person of the trinity, in bringing many sons into glory; now it's argued that sons couldn't refer to our relationship to Christ, but it could, because just below here the words of Isaiah, Here am I and the children given me, are definitely put into the words of Christ, although that's not the usual figure. We are His younger brethren, yet it is not an unknown figure in the scripture to call us sons of Christ. (1/21/4) It behooved Him to make the $\alpha\pi\chi\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. Well, now to me that is not a strong difficulty. I make the ~~SECRET~~* President of Shelton College do a lot of things, and I make the teacher of certain courses at Faith Seminary do a lot of things. It seems to me a very common expression to say that a person makes himself in a certain office do certain things. It is suitable for Him to perfect the $\alpha\pi\chi\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ of our salvation through suffering. (1/21/4) So Christ perfects (End of H19)

Of course the theological question How did Christ perfect Himself, that goes back again to the places we speak ~~of~~ ^{in-which} of the potentialities, and of the chronological accomplishments. If you have a certain theological philosophy: You say God is the fully realized. You find that up near Philadelphia, and you'd find that in Thomas Aquinas, but you wont find it in my theology. If God has no potential, if God is the fully realized, then He might as well be Aristotl- es God, who is a nonentity. But God is able to accomplish all things, in time He does what He always ~~is~~ intended to do. Christ perfects Himself by doing the things that He eternally purposed to do. (1) Hwe never was imperfect at any time but He accomplishes His purpose. So the thought that Christ, for whom is every- thing, through whom is everything, in bringing many sons into glory, perfects Himself, namwely the Capstain of our salvation, through suffering. For He who sanctifies, and sthey who are sanctified, are all $\frac{2}{3}$ εὐδὸς. Now don't let anyone read that in the masculine. Ye Sir: (Student question) 1½

Buswell: They, they suddenly change ~~to~~ over and the subject of discours is God the Father and the object of the action is the Son. It was suitable for the Father, and of course in another sense all things are for the glory of the Father ^{not} but in this context; and the Father perfects the Son, just because it seems a little strange to have Christ perfecting Himself as the author of salvation.

~~(2)~~ I certainly feel that Christ is both the subject and the object, and there is nothing, certainly nothing grammatically impossible. A.T. Robertson was quite hot and peppary ^{that time} but I never did get a chance to argue it out with him. I'm not sure whether I would have got anywhere or not. He who sanctified and thwey who are sanctified are of one. ~~(2)~~ If you must substitute a noun take the word $\tau\rho\alpha\upsilon\mu\alpha$ (?) which is neuter classification, of one kind. Some of the modern English translators have said taken it as masculine, all have one common father, one common father. Well Christ's sonship is differwent in kiind from ours, and He never put Himself on a plain with us in sonship. Hwe said I send to my God, ^{and ypur God} my father and your father. As to this manner of saying (3) our Father. Christ never associated Himself in the same kind of sonship, or with

the term son in anything like the same sense. Yes Sir (student) (3½) Buswell: Source? Christ doesn't come from a source. It's explained in what follows, of one nature. (3½) this is feminine, and this must be ^a neuter if itsn't ^a masculine so I would say ? if you must apply a word. But kind would do in English or of one, why not leave it there and not defy a word and then it goes on to say because of this fact he did not take to himself the nature of angels, he took to himself the seed of Abraham and took flesh and blood. That is what it means by saying $\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$. For which reason he is not ashamed to call them brethren. Now we will just read through these quotations and then enlarge upon them later. I will report thy name to my brethren in the midst of the church I will hymn praises to thee and again. I will be one who has put his trust in him and again, Here am I and the children whom God has given to me. Since then the children have ~~had~~ a common nature of flesh and blood. See that is what *the* $\epsilon\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ means, flesh and blood. Since the children then have common flesh and blood, he also especially partook of the same in order that through death he might destroy him. That is he became incarnate in order to ~~die~~ die. That is a very common statement. In order that, through death, he might destroy him having the authority of death, that is the devil, and might redeem these who by fear of death through all of their lifetime are subject to bondage. That is to go back ^{just} a little then. He is $\delta\epsilon\iota\tau\eta$ not a created superior being like the angels. He is the captian of our salvation. He is the one for whom ^{everything} and through whom everything and he perfects himself by coming down to a plane of suffering, he takes to himself a flesh and blood so that he might die and thus destroy him who has the power of death. For he did not take to himself of angels. Now your King James version, I think is correct and ~~the~~ the revised version is very wrong. $\epsilon\pi\iota\lambda\alpha\upsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\alpha\iota$ literally means to take hold of. Sometimes it means to give help. The revised version translates ~~that~~ he does not give help to the angels which isn't true. Why the angels couldn't exist if he didn't help them. He sustains them in all that they do. Simply is false to say he doesn't give ~~them~~ help to the angels but $\epsilon\pi\iota\lambda\alpha\upsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\alpha\iota$ ^{to} takes to oneself. He did not take to himself of angels, but he did take to himself, the seed of Abraham. Of the seed of Abraham. Supplied the ~~seed~~ or the character or the

identical ~~the~~ nature of flesh and blood. It is all talking about his incarnation. He didn't become an angel to save us. In the Old Testament time he appeared in ~~invisible~~ form and appeared like a man but in his birth he took to himself flesh and blood, not the ~~the~~ nature of angels ^{as} ~~with~~ ^{Probably} the captain of the lord's host ^{that} appeared to Gideon was Christ. Probably one of the angels that talked to Abraham was Christ and he could take the form of an angel in Revelation but in salvation he didn't take ~~the~~ nature of angels he took the seed of Abraham. Took to himself the nature of the seed of Abraham. Wherefore it was suitable with reference to everything for him to be made like unto his brethren. So that he might prove to be a merciful, a ^{ἐλεημων} a merciful and a faithful high priest ⁱⁿ ~~toward~~ the things ~~toward~~ God. So that he ~~might~~ offer ~~propitiation~~ for the sins of the people. For in that he had suffered, being tried, he is able to assist those who are tried. There is a good stopping point, Dr. MacRae. I think it brings to us a climax, the fact that Christ is not a created being and ~~if~~ he is Lord of the angels, he is eternal deity and then as to his incarnation he was made lower than the angels, he was made a man. He was identified in nature with man literally became a child of Abraham. as to his flesh and blood.

Student: Dr. Buswell, this is a little off the subject with a reference to the creation of ? today in the revelation we read in the third chapter, the sixteenth verse (9)

Dr. Buswell: Well ^{εαρχην} (?) you see is not the ^{πρωτος} it is the source. ^{the αρχην} is the source of the creation of God. Student: In other words, Christ was the one who was first

Buswell: Yes, he was the creator of the whole creation of God. There you have the same doctrine you have in John 1 and in Hebrews ϕ 1 and in Col. 1. That all things are made through him. He is the creator-God. He is not an angel. He is not a created being ~~but~~ however great you ^{SEE} the ^{ARIAN HERESY} was, That Christ was ~~the~~ first and greatest of all beings, next to God himself. ^{But} Still that would make him finite. ~~So~~ he is the creator God. As to his eternal nature and then as to his flesh he is not an angel he is one of us. Student: Is that what you

~~would~~ say (10) Buswell: Well now the word ?

you see you have to take it in its different context. Where it says, first

begun of the dead. It is an obvious figure of speech. The first one to be born from among the dead in other words to arise to mortality. Where it is that he might be the *πρωτοτοκος* among many brethren. There it is that he has the right to *primogenitor* of course he is the, the one among many brethren. And he is different from the brethren in that respect. In Col. I the *πρωτοτοκος* of every created thing, *Erasmus accented it πρωτοτοχος*

which would give us the active meaning, the original ~~grain of force~~ ^{brings forth} of every created thing and that is explained in the next phrase for by him all things are created. Now I rather thing that *Erasmus* is right there. That shouldn't be translated. That particular word should be translated original ~~grain of force~~ ^{brings forth} of every created thing and then *the word πρωτογενης* I made a study of *πρωτογενης* where it occurs and I thing *πρωτογενης* simply means unique. I think it has lost all the meaning of *γενω* completely. Simply means the unique son of God

So first-born must be taken each time in its context. It means different things in different contexts. Anything else? Yes sir: (student - I didn't understand exactly if

οτιως (12) the relation of glory and honor to the great)

Buswell Yes well now *οτιως* clause isn't it? (student 12) Buswell: Well if *οτιως* is a purpose clause that doesn't (12) down then. In order that by the grace of God He might taste of death for every man. Now if that is the purpose

what was done in order to that purpose? Something happened in order that so that *οτιως* almost seems to me to demand that the *δξα* shall be purposive. That's all, that's the grammatical argument. (student (13) I don't what the

glory and honor have to do does that refer to the original state? and that therefore makes the value of the sacrifice (13) doctor MacRae? Well, let

me read it again We see Jesus for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor so that by the grace of God He might taste of death for every man.

(13 1/4 student) Crowned with glory and honor for the suffering of death so that --MacRae: Would it be possible there to take the for the suffering of death with the previous clause, and then He by the grace of God should taste death with the "crowned with glory and honour"? You see what I mean? That would be "but we see Jesus (13 1/2) a little lower than the angels for the

suffering of death, for the purpose of the suffering of death. Crowned with gloory and honor in oorder lby the grace of God to taste death. In other words the conclusion would lbe the dsame in both there'd be two different means given to reach ~~the~~ the same---Buswell : That's a very possible reading, yes it certainly is possible. It would come out of the same thing if you gave(?) but it might be fjust a little bit more straightforward according to our method (14) Yes, that would give us the same interpretation , yes. Righto. This is very important material. End H20.

(Begin H 21) Dr. MacRae speaking:
 Is very interesting to me-but it just occurred to me to feel a bit of sympathy
 for my secretary as ~~she~~ ^{she} ~~trys~~ ^{tries} to type out what he has just given to us, so many
 Greek words in it. and she doesn't know any Greek. (Class laughter). So I
 wonder if there is anyone here who would like to give us a little help right
 at that point. Someone could see me afterwards, who can type, who would like
 to type up from this section that Dr. Buswell gave because he has so much
 more Greek than he usually has today. I think that it would be a real help
 and you wouldn't have to review, by hearing it over again. So that (class
 laughter) I would pay you for your time but I mean in addition to that it
 would be a real help to your studies. And so I will appreciate it if someone
 will see me who will be able to give us that little help in getting this
 material ^{of} ~~that~~ Dr. Buswell's down. Now Dr. Buswell had dealt with the thought
 of the passage and that of course is the vital thing here but our problem here
 is, our personal problem of this particular course is the relation to the Old
 Testament. And that is a very vital matter since the author of Hebrews based
~~the sum~~ so much of his thought in the book or quotations from the Old
 Testament. I would like to read you again from Torrey for a second. You
 notice that verse 12, we have these quotations in verse 12 and 13 that
 Dr. Buswell has passed over leaving them for me to discuss. Now verse 12
 Say I will declare thy name unto my brethren and in the midst of thy church
 will I sing praise unto thee. And Torrey says of this, ^{Psalm is a cry of} ~~the~~ song ~~of the choir~~
~~of~~ of deep suffering followed by a strain of thanksgiving to God. The personal
 experience of a pious Israelite referring to ~~in~~ nobody but himself. The words
 might indeed be adopted by any servant of God and therefore and therefore by
 the Messiah but the epistle accepting the current Messianic interpretation
 of the Psalm and taking the expression literally and without regard to its
 context treats it as an utterance of the Messiah. Which by the words my
 brethren affirms the oneness of Jesus and of the disciples. Here again
 Paul had his spiritual thought that Jesus is a saviour because of his complete
 identity with his people in nature and experience, now is that a correct statement
 His spiritual thought that Jesus is a saviour ^{by reason} ~~because~~ of his ~~complete~~ complete identity

with his people in nature and experience. I think that you will agree with me that that is not a correct statement for the thought of Hebrews. But ^{Torrey} Torrey continues following out this thought, feeling that a recognition of this fact must exist in the Old Testament obtains it through the literal verbal exegesis of the time. To this quotation he added another/ⁱⁿ which his exegesis is still one force. Well now is ^{Torrey's} Torrey's interpretation correct in this verse here?

Now of course we, all of us are predisposed to think it is not. But I fear that the interpretation of a good many godly people of New Testament quotations from the Old Testament would find to be pretty much along the line of Torrey's suggestion. That is they just take it as a few words taken out of context and applied to something to which you would find nothing in the Old Testament context as suggested by Torrey. And we want to see whether the New Testament writers actually ever do that sort of thing. Well now Torrey says the next one is still more important. Now you notice the next verse says, and again I will put my trust in Him. and Again, Behold I am the ^{children} ~~child~~ of which God has given. Now can somebody else, can somebody say quickly what about the textual evidence of that ~~second~~ and again, verse 13. Is there any question on it? ^{Torrey} Torrey simply omits it and in his Greek he puts it in brackets. He reads, he translates it simply, I will trust in him, behold I am the children whom ~~of~~ God has given. Student: (4)/ MacRae: There is no evidence of any textual evidence at all. Well now here is an interesting fact, in Isaiah 17 and 18, in the Septuagint, there is an interesting fact that in Isaiah 17 and 18 in the Septuagint, it reads, I will trust in him but then there is more to the verse. Then it says, behold ~~and~~ I and the children whom God has given. Now the Septuagint here has exactly the same words which Hebrews has. I will trust him. ' But has it in the, it has the order turned around, the two words but exactly the same word, It has it ~~as~~ at the beginning of the previous verse. Well now the Hebrew says, I will hope in him which is not very remote from bible customs. (5) again, he is simply is quoting/^{one}verse and going on to the next. But it suggests in its entirely different and unrelated prediction. And that little ~~the~~ phrase, I will trust in him, is here if it stands

all alone, what does it mean if it isn't part of the same quotation as the last part of the verse. Well it is a question I wish you would think about before next time. In that I will trust in him, a third quotation that is a second of three or is it a part of the second one? There being only two. I note there is just one of three, just what is its relevancy to the argument. What is its connection? And if so, where is it taken from. I wish you would study that a little bit. Well now Torrey simply takes it as one as a part of the third, of the one quotation. Taking just ~~one~~^{two} instead of three. And he points out that in , he considers that this is a quotation from Isaiah 8, this next one, Behold I am the children which God hath given me. in which he says Isaiah is speaking of himself and his children, who have symbolic names

(6) a remnant shall return and hasten the spoil bury the booty . And he adds a final paragraph in which he says the epistle, ignoring the historical sense of the words takes a part of the sentence and puts into it a Messianic meaning which it might thus isolate it conceivably there. The author is probably lead to this view by following a faulty punctuation of the Sept ugent which puts a full stop after God has given them. And thus the speaker, the "I" is severed from the connection might in this ^{somewhat} obscure package seem to one on the lookout for types and allegories and hidden predictions to be in the Messiah. Hence are inferred in the epistle the oneness of Jesus and his people and the necessity of the incarnation in the Messiah. The prophet it held to say is one with his children in order ^{to be one with them and} to take on himself their nature . Now look at this eighth chapter of Isaiah I don't ^{feel} think-I should spend as much time with it on it here as I might like to but we will go into it more fully about next January in the Prophets ~~Course~~ in January or February. And that ^{fully} being the case, we wouldn't want it to repeat here/what we will do there. But we want to look into it in some extent, so look up some of these quotations and ~~write~~ the things that we won't properly deal with here. Maybe we will be satisfied to look at them rather briefly and note one or two aspects since we will go into them fully in the prophets course so soon. And of course in here who have already graduated have

already had it in the Prophets course. But then look at those and get some ideas about them, in those quotations in those two verses and particularly think about this one, I will put my trust in him. Where does it come from if it is not part of that same one. And then go on and look at Chapter 3 and I think you might look into chapter 4 also because there are not many quotations in 3 or 4 and so we may be able to go a little bit faster next time. Unless we spend a long time of course on these two quotations here. Which I don't think we will do, so we will continue there next time. I hope I have everybody's report or if I don't please get them to me. (End of H 21)

(Begin H 22) I would say, if you are taking it for only one hour of undergraduate credit that you would want to review the work in class. And perhaps that is all you could do in that case because then you only have one hour of study to do, and to review the two hours work in class. I should think everybody should review the work in class. That would be tremendously important. You have in mind what was done in class before or what we have discussed before at earlier classes that would be helpful in connection with the whole subject that might come in, that is we discuss something now. Something we discussed a month ago or two months ago, maybe to go back to them. And then the next thing after that the next thing I would say is to get the passages so well in mind ~~that~~ in the original. The Hebrew and the Greek. Especially those points of form and vocabulary, which would throw light on the subject under consideration. That would be the second thing. And then after that, personally I think your own direct study is the most valuable thing you can do. That is take the passages ~~we have~~ studied ~~by~~ the problems, try to figure out your solution to the problems we have. Or not necessarily that you are sure that this is the answer, or if you can think of two or three possible answers, get all the reasons you can and then figure each one, so you will have the situation well in hand and then the next thing is to look at commentaries and discussions and see what they have to say. And I think there is a, when you get into that you may spend quite a little while in a book and find out it was a waste of time. You may on the other hand get into one and find out it tremendously valuable. But what you are trying and learning is all helpful to you as to methods as well

as to material and helps you in later studies and then if you have suggestions from your studies, I think it would be fine if you would bring them into class here and if you find points which you think are helpful and if you find some commentary which you find not much useful or some particularly useful, bring the world in for all. That would be valuable. Now, we were today, going to continue our discussions of these two quotations at the end of the second chapter of Hebrews. Dr. Buswell gave us a discussion of the general meaning of the superiority of Jesus to the angels. And then we had two quotations in verses 12 and 13 quotations which I read you what ^{to} Torrey said and I want to read you again what he said. Professor Torrey of Harvard, a good many years ago when one of the primary considerations of Harvard was study of Old Testament teachings and New Testament teachings although it was done primarily for the purpose of showing Christianity as historically held was not true. But yet there was a much greater interest in some subjects than you would find today in any great university in this country. Of course the same is true in Germany 50 years ago, 60 years ago the primary subjects in all the German universities were of the New and Old Testaments. It remains right up to very recently. A subject of greater interest there than remains in this country in general. But a good bit of the interest had disappeared as people lost faith in the Bible as being the word of God. Now we notice how this quotation was introduced. The writer said both he that sanctified and ~~both~~ they who were sanctified are all one for which (4) he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying I will declare thy name unto my brethren in the midst to the church will I sing praise unto thee. What is he trying to prove here in verse 12, Mr. Black what would you think he was trying to prove? MR. Black: for Christ. MacRae: For what purpose? How does it fit into the argument? Black: To show that he, that Christ has (4 1/2) to 4 3/4) MacRae: He is showing a way then the superiority of humanity to the angels is he not, in the one regard. Though the angels have got a superior power, there are human qualities that are superior to anything the angels have. And Christ took on himself the seed of

man, not the seed of angels. And ~~it~~ exalts man as well as exalts Christ. It shows us the fault of worshipping angels, that Christ and Him alone should be worshipped. Well, now does this verse prove it, verse 12, I will declare thy name to my brethren. Well it does if the one that sanctifies says it doesn't it, but it doesn't otherwise. If God says, I will declare thy name to my brethren, then that proves that we are his brothers. If Christ says it it proves that we are his brethren. But if Isaiah says it, what does it prove? Nothing at all, it proves that Isaiah was just a man, It doesn't prove anything. If you say, if somebody from Spain speaks of another Spaniard as his brother that is to be expected. If someone from America speaks of a Spaniard as his brother, you might say it shows an idea of world brotherhood an interest beyond national frontiers and you could build something on it so it is a very very vital question here, who said this. It is quoted from the Old Testament but you can't take everything from the Old Testament is what God says because the Old Testament contains a great many things representing human ideas, human aspirations. There are many prayers in it addressed to God. The Lord is my shepherd. Does that prove that God is Christ's shepherd? Christ is not speaking, it is man speaking isn't it. The Lord is my shepherd.. shows relation of redeemed humanity to the Lord. It shows nothing of the relation to Christ to the Lord Well now who says this that I will declare thy name to my brethren. In the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee. We notice that Torrey said the Psalm is a cry of deep suffering followed by a strain of thanksgiving to God the personal ~~the~~ experience of a pious Israelite referring to no one but himself. The word might indeed be adopted by an suffering servant of God and therefore by the Messiah. But the epistle accepting the current Messianic interpretation of the Psalm and taking the expression literally and without regard to its context. treats it as an utterance of the Messiah which by the word, my brethren refers to the oneness of Jesus and his disciples. Here again in calling out his spiritual thought that Jesus is a Saviour by reason of his complete identity with his people in nature and experience the author feeling that a recognition of this fact must exist in the Old Testament, obtains it

throughout the literal, verbal exegesis of the time. To this quotation he adds another which ~~this~~ exegesis is still more fully. Now Torrey says here is a prayer, here is a Psalm in which a man praises God for having helped him and he says he is going to declare God's name in the midst of ~~this~~ brethren. Well, now for the author of Hebrews to take that quotation and to prove that Christ calls human beings brothers, if Torrey's interpretation of the Psalm is right is utter nonsense so far as thing being the word of God then, it is not even the word of an intelligent man. Untelligent interpretation is misleading interpretation. just grab a few words to prove anything you want. If you want to do that, you can prove anything at all by the Bible. Well have you any answer to that Mr. Grote. Student: (9) speaking to Isaiah. MacRae: No, this isn't Isaiah, this is Psalm 22, Student: Oh, But it doesn't say anything about the Psalm though it is that David was so filled with the leading of the spirit of God as he wrote that what he put down was not only his own experience, he put down even more than he himself experienced because these were words that could be applied to Christ. MacRae: He did put down what he himself experienced. Student: Yes, that is David's approach, this is David's experience because he was ~~en~~ by the spirit, he puts down more than what David himself had gone through because the spirit realizes (10) MacRae: So then according to that interpretation, Psalm 22 is a Psalm in which David tells of some sorrow and misery to pass through and how God rescued him from sorrow and ~~miser~~ and consequently it is a human exertion of praise to God for deliverance. ~~///~~ But the suggestion is made in this human expression there is also a recognition of something referring to Christ and ~~who is to~~ ~~///~~ to know which human experience has something applied to Christ and which don't. We can go through anything we find and if we like the idea of applying it to Christ, and what we don't like we ~~///~~ don't have to apply and we have no foundation on which to stand,, you may as well lay the Bible aside and just make it up out of your head. There is no authority to it if you can interpret it that way. Dr. Buswell looks as if he doesn't agree with me. Dr. Buswell: (laughs) Well, I think I do. there is nothing in this Psalm which couldn't apply to Christ but there is

in the 69th Psalm. The Psalm which confess of sin. Suppose that ~~he/pt/pt/pt/pt~~ the teaching of Christ ~~is~~ regard as to who are his brethren. (11) out of it a direct statement of Christ about who are his brethren and he calls his associated who have to him definitly his brethren. And he in the will undoubtley think that Gods psalm and apply it to the company along with the rest of them. So that even though ~~4~~ you don't absolutely take the Psalm and direct prediction, which I think would be taken, so this author knows that Christ did call his people brethren and Christ did ~~not~~ do the work of the Psalm ~~and~~ in his contact with his people. ~~1/1~~ MacRae: Well, that is a rather round about way of proving things. DR. Buswell: Well I think that you hve to recognize the 69th Psalm is not a direct prediction although it is 12 anology. MacRae: Well that is another problem. Buswell: That is another problem. There is nothing in Psalm 22 that coun't apply to Christ. Beaause there is no conviction of sin there or anything else. It wouldn't fit. MacRae: Well now if a , if the author of Hebrews wanted to prove that Christ was not ashamed to call his men brethren, couldn't he say, Peter said, one day' Christ said to him, we read in Mattheu, Christ said to him, he could easily quote a verse , quote a statement Chrsit made and that would prove about Christ But why quote a verse from the Old Testament or if he does it, why not say, we remeber how often when Christ was on earth, he quoted these words, or do you mean that is just assumed. Buswell: Well consequentially that is waht it means Christ calls us brethren, using the word of the 22nd Psalm. I imagine that was a new experience to them all. I'm not arguing that the 22nd Psalm isn't a prediction of prophecy, MacRae: But ~~4~~ you are arguing that even if it wasn't, even if it were not, that this could be a (13) that this author writng at the time that he wrote might be referring to the fact that Chrsit used this Psalm when he was here. MacRae: You mean also when you use the Isaiah type. Buswell: Yes, MacRae: And Chrsit having quoted the Old Testament applyed it to himself, lyou could use these passages from the Old Testament in that case to prove a relation of Christ with his people even regardless of any, whether the Old Testament orgginally meant that at all. Buswell: We know

that Chrsit in calls his people brethren and we quote many of these scriptures and this might possible be referring to that. Student: But do we know that he quoted it (14) MacRae: He ~~might~~ quote some parts of it . but I don't think we have any evidence that he quotes this one but we now he ^{qu}otes some part of it. S_tudent: Then in other words there is no an argument. Everybody know that Chrsit said theis so MacRae: Yes, it would be trying to prove that you shouldn't ~~use~~ work as angels by reminding you of the fact that the Lord of the universe when he was on earth here, put himself in our class rather than in the class with angles. Yes? Student: Didn't you say last week that if a Psalm or a different passage is shosen to be told to be partly Messianic (End of H 22) (Begin H 23) MacRae: Yes, before making a rule that if any' part of a passage is Messanic it all must be, I was one to look at a great many passages. I wouldn't know of nothing on which I could establish that authority. I have a status that I wouldn't want to do it indefinitely. And it would take an examination of a great many passages. I would hesitate on that, I would say that at least if a part of a passage could be Messianic it would suggest that the rest of it is also Messainci unless you see a reason' why there may be a shift in subject. As some explanation for a change or between this part and the other part. But that it would prove it, I would hesitate because there might be some shift. And now in this, this is a very intersting suggestion that each of these quootations here then accordingg to this suggestion then would really be simply trying to prove the oneness of Chrsit and man rater than Christ land angels. "And Christ was not ashamed to call his brother, he did that when he was on earth and then we may say, that if that is the case, perhaps he quoted from a Pslam , the words of a Psalm and the words of Isaiah and you could quote those without really meaning this is what they predict. That is you could use the phrase somewhat use use a phrase and apply it to yourself. You are not applying, originally you are applying a phrase. That can be done provided that nothing here is based upon the Old Testament proving this . It is based upon Christ use of brethren in his relation of this apostle proving it and yet that he quoted phrases from ~~the~~ the Old Testament

That is a possibility. Dr. Buswell: Well on that interpretation, this author is giving us information that you don't otherwise have. MacRae: Yes,

Buswell: ⁽²⁾ ~~Fof/ll/lls/~~ By cross by one phase of Jesus that you don't otherwise have. It is more blessed to give than to receive. Now Paul of Christ, that Christ said that, and that of course is our information. So this author being in the first century. He is not telling us that Christ used to quote this passage when he was with his people. Not at all denying that these are the words of Isaiah in verse 18, but Christ gives to leading to prayer, and says Father here am I and the children thou hast given me. MacRae: Yes. Buswell: Constantly quoting Isaiah but taking it to himself. That is a legal possibility.

MacRae; Yes, that would seem to be a possibility in view of the fact that not much is built upon the (3) . Yes Student: quotations

MacRae: He was Yes, Student: Seems to be no alternative besides Dr. Buswells statement that (3) MacRae: Well, I would

say that the Holy Spirit lead the writer, that is very definite. but the question seems to me is , is he giving us an argument based upon the fact that the old testament proves something. If so, lthan these words in the Old Testament must definitely refer to the Messiah. If he is abasing it on the old Testament.

It must refer to the Messiah and then in that case we can say that the Holy Spirit kept him from error in writing this down whethe he originally revealed it to him or whether he heard the suggestion somewhere or whether he thought it out himself at least the Holy Spirit kept him from error in writing it down so we know it is true. But is that what he means, does he mean, the Old Testament teaches us this therefore we know that the lMessiah and the men are of the same, that ~~the~~ is not ashamed to call them brothers because the Old Testament says so, about the Messiah. Does it mean that? Or the hour of suggestion, is the one that

Dr. Buswell suggests is a possibility, not that he holds it but suggests a possibility ~~not~~ that he is not talking about what the Old Testament proves at all. He is talking about what Christ said when he was on earth here and that Christ, when he was on earth here, used two phrases from the old Testament ~~not~~ using them in the sence of saying the Old Testament ~~pro~~ves this about me

but simply quoting familiar verses. Just like I might say, that you might speak about having a basketball game with a Unitarian Seminary and I might say, well wathh out for entangling alliances. It would be quoting the words of George Washington's farewell address.. Well Washington didn't have in mind a basket ball game with the Unitarian Seminary. (class laughter) ^{He was speaking} But I would of an entirely different matter but I would be ~~be~~ simply using familiar words in such a way that it would ring a bell in your mind the familiar words, even though not alleging that he had anything to do with that. It would be possible that Chríst used Old Testametrn quotations. in that way. Possible, Personally I would be inclined to doubt, that he actually to doubt the fact of it but I think that we must admit the possibility of it. And if you intrepret it in that way in view of the fact that not a great deal is built on the (5 $\frac{1}{2}$) prediction. It would be a possible way to intrepret it and it might be an altogether different if it says, these things were done that it might be fullfilled which is spoken by the prophets. If you find a stztement like that it means the prophets predicted this and now it happened. They made the prediction, now it ~~is~~ fullfilled. That means this and this looks back to that. But this idea, that this is quoting Christ rather than the Old Testament, just an echo of the words of Christ of the Old Testament by Christ is a possibility. But a possibility which we can not deny it is a possibility but we can, we must not hold that it is the only possibility and consequently I wouldn't build anything upon it as an analogy for other intrlepretations. I would rather say we will have to have some good analogies elsewhere before we can be sure that is the way it is done here. But it is a possibility here definitely a possibillty. Now if you can prove in however that there is another possibility the possibility that he is actually quoting the Old Testament, that would fit in better of my personal idea of how the New Testament uses the Old Testament to show the vary thng the Old Testament is talking about. And so lets look at that possibility and see if that can be. Now this first statement is ~~not~~ I will declare thy name to my brethren and the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee. Now Torrey says th~~is~~ is the personal experience of pious Israelite referring to no one but himself. So we go back to the 22nd Psalm

and we ask ourselves does the 22nd Psalm express the personal experience of a ~~Y~~ pious Israeilite referring to no one but himself and it is interesting in this connection to note that Bushenbezer (7 $\frac{1}{2}$) the professor in the Hebrew^{Union}/College in Cinnciniti in his commentary on the Psalms says this 22nd Psalm is really two distinct Psalms which have been united together here He says the last ~~1/3~~^{third} to half of the Psalm is an expræssion of praise to God. By someone who has been in great sorrow but God has wonderfully blest. Now the first part of it, the first 2/3 of it, he says is an expression which is made by a man who is in the Macabean time. within a dungekn and there he was tied in the dungeon and he had throngs ajoundd his haddis and his feet which pierced close tight into his hands and feet and left disagreeable marks on them that they held him tied there in the jungle and there in the jungle he used to fancy he heard the noises of animals round about and all sorts of misery such as described in this here. And this is the expression of terror and misery of a man who died in a jungle who died in a dungeon in bbe Macabean times and in someway the account was smuggled out of his prison house. and so this got into the Psalm this is one song and the other is the other song and the tow have been united in the book. In other words Footenbezer (9) thlnks it rather impossible that one man can have written the two parts of the song , the tow parts are very, very different. For about twenty verses you have sorrow and misery and then you have joy and lhappiness in the last part of it. and the sorrow and misery is such it would seem to lead to death such is pretty hard to figure as being actually experienced by a man who actually escaped out. And he doesn't see how the two could have been written by one man. The thought is very different. This mäsery and sorrow of hisheart and this greatt joy and rejoicing at the last. Now the heading says a Psalm of David. Now did David ever have experience with such described here? Did David go through the experiences described in these first 20 verses? Well, if you take one experience in one part of Davids life and another in another and another in a different one and try to get a little bit from each and fit them together, lyou can perhaps find an allegory for most separtate sections of it although most of it is rather

difficult. But just any one expericen of David is very similiar to all that is here described. It is pretty difficult to think on. Don't really know what it could be or what it could apply to. And it is pretty hard to think of David is writing the last part too, because the last part is so tremendous to think that the ~~last part~~ ^(10 1/2) declared and the last part going to happen. It is pretty hard to see where in Davids life you would expect like that of himself. You remember that when one quotation was given from David said to Peter on the day of Pentecost he said David said in (10 1/2) his tomb is with us. This can't apply to him. But he said David forseeing Chrsit, spoke of Christ and one commentary by a very Godly man, a great scholar takes those words of Peter and twists them around to mean the exact opposite I don't know how he ever does it. but he does. But here in this case, it is pretty hard to say that this is Davids experience. This 22nd Psalm. It doesn't seem to fit David. It doesn't fit anybody else we know of. It is an experience which would seem to be a compositive experience, little details from many parts of one mans life or from different peoples life and why should all these details be put together It doesn't make much sense this 22nd Psalm unless you take it as a direct specific prediction of the sufferings of Chrsit and the glory that it to follow. And if you take it as that, the first one one verse seems to fit exactly the sufferings of Christ. Now once in a class I think I took 6 or 8 hours going through the ~~psalm~~ psalm in detail and we can hardly do that in this course but and I imagine in the fourth course you will how many years (12)

but we can note a few things in it here as we glance at it, how very aptly it fits Christs experience on the cross but what a description of him forsaken and despised of men, people passing by, shaking their heads saying He trusted the Lord to deliver him, let him deliver him seeing he delighted in it. When did that ever happen in Davids life? And then the reference in verse 9 right away, Thou art he that took me out of the womb. Thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mothers breat. The reference to the mother this way is possible for anyone but it would be a frequent reference to the remarkable natlure of Christs birth it fits in with it. It fits in with it very definitely

the reference to his mother. I was cast upon thee from my womb, thou art my God from my mothers belly and then telling about the wickedness round about him, gazing upon him with their mouths and then the description of the crucifixion which certainly was unknown centuries after Davids time. I am poured out like water all my bones are out of joint. My heart is like wax. It is melted in the midst of my bowels. You could say all this was figuratively language for somebody in misery but it certainly literally fits the situation at the crucifixion. Strength dried up like a posserd ^{my} tongue cleave to my jaw remember how he called out in thirst, Thou hast brought me into the dust of death for ^{dogs have compassed me} ~~and~~ to ~~accept~~ ^{accept} ~~the~~ ⁽¹⁷⁾ the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me me they have pierced my hands and my feet. Now of course the Hebrew doesn't say they pierced my hands and my feet. But that is what the Greek says. The English says it and the Greek says it. ~~Interpret~~ and what does the Hebrew say? Who can tell us? Student: MacRae: Yes. Now what sense does that make? For ^{dogs have compassed me} ~~and~~ to ~~accept~~ ^{accept} ~~the~~ ⁽¹⁷⁾ the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me like a line in my hands and my feet. It makes absolutely no sense and of course on law transcriptional probabilities is the difficult reading is the right one. that doesn't mean that and 14 reading is the right one. You can copy a thing and you can make an error that we use as a and that doesn't mean that that nonsensical reading is the correct one. When you find that you have ^{this upon the} ~~correct~~ ^{of} of the morning as the title of this Psalm and you have the bulls of Bashan and you have the dogs you have all these animals around, the unicorn, is right after it. It is very easy and the dogs right before it. it is very easy to see what is described could take a word and could miscopy it and get an extra line there and those who insist that the lion belongs there that it is like a lion still feel that some ^{verb} ~~word~~ must apply. A verb is absolutely necessary. They will say that the verb is just assumed. well what is assumed. Like a lion ~~my~~ hands and feet. What does a lion do to your hands and feet? They can do anything chewed them off. It couldn't be so far off from pierce after all. Is ~~the~~ ^{verb} ~~word~~ ^{verb} Dug my hands and my feet. There is a verb which (15) it doesnot fit exactly but approximately

which types similiar to the word which is conjested son of man. It would seem to me that the septugent rendering here was made well before the time of Christ probalby a century or two. It has (End of H 23)

(Begin H 24) Student: MacRae: Yes, at least it would seem to me that Hebrew must originally have some verb here. It would make no sense. You can not say, you can't simply supply the previous words, dogs have ~~assess~~// compassed me the assembly of the wicked have inclosed^{'like a}me/lion they have ~~blotted~~// hands and my feet. It makes no sense. Like a lion they have inlosed me, like a lion they hzve compassed me. It requires a different type of verub altog~~ether~~ And so it would seem to be requ~~ired~~ to be accept and Jerome has translations here and would not prove that he had a manuscript ^{that said it} and ~~it~~//but it would certainly be a point in that direction, a look in that direction if he had a statement that a manuscript said it then ~~in that direction~~// you would khave definite proof. Without such a commetn on it it is possibel that we follow the Septugent. But if only had a statment would be good (1½) Well now the, then

I may tell all my bones, they look and stare kpon me and even this specific note of Christs crñfixation they cast my garments among them they cast lots upon my vesture and then the plea goes on be not far from me O lord Omy strenth haste to deliver me. Deliver my soul~~s~~ from the sword, my darling from the power of the dog. Save me from the lions mouth and then that verse 21 is translated in our authorized version in such a way ^{that it} ~~as to~~ makes absolute no sense at all.

I don't know what was in the mind of the translators of the authorized version when they made this translation. But on earth does it mean, for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns? The only possible sense I could get out of that was to imagine God throne as somewhere where there were horns of unicorns around and then(class laughter) leave it there. Thou hast heard me from thy throne in heaven. Thou ~~hast~~ heard me from the horns of the unicorns. If the horns of the un~~pr~~ons was a term representing his throne. But now, ~~z~~how is it literally in the Hebrew Mr. ? Student: MacRae: I hope most of you do, it is pretty hard to discuss it without having Mr. Black will ~~to~~ you

Poetry, Even now and then you will find that a line in the way we print our English poetry. A line will be half way through and you will skip down below and start the middle of the line and go on. ^{Because you have} We have a break of thought, a break of a paragraph another speaker, in a play or something like that and yet you complete your line, that way, if there is a sharp break in the middle of the line. We very often do that. Well now that would seem to be what happened here. We come to a point where ~~we~~ you expect the line to be finished and then you show the suddenness and the shortness of the transition by making your break right in the middle of the line and of course / and of course how they word it originally whether it goes right straight along a long line or whether they have a line straight down, how it weakens (4) .

But at least it makes perfect sense here. If you make your break one word before the end of that verse. And you have got a sharp transition in any event. You have to recognize that sudden unexplained transition. And of course if you put this / transition, it explains it . If you don't, suppose you change it and instead of thou hast heard me, suppose you change it to deliver me. Save me from the lions mouth deliver me from the horns of the unicorn ~~that~~ / I will declare thy name unto my brethren , in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee. Ye that fear the Lord praise him for he has not despised ~~the~~ / ^{affliction of the} nor abhorred the / afflicted. There is no recognition of the change. There is no explanation of that, just a sharp change from the situation of misery to the situation of God. And there is a change which fits just exactly with the suddenness with which the realization of the resurrection flashed upon the disciples mind when they had thought everything was ruined, Christ was killed and all their hopes were ended and suddenly they realized, No! he was raised from the dead in newness of life and a wonderful joy was upon them. And the suddenness and sharpness of it here is, fits in with the impression made upon his people as the sorrow was suddenly changed into joy and rejoicing. And so it is a wonderful prediction of his death and of his resurrection. The resurrection might describe / ^{but} the suddenness / ^{of the joy} and the greatness of the joy well in mind. And then we go on and in the last part of the Psalm I don't think has received from

the general which in anyth ng more than which it deserves. The first part of the Psalm is one of lthe best known of all lthe Psalms because of the wonderful picture of Christs crucifixation. But the last part is just as wonderful a picture. Imagine David saying this or imagine some pious Israel saying this God is/ has heard him.. Alright, God has ~~heard~~ heard him. Therefore you that fear the Lord praise him. All she seed of Jacob glorify him and because he is not despised ~~therefore the/f//~~ nor ~~bope/ty~~ abhored the afflicted. Verse 26, the ^k meet shall eat and be satisfied. They shall praise the Lord that seek him and all the ends of the world will remember and turn unto the Lord. All the kindreds and nations will worship beforethee. Why will alllthe ends of the world turn unto the Lord? Because some pious Israelite has been delivered out of some troubel. That is rather silly. He was an eglemania (6 $\frac{1}{2}$) to think such a thing. All of this was going to happen because I got deliverance. Because I was rescued from misery. Even David will be certainly be going beyond any reason because he was delivered from out of some sorrow. Or even because he was rescued from Absolom and brough back to his kingdom and therefore all the ends of the world are going to remember and turn to the Lord. And all the kindreds of the nations will worship before the Lord. It is very estreemed. It requires a reason sufficient to justify such . Nothing of an ordinary nature like that. No matter how tremendous the change in one persons life no one human being would justify by a rescue which he has touched tremendous phrases with this. All they that be found on the earth will eat and worship because David was rescued. so , because an ordinary pious Israelite uttered so. All they that go down to the dust shall before him and none can keep alive his own store. A ~~seed~~ shall serve him. We read in Isaiah 53 that who can declare this generation for he will put off on the land of Israel For here we find, a seed shall serve him. Here an account of this deliverance there is going to be a seed, there is going to be a prosperity, there is going to be a continuence on of those who are worshipping God as a result of what he has done. A seed shall serve him and it will be accounted to the Lord for a generation. They shall come and shall deliver his righteousness unto a

are received into his kingdom and become members of this church and declare the name of God and Gods wonderful salvation. So that I feel that on correct intrepertation of Psalm 22 ~~there is a word~~ ^{that the words of} Torrey are utterly out of place here. Where he says the ^{pride, the} personal experience of ~~ap~~ pious Israelite, referring to noone but himself. SI would say it is the personal experience of Jesus Christ referring to no one but himself and he said , he says that the author feeling that a recognition of this fact must exist in the Old Testament as p(12) as the literal verbal exegesis of his time. I don't think that this is a case of that at all. To this quotation he adds another in which his exegesis is still more fully at false. Well, now we look at the next one and the, Yes? Student: a feeling of or David, and we wonder well what kind of a kind was Davids anyway I mean was it pure dictation by the Holy Spirit or what was it. MacRae: Yes that is a very interesting question. We do not know. Is it possible that God can predict that , is it possible that he caused David to have some kind of a trance maybe to get these thoughts or is is possible that he caused David to bring up sort of a(13) to bring up experiences form his own life or from the lives of people he had known. And th nking of this and that and that ohter sort of sorrow and misery and putting it all together in(13½) and we don't know just how the spirit works but the result was that what we have is a definite, exact, specific prediction. Student: Would you say it is possib~~le~~ that David knew exactly what this had reference to. MacRae: Hardly. Well even in that case did God say today I am now going to give you a prediction of the Messiah. Here it is, write it down, or did God say I am going to give you a vision of the Messiah. You in imagination passed through this experience and write it down. representing that which I have given about the Mess~~iah~~. ^{We don't know that we have} / But the result/is ~~that~~ (14½) and the wonderful prediction of the Messiah. And of course it is true that as probably as we have all heard this information that we have today and consequently/^{the ordinary} intrepreators and not who hsn't studied the prohets in general Think of a ~~man~~ ~~sitting~~ sitting down and wriging anything he is apt to think like but if he thinks logically (15)

NOT PLAIN

people that shall be born that he shall have done this. Will you read us that from the Hebrew, Mr. Stewart please? Verse 31, a literal translation of verse 31. Student, MacRae: or verse 32. (9) MacRae: The prediction of the right of the Christian church. You have Jews and Gentiles before and now you have Jews and Gentiles and the church of God a new people born ~~born~~ from both. And this new people must be born, must come ~~into~~ into as a result of what he has done as a result of his death. And (9½)

Now these are a few of the many things that can be found on close study of the Psalm for one sees how neither ~~the~~ the first part nor the last part fits any ordinary pious Israelite or fits the prophet David. But it is a direct specific exact prediction of the sufferings of Christ and ~~of~~ of the glory that is to follow. A wonderful prediction of it with point after point exactly and remarkably fitting with Christ's death and his resurrection and the result that flowed out from it and not (10) . And so that being the case this twenty-second Psalm ^{being} exactly ~~is~~ that, then it is not the least bit out of place to quote from it the words I will declare thy name unto my brethren in the midst of the church will I pray thee . To quote those words as from the Lord Jesus Christ, even a part from any knowledge ^{of whether} ~~as~~ he personally and previous to his death applied them to himself. Of course we know that after his death we are told in Luke 24 that he went through beginning at ^{Moses} ~~the~~ and the prophets in ~~the~~ the Psalms. and here is one of ~~your~~ Psalms. He took the things that ~~quite~~ ^{pointed to} ~~quite~~ ~~of~~ himself and explained them to the disciples so doubtless he ~~was~~ explained it then. But in ~~this~~ particular case I personally am quite convinced not a matter of Christ using terminology which occurred somewhere in the Old Testament was familiar as he could very easily have done. But in this case it is an instance ~~of~~ his deliberately quoting from what is a specific and a direct prediction of his death and his resurrection. And in the midst of that quotation, he refers to his ~~people~~ as his brethren. I will declare ~~thy~~ thy name unto my brethren. In the midst of the church will I praise thee. And so the praise of God goes ~~up~~ out to all ~~the~~ world and Jesus Christ declares all those brethren who are saved through him

both experiences. (Laughter) Because you think just a little bit more and I don't know how the Macabeen would really have experience on the first part and I don't know why any of you Student: (15)

(End of H 24) (Begin H 25)

... except that I would say that the idea of finish is an idea that is in it but it is not the . It is like if you say done. Now done you can Mean just anything or you can mean Your interest can be on that and not Now the Hebrew is like that. The Hebrew may be used

ist is rather abrupt. Both, The job is done. The job is ended. Both may be used with the word done. It depends on which you have in mind. when you use. Well now the son of Christ, wouldn't that be not necessarily just finished. Wouldn't that be of the idea that it is affected the purpose accomplished, would say that could be possible, Dr. Buswell?

Dr. Buswell: (1) I don't get the point. MacRae: Well the word that it DR. Buswell: (Greek words) MacRae: That the Lord, But the Lord you see is not in the Hebrew. Buswell: is is simply the word that types MacRae: On the cross. Buswell:

MacRae: translate sentences in the Hebrew Buswell: I didn't get the question. the 22nd Psalm. MacRae: Well it is simply this that the 22nd Psalm, begins, I mean that Christ on the cross begins to say, with the words of the 22nd Psalm My God, my God why hast thou forsaken me? The last words he says, are it is finished. Buswell: Yes, that is not written in Hebrews of the Psalms (2)

(Greek)

MacRae: People must be born because it is done. And then Christ had the end of that which was going to produce this new to people and was going to bring people into his kingdom and end the wonderful things here in the Word Buswell; But it isn't the things said at the time it is done and victory and as to so Christ couldn't be taken that from the last verse of the Psalm. MacRae: Well the suggestion, I believe it is Spurgeon in the 22nd Psalm is a possibly a prediction in advance of the

(This part of record is very indistinct)

~~105~~

meditation of Chrst on the cross as he describes the experience and calls out in agony and calls out My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me.. They are the very words used and goes on and describes the circumstances which are around about him and the situation exactly the same, and then his thoughts turns forwards to the resurrection which is just ahead as he recites the last part of the Psalm and declares the joy of the result of that which is now being done. And the wonderful results that are to come and then at the very end the last thing he cries is It is finished. and gives up the ghost. That is the words in between which said to himself, I don't know where that is originally quoted but Spurgeon has made a suggestion of it and it doesn't seem to me we can say it dogmatically

MacRae: There is the possibility of

the improbable. MacRae: Well, I'm not sure I put things wrong there. (Ladd

class laughter) Student: It is very definite that the Psalms is speaking very definitely of the resurrection. MacRae: Yes. and there is ^{Possibly a} ~~a possibility~~ difficulty with his with his quoting on the cross, that word, but it doesn't seem to be

I think anyone would be very foolish to say dogmatically say Chrst ~~he~~ recited the whole Psalm on the cross but when you begins with the whole quoaation of the whole verse of the Psalm on the cross and then when his last thought can represent the thought of the last words, why it seems to me that it is perhaps not a follow up but that it is a kpossibility and I don't think i'd tell it as an improbability. (class laughter) because it fits the whole situation so accurately. The only difficulty of it is that ~~the~~ the last half of the last ~~part of the~~ the third of the Psalm is dealing with the ressurrection which had not occured. And for lhat reason whether he would just say, it is finished with the thought of this 5 done here , well, to my notion, now perhaps I'm going to be worng. This is getting into Theology rather than to Old Testament but to my notion it is the crucifixation , the suffering of Chrst on the cross that made the atonement , That is Christ came to this earth to die. He didn't come to this earth to be raised from the dead. He came to die. His resurrection from the dead is the earnest, is the sign that the redemption is accomplished it is the evidence that the ransom is paid. It is proof that his death

~~Lab~~

Page 2 of

H 25

5 1/2 depts

accomplished the thing that was to be accomplished but the deed is the

Now if that is the case, then the thing that we are declaring to the will, that he died for our sins and in his resurrection he has given proof of the fact that his death accomplished that which it was to accomplish and that he has as a result of his death, produced for all of us the possibilities of newness of life. / Dr. Buswell: I agree with that it is our understanding. Now if it is finished means that the propitiation that means completed, if that is what he said, then I think it couldn't be the 22nd Psalm because the 22nd Psalm doesn't dwell upon the ecstasy of the atonement but on the definite resurrection of Christ and his victory and deliverance. MacRae: But the last three verses are to the atonement are the not, of the 22nd Psalm, All they that go down in the dust shall bow before me none can ~~keep alive~~ / his own soul, the only way anyone can be kept alive is by bowing down before him A seed shall serve him as a result of the atonement

Buswell: The result MacRae: Yes, it was the atonement that accomplishes it. It gives us new life. It makes a new creation. They shall come and shall declare his righteousness unto a people that it to be born. What will they declare that he has profound the atonement. Student: ~~Buswell~~: That how will be raised from the dead. (Class laughter). We have placed all the emphasis of all the reaching back to the resurrection of the dead. MacRae: Proving the fact that his death is that the case, is it not? The great news that he arose from the dead and proves that he had not died in vain. but that his death did win us the deliverance 7 1/2. Now it is to my notion that the resurrection from the dead is the wonderfully ~~proof~~ proof. But the thing that is the means of our salvation is ~~the~~ the atonement of the death, And the resurrection is the proof that the death was effective. It is the outworking of the death but the defeating of Satan (8). And paying the ransom and making us new creatures is the result of the death of Christ. I can't feel it is infallible. (class laughter).. ~~But~~ I'm not ready to necessarily to say it is ~~probable~~ probable but it seems to me that perhaps it is as near probably than improbable. (Loud class laughter) Maybe next time we can

- ~~of~~ -

discuss it a little further. But then the rest of you think about it too because there may be other implications and other relationships to it that we aren't thinking about but I at present would feel ready to say and affirm that it may be that this is the mediation, the very mediation which our Lord said on the cross and that when he came to the last words of the mediation that he cried out in joy, it is done. BYes, Student: What about (8)

Well, in one sense ~~it is~~ ~~the~~ ~~at~~ the atonement is always to Christ, the active as well as the passive (9) You might say the sharp edge of the atonement is the defeating sake through giving his life as it is for a ransom and the resurrection, I would say is a (9½) and the outworking of it and the fulfillment of it but that the actual death is the doom of his

Student: MacRae: Yes, I would say so, Yes, I would say that the proof that gives us new life is the proof that he had new life. That he is raised again for our justification, would mean that he is raised again to show to us the fact that we can be justified through his death. To prove it, that our justification, I wouldn't think was based on his resurrection, but based on his death. To prove by his resurrection. Is that at all reasonable or not Dr. Buswell

Buswell: There is another way of thinking that the having accomplished our justification. It being a past fact. If he had completed our justification, he was raised. MacRae: Yes, that is you don't feel the resurrection is what gives us the justification. Buswell: No.

MacRae: But the resurrection either follows justification or the justification. Buswell: The atonement was finished when he died on the cross The atonement was not made on the grave. The atonement was not made in the garden of the resurrection. The atonement was finished. MacRae: Then when he said it is finished. Buswell: I think he meant the atonement was finished.

But then it would hardly make it possible for me to see that he means the Psalm is finished. Because the Psalm goes on. MacRae: Yes, but the thing that is declared is he was done, what he had done. what he had finished and of course the resurrection is the proof of it. It is a very important part of it. Student: I just wondered where you got this book of Spurgeon

MacRae: Where? It was about 1926 that I arrived and I got this book. Class laughter

Buswell: The Treasurerly of David, MacRae: Yes, that would be my guess this far after that ~~forall~~ all I could go is guess. I don't recall?

Student:(11 1/2 to 12) MacRae: We are given the fact that he started in Aramaic. Now to, Student: Well "it is finished" isn't in the Aramaic?

MacRae: No, all the other cries that he gave on the cross, are written in Greek. ~~They~~ // ~~but~~ // But does that mean that he said them in Greek? We don't know. Ordinarily, he certainly spoke Aramaic. His ordinary prayer was doubtless given in Aramaic rather than Greek but they are given in Greek in our account and I would think it would be very likely that when the 12 1/2 wrote they took the translating into Greek as a rule the Lord should be his death. And in that case they probably would have translated that also except that some people would say he falsely lied and the misconception of the people wouldn't be evident unless they quoted it so that for that reason they quoted in the (12 1/2 to 13) If I am telling

experiences that I have had in Germany I will ordinarily give them in English. And just translate but if there is a ^{point} ~~change~~ where it has something termed upon the sound of a word, ~~it~~ then I would have to quote it in the German. That is of course one thing which makes a small difference some time in parables where two gospels write the same parable. They may be two different Greek translations and the original and ~~the~~ no Aramaic given and both might be both equally doubtful, that the translation is the same (very indistinct)

Well, do we need more time on Psalm 22 now or shall we pass on and possibly Dr. Buswell will have some more thoughts he has a long trained system (13 3/4) muddle over this abit. Buswell: Isaiah sto be very interesting

MacRae: Well I once took or 6 or 8 hours on it but it has been a long time ago. I have forgotten a lot of (class laughter) but more fully in this class because you will all have it doubtless in the fourth course. But I just wanted to bring out a few important aspects of it. (And Well shall we turn on for now and then come back to this later. I don't know

13 1/2 - 14 1/2
NOT
PLAIN

quite how to reach you but Isaiah here because he has a place in
 and I think that possibly the last paragraph, yes, (End of H 25)
 (Begin H 26) ¹⁰⁷ Torrey says in the last paragraph, the epistle ignoring the
 historical sense of the word, takes a part of the facts and puts them in
 a Messianic meaning which it might just isolate conceivably there. The owner
 was lead to this view by following a faulty translation of the Septuagint
 which puts a full stop after 'God has given.' and thus the speaker, the I
 is severed from the connection, might in a somewhat obscure passage seem to
 one the lookout for types and allegories and hidden predictions to be the
 Messiah. Hence are inferred in the epistle to oneness of Jesus and his people
 and the necessity of the incarnation of the Messiah. Now the quotation here
 in Hebrews he has just said for both he that sanctifies and they that are
 sanctified are all of one for which Christ, he is not ashamed to call them
 brother. Saying, I will declare thy name unto thy brethren in the midst of
 the church will I sing praise unto thee and again I will put my trust in him
 and again ~~the~~ $1\frac{1}{4}$ and the children which God hath given me. Now that sounds
 like three quotations, but if it is three quotations, I don't see what the
 second one has to do with it. Do any of you have any ideas on that?
 What the connection, if there are three connections, what does the second one
 prove? Student: It seems like it is an individual, a human being or man that
 destruction of God. He is so much wondered then that while he walked on
 this earth he walked as one who instead of man. (1 3/4) MacRae; How
 would that show some other man and not I haven't been able to see any reason
 for it and to me that 'and again' is an interruption there. I was hoping there
 WOULD be some typical references so it didn't belong there but there seems
 to be none. But I don't know what to do with the, ' I will put my trust in thee'
 Maybe someone will think of something that will help. But if you leave out the
 in the middle of the verse then you will have a quotation here from
 Isaiah. Behold I, I will put my trust in him behold I am the children which
 God has given me. And the quotation of course if from Isaiah 8 and we look at
 the exact words there of Isaiah 8. Student: (3)

(3 1/2) I don't know. I don't understand what it means by that maybe

Student: But now here MacRae: But now here Isaiah says, bind up the testimony seal the law of my disciples and I will reign upon the Lord that hides his face from the house of Jacob and I will look for him. Behold I am the children of the Lord hath given me are for signs and wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts which dwells in Mt. Zion. And when they shall say to you Seek unto them that have familiar spirits and of the wizard of the people that mutter , Could not a people speak unto their gods. of the living, of the dead? And ~~with~~ Torrey says of it that the epistle, the authro was probalby led to his view by following the faulty punctuation of the Septugeant which puts a full stop after ' god has given me' . That suggests that this , if you take the whole verse, could have no possible ~~de~~ development for the quotation of Hebrews. In whom I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs

and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts who dwells on Mt. Zion. Now Torrey says that it couldn't possibly make any sense. ~~It~~ ~~says~~ He was misled by the fact that the Septugeant had a period after ~~It~~ behold I am the children whom thou hast given me. And that is a vital question as to relation to Hebarews here. Yes

Student: (6) MacRae: Now is this quotation here was just an ordinary passage from an ordianry book, then we might say well certainly the author is talking abouthimself. What ^{has} does that got to do with the Messiah. What right have you got to write from Messiah. But Torrey says If something is dealing with Isaiah and with his two sons who had named that has meaning for Israel. And they have meaning for the people, Mar _____ and the older son. They have meanings of Gods coming to them upon the nation. Well now that is all he is talking about. He is talking about Isaiah and his sons and his disciples binding up the testimony, the Lords testimony through Isaiah he is willing to save Isarel, Torrye says, Seek out the instructions he says that he always di (7) through lthe admonition to Israel through Isaiah among my disciples. And then follows abruptly the prophets declaration of faith ~~in~~ ? and his ~~announcements~~ that he and his children had been apponted signs, living symbles of the divine will so that ~~there~~ was no need

of the people absorbing through wizards and necromatis. They didn't need to resort to wizards and necromats, they had Isaiah and Shermocic and ^{Maith} ~~Maith~~ ^{herahalahally} two messages men something Isaish gives them some messages from God so there is no need to resort to wizards nor nicromancers. I am the children whom God has given me are signs and omens in Israeil for the of hosts who dwells in Mt. Zion. Now is that all that they mean? Is that necessarily what that means at all? Well, immediately we know that we are not reading an ordinary passage from an ordinary writer, about an ordinary subject. We are dealing with an extra ordinary book, by an extraordinary writer, about a most remarkable subject. What is the subject that Isaiah is discussing. Well, we note that in this book of ~~Isaiah~~, we have a section which most intreporetors, I shouldn't mention it because it is part of your lessons in Prophets for tomorrow, but most intreporetors consider it as a unit. so if you take it as part of your lesson tomorrow is up to you. But some take it as a unit. I will say this, ' regardless of how far back or how far ahead the section is spent. Isaiah said in his ^{9^o} ~~wealth~~, it is a unit, it belongs together, that we can say definite. Said in his ~~we~~ it belongs together, there is no question about it. Well now what is Isaiah 7 to 12 talking about? Well you will find that in practically every commentray on the book of Isaiah, that Isaiah 7 to 12 will be headed with this title. The book of Immanuel. That is the title they will give it. Well why do they give it that title? Is it just because it is mentioned Emmanuel one toward the beginning of it? Wouldn't it be better to call it the book of the ~~book~~ ^{Syriac 9¹/₂} In Invasion, than to call it the book of Immanuel? Well, I don't think so. I think it goes way beyond the Cyril com invasion. It begins with the discussion of Ahaz in its problems and Dr. Goodsby has put it that it looks way on into the future and it looks on into the results of Ahaz ~~chever~~ scheme, stopping the Syriac invasions by getting the Asyrians in it and goes on to the future attacks of the Asyraians and all that. There is a tremendous amount in these chapters. We~~l~~ will probalby take three weeks at least. Two to three weeks we will say on this. these 6 chapters, about next February. And let us call your attention to this now. That the, there

are many subjects here but all through it, one to one theme of Emmanuel. Now you start with chapter 7. And you have here in verse 14, Therefore, the Lord himself will give you a sign, Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son and thou shalt call his name Emmanuel. Well that is not all you have about Emmanuel. Move on to chapter 8, verse 7 and 8, Now therefore behold the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks and he shall flow through Judah and he shall overthrow Judah he shall overflow and go over, he shall reach even to the neck and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land O Emmanuel. (11) Emmanuel is already as possessing the land of Palestine And the coming of the Assyrians through the land which didn't but in the reign of his son Hezekiah as a result of what 11 $\frac{1}{4}$ Emmanuel is a vital character in chapter 8 as well as chapter 7 and then you go on to verse 10 take council together and it shall come to naught seek the word and it shall not stand for Emmanuel because it is in Immanuel's land therefore the Assyrians can not conquer unless God chooses to let him conquer. It is Immanuel's land. Our English translation for God is with us, but there is no is. It simply is Emmanuel. You have had Emmanuel mentioned in chapter 7 and again in verse 8 and again here in verse 10. It is Immanuel's land. Now, then you go on and you get out passages with just looking up verses in 17 and 18 but then chapter 9 begins with the great hope of deliverance from wars, Christ preaches at the beginning of chapter 9, Land of Zebulun and land of Naphtali, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations. The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light, down to verse 6 unto us a child is born. Unto us a son is given and the government shall be upon his shoulder and ~~the~~ the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, and go on to chapter 10, there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse and a branch shall grow out of his roots and that wonderful picture of Christ. In other words, chapter 7 to 12 is just filled with Emmanuel. It is the book of Emmanuel. The whole context is about Emmanuel. Even though in some places

the references are not obvious at first sight, yet upon examining them like those two I pointed out at the beginning of chapter 8 it is quite evident that it is Immanuel he is talking about in dealing. Well, now if that is the case, these 6 chapters are the the book of Immanuel. It is where Isaiah is discussing the Messiah and he shows the Messiah as a rebuke to Ahab. He show the Messiah preaching. He shows the Messiah as the child, the man, the son of God. He shows the Messiah as the one to rule on the throne of David. He shows him as the one who brings the end of wars. He shows all these things about the Messiah Well under those circumstances, why can you say that it is perfectly obvious that when he says behold I am the children whom the Lord hath given me that he is only talking, Isaiah is talking in his own person and not quoting Immanuel. What right do you have? ^{to} ~~do~~ say that. If your whole section is, If Isaiah is giving us a picture of his life, purely dealing with his own heart, why yes you might say it is silly to bring in the Messiah. But when Isaiah is talking verse after verse, section after section in the 6th chapter about the Messiah, why there is at least as much assumption as to the Messiah (14)

as Isaiah does and so we have to take the fact and see what one actually is under consideration. Is it Isaiah or is it Immanuel? (End of H 26)

(Begin H 27) Which is it? Well, now we find that he is discussing here the things that going to happen and there are going to be wars and rumors of wars and there is going to be overfloodings of the earth and chaos and despair as a result of the coming of the Assyrians but he takes them ⁽¹⁴⁾ many of them through the history of this time when Satan is ruling in the world And he show the conditions when people come ^{turn} ~~through~~ to all sort of sources instead of to God. And he tells them to sanctify the Lord of hosts and let him be their God. And he goes on to show that the only hope begins at the coming of the Messiah and his setting up his kingdom and ruling on the throne of David. Well now under these circumstances, he shows that the situation ~~is~~ and the therapy in between I will wait upon the Lord that hides his face from the house of Jacob. And I will look for him. Behold I am the children whom the Lord has given me are for signs and wonders in Israel and the Lord of hosts who

dwells in Mt. Zion. Now you might say that some of this might fit Isaiah because Isaiah was a sign. Well how was Isaiah a sign, Isaiah came and (1) to earth and he declares himself dead. But how was he a sign? And certainly how was he a wonder? Well now the two sons of his, they had names which had meaning. And the one these names they conveyed a meaning. It conveyed the meaning that God was still going to have some mercy on the people and they observe chaos and misery convey these two meanings. But is that sufficient to say that they are signs and wonders in Isareal from the Lord of hosts who dwells in Mt. Zion. It is a pretty strong phrase to express a verily weak thing that they had names that convey meaning and then what is to be done? To seal up the testimony. Bind up the testimony, seal the law and then you have the picture here of people, a group of people who are carrying the testimony of God. Who are ^{presenting} ~~preserving~~ the truth. It is locked up in them. It is kept in them. It is preserved through them and they are the carriers you might say of the kingdom of God to the time when the world around is the kingdom of Satan and they are signs and wonders of a wicked world. Well now for someone stand Isaiah (2 $\frac{1}{2}$) It is a wonderful picture of exactly what the Christian church is. Now of course Isaiah was the Christian ^{but it is Gods people all through the ages, but most particularly in these days} church in these days / that God is with them in the midst of a wicked and perverse generation speaking of the truth of God, keeping the testimony preserved in us and giving it out. It is a picture of Gods plan for the ages here and here is a picture which someone on first sight might say, well this is just a picture of Isaiah and his children but as long it must too exhalted to be just Isaiah and his children, ~~signs~~ signs and wonders, how well we find (3) and it doesn't exactly describe the situation of Gods people during the time previous to the revelation of Christs accomplishment. And so I would feel that we have nothing in the New Testament about it I would / feel that we would be justified in saying this passage here may be talking about Isaiah but it doesn't seem to fit in very well. It is much too strong to be Isaiah. And yet I would say it is extremely probable that is Christ and not Isaiah at all. I wouldn't be quite ready to say it couldn't

on the basis of the book of Immanuel law. It is the topic of the whole book That is what it (4). That is the thing expressed over and over. Student:

Macrae: Yes, look forward. Student: M: Yes, wasteful. Student: If

that is the case than that would be the case if Hebrews . Buswell: Stake

Daniel 2/7 23:3. It is probably the (4 1/2) MacRae: Second Samuel

22:3 and that is Buswell: That is the other is similiar. in of David.

And I will put my trust in him in seeking that is the heir of Davids throne.

MacRae: That is a very good suggestion My only ~~hesitation~~ hesitation about it is

that just how it proves of the angels. Buswell: I think it is, over here

that Christ in his huminiation did not become an angel. He became a man. He

became lower than the angels. Christ is not the lord of the angels. Christ

did not become an angel he became a man. MacRae: But how does that prove

true? You mean because he was Davids son. Buswell: Yes, Davids son. He is

~~literally~~ literally the god of the angels He is litterrally the man.

(5 1/2) He is not an angel then either. He was one who was made lower than

the angels he is idlentified with god and he is identified with man. MacRae;

Well now lets find chapter 3 I believe , Dr. Buswell , you carry through

chapter 3 I don't believe there are many quotations there so maybe I will have

a littæ rest for a while. And perhaps you can turn us back to some helpful

points on so we will continue here until next time. Buswell: It was very

profitable today. Thank you. (Continuing with class held on Oct. 22, 195

Buswell: In the second chapter of Hebrews, illustrates not the detolerte^{8 1/2}

relationship of quotations or allusions but it illustrates the broad relationship

between the New Testament truth and Old Testament truth. Christ has presented

as the merciful lhigh priest who is able to make rpopitation for the sins of

the people. So in that comparison we have not any direct quotation but a

broad analogy with the situation which prevailed in the Levitical worship. Now

if you had something to ~~start~~ start off with, Dr. MacRae? MacRae: No

I thought if you could continue ~~with this~~ ^{a ways here} here now in the way of quotations

and then I'll fit in wherever there is. Buswell: Well, I thought that that

ought to Confess my sins, to start with. ,acRae: No, never do that,(Class

laughter) Buswell: Well, you are both one to another in so far as they affect one another. I am not a bookmanite either. But I was figuring that last time by the closeness with which Dr. MacRae presented the Old Testament passages, with probably direct quotations in the sense that these are words of Christ in the Old Testament. prophecy. The date which he presented is something I have missed all these years, and was very glad to receive. I thought perhaps, possibly as a probably weakness, I ought to put over against that an attitude of mind which I have entertained all these years, not anything to the contrary of what we said last week, but an attitude of mind toward some of these Old Testament passages. And I'll just throw it out in the midst and stand subject to correction ~~why~~ or chastisement or whatsoever. I had thought that it was not inappropriate for an inspired writer to quote into the lips of a personage, Christ or one of these personages of the New Testament, words which were analytically descriptive of his position or his attitude toward his work. I thought that was sorely justifiable as a perfectly truthful literary device not at all contrary to fact. I have been probing the mind for an exact illustration but I know for example in political cartoons you sometimes find ^{the} cartoonsist drawing a picture of a public character and in all seriousness presenting that character saying some words from Shakespeare which the character himself never said as such, but never the less which are true to life and I had taken this quotation from Isaiah and of such a nature and I can clearly see from what was presented last week that that quotation ~~some~~ ~~is~~ is from the book of Immanuel and may very well have been a direct prophecy of just what Christ would say but I am presenting the apocryphal?? (12)

question, Would it have been inappropriate, if these had been known words of Isaiah which everybody knew Isaiah said, and never the less appropriate for Christ because it was known that Christ did call his associates his brethren and Who is my mother and who are my brethren, He that doeth the will of God, the same is my mother, and my sister and my brother. (12½)

At least this has been my state of mind, it would not have been anything contrary to truth or contrary to probability if they had known where Isaiah had been in the epistle of the Hebrews, put into the lips of Christ, It's situated nobody would think they were the direct words

of Christ but everybody would see they were very appropriate words for Christ to have uttered. ^{MacRae speaks:} ^{there is the one} ~~SI~~ I would say that there are ~~approaches~~ ~~to~~ ~~one~~ matter of approach, taking up a passage and considering what the possibilities are and on that matter the view Dr. Buswell has presented, it easily would be a way out of the attack which ^{to} Torrey makes upon. And probably a justifiably one. But I would say that there are, I would say that on each passage there are we must ~~consider~~ by itself first in contact and see what are the possibilities of interpretation. And the one possibility is he here is quoting something from the Old Testament to prove his case. Now that is not necessarily always true. There are times when a man quotes a statement from someone simply because the words fit accurately even though the other person used them they didn't have applicability to this particular situation. And then there is the possibility that Dr. Buswell ~~will~~ present that though the words occur in the Old Testament, ~~if~~ they have been used by someone else in a different sense and we are quoting from him, his use of those words. There are these possibilities and we take up the passage by itself and we look at it and we see what possibilities there are. Now as to reaching a conclusion whether these possibilities are justifiable or not, I would feel that our only ultimate sort of decision would be its induction. That is to say either a definite statement of the Lord or of the Scripture in clear language that such a ~~language~~ method of interpretation is justified or well, a definite analogy to other passages where a certain method of interpretation would use. Now in this case, I would say that if the fact, as I put it out last time. ~~that~~ in connection with the Old Testament were not true or did not exist, we would have to say Torrey is either right and the new Testament writer has misinterpreted completely or we would have to say, Such an interpretation as Dr. Buswell has suggested which doesn't seem to me at all out of the way. The (15) is the correct ~~of~~ interpretation here. Then when we come to another passage we would have this as an inductive evidence ~~of~~ of the justified ability of such a method of interpreting in the other case. Well here I don't think we have it because I think that the Old Testament evidence shows that

in this particular case the other is the direct interpretation and when I am interested in the end, I am interested in the meaning of all these facts and what I am much more interested in method than that is evidence as to correct methods of interpretation and I feel it is an inductive (End of H27)

(Begin H 28) Dr. Buswell: Is that up to the next quotation? MacRae: Yes, Buswell: We have just been reading before, ~~He~~ 'He did not take to himself angels or of angels and we are very certain that we should understand something like the nature of angels because it isn't true that he doesn't give help to the angels. That would be an an absurd statement. The revised version gives it. He did not take to himself supply the nature of angels, but he took to himself the seed of Abraham and that of course is the point. He became a man and he became a member of Greek Hebrew race. He became of the tribe of Judah and in becoming flesh, he was able to do as you found in the fourteenth verse. (1) that he might be a faithful high priest and the things relating to God so that he might make propitiation and for the sins of the people. For in the fact that he had suffered being tried I think before than you translate that word tried, that had been tempted he is able to assist those who are tried. I wonder Dr. MacRae what is your opinion on taking a few minutes on the popular theory that Christ was not a Jew as of our god friend, Dr. DeHaun. Do you think it disturbs anybody or is it worth bothering with? MacRae: He says he is not. Buswell: I could summarize it in about a minute and unless somebody breaks up with it, (Class laughter) It wouldn't take long to get passed. Well I got the pamphlet in which DeHaun makes that argument now is a doubtful man and we don't just around slapping people who preach the gospel but I don't think that he is very wrong on that point. He is an M.D. as well as D.D. but I don't think both ends of his name work. Now he brings out the point that in the embryo the unborn child develops his own blood, just the same as all other tissues of the body are developed from the chromatin of the germ cell. From the chromatin of the fertilized ovum. And in the mother's body the mother's blood brings nourishment to the placenta and so into the body of the child but

the blood and blood does not circulate in the body of the child, but the child's blood just like all other tissues of the child's body are developed from the fertilized ovum. Well that is physiological true and nobody in the world would dispute it so therefore his mother's ~~blood~~ blood did not circulate in his veins so therefore he did not have a drop of Jewish blood so therefore he wasn't a Jew. Well that would prove there never was an Irishman. There never was a Swede, there never was a Scotchman. The argument just doesn't follow at all but that, I think I am faithfully presenting it to you that that is what there is to it. Now for some strange reason he feels that it is very important to say that Christ is not a Jew. MacRae: Yes, but the blood would be produced by the ovum. Buswell: Certainly. MacRae: Well, that came from the mother. Buswell: I think there is not the slightest doubt the physical ovum of the (3½) was miraculously caused to produce the body in the human nature of Christ. Now the body doesn't mention the ovum as such but it is understood I think and he is a Jew. He is of the tribe of Judah. He is a descendant of David according to the flesh and his blood physically was produced from the unfertilized ovum which was miraculously caused to develop. Student: Now what point is gained by labeling his view of Christ not being a Jew. Buswell: Well, I only infer there that he has a certain hyper-dispensational attitude toward the Jews at the present time which I think is very wrong in itself. Student: (4½) Buswell: Well that is to say that this business of antisemitism is very delicate and perhaps we should say a word about that. I think there are some of the Bible teachers who emphasize the curse upon Israel in the disproportionate way and I personally always try to make it plain that the Gentiles are just as guilty as the Jews. That the Gentile judge that tried to wash his hands, the Gentile carpenters made the cross. Gentiles made the crown of thorns, Gentiles gambled over his garments. Jew and Gentiles together and, the human race is guilty of the death of Christ. I do think that is important and I think that to put the curse of the death of Christ on any one race more than another is quite wrong, though a good many do it. And, but I was asked to write an

article, for Jewish Forum, about two years ago on Anti-Semitism.

The question was whether the protestants celebration of Easter is anti-semitic and of course I had a wonderful chance to preach the gospel. And I made it very emphatic that the Gentiles are just as truly sinners and we are all guilty of rejecting the son of God. That is racially and representatively I made it very strong and they printed my article really just as I printed it and I got a lot of Gospel in there which usually a blast from the paper, that it is a very narrow biggoted type of Judiasm but then the editor commented on my article, "Mr. Buswell ~~says~~ says that Fundamentalism, American fundamentalism is not anti-semitic, but isn't Roman Catholicism fundamentalism and we all know that the Roman Catholic are anti-semitic. (Loud class laughter)

There is the reserve. ^η(6½) Now it has been true that the Roman church has some times put the blame on the Jews as Jews. I don't know whether it has officially, I am not conscience of any official pronouncement but it is rather common for Catholics to take that attitude and some protestants also. I think there is just a little bit of that in DeHaun's theology. The Jews as such have a particular guilt for the death of Christ. More than the Gentiles That I think is a part of the motive. But anyway, whatever the motive, there is not basis whatever in Physiology or in Scripture to deny that becoming flesh he became a particular man of a particular race of a particular family. ^{MacRae:} /And doesn't Paul speak of him as the seed of Abraham? Buswell: Certainly, he took to himself the seed of Abraham. There you have it. That is very very specific Now ~~one of these days~~ when we say he has Jewish blood, why we are ~~using~~ using an expression which might imply something with reference to the mothers blood in ~~the~~ defeatist which is not physiologically correct. But the Word is well understood in the language. He is of Jewish blood or he is of Scotch blood or whatever, everybody knows what that means, simply he is just Gods defense and that is all there is to it so, so much for that, I don't think it is worth while to put any more time on it unless someone is disturbed by it.

Yes, Sir? Student: Well, itself, the blood itself in all races, has a distinguishing factor in in the blood from one race to be put in another. So the

blood itself is another distinction between Negro or Gatile or Jew or anyone else. Buswell: Yes that is very strikingly brought out in one of Grobers sayings. G^Rober is thas great anthropologists. That if you should be ducked out of any airplane and parachute anywhere in this world you would be practically certain to be within a few miles of some human being who had your same blood type. That is many, not in a fuller conuntenance of course but the blookd type, there are the different types in all the races, The races are not distinguished by blood. Yes, sir? Student: that it is true that there is no sinful blood in Chrsit? Buswell: There of course he does, I have his pamphlet on that Christ not being a Jew, but that of course Student: The Chemistry of the Blood, His book on the Chemistry of the Blood? Buswell: No I don't think that is the title. I read it several years ago. Student: He ahs a book that is called that. Buswell: Well, look in it and see I mi~~ght~~/ I'm not good at remembering titles, but I did examine the argument' quite carefully and I have the bookat home. Now sinful blood you see, the~~x~~ Roman Cahholics of course have their own doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary try to get around that. The effect is that the physiological blood doesn't s~~en~~, the physhiological blood is what it is. And Protestants believe that Mary rejoiced in Christ as herRedeemer and her Saviour, She had to be sazved from sin, just like any other person. And even according to what DeHaun says, It was Mary's body that nourished the body of Jesus and so if sin is passed on physiology why he wouldn't get anywhere iwth that type of argument. The doctrine of original sin of course operates through the representative principle, Not through physiology at all. So he is not represented in Adam because he is Adams creator as a person. And in the human nature which he assumed was a sinless nature because it was. that particular miracle. The sinlessness of the human nature of Christ. So then shall we g forward. This of course is one of the magnificent passages when you are on theCaledoian doctrine, of the (11) natures, the one person of Christ He for whom is everything and by whom is everything in bringing many sons into Glroy, perfected himself by suffering and in the process of suffering,

he endured death that He might destroy him who has the power of death and in order to die, he did not take to himself the nature of angels, he took flesh and blood and in particular he took of the seed of Abraham so that he is a merciful high priest, able to ~~and~~ make propitiation. I think there a little distinction of phrase might help here. He did not become incarnate in order that he might understnad us as some have ~~clayngt~~ (11½)

have said. He became incarnate in order that we might understand that he understands us. It certainly is much easier for us to understand that he understands us, since we know that he has become flesh and blood. Although he being our ~~omptient~~ of course, understood at all times, but through the incarnation we are able to appreciate his sympathy for he has been tired as we have been tried. Now the third chapter, Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, focus your mind upon (Greek 12

the apostle and high priest of our profession , even Jesus. There he calls him the apostle and the high priest. I think the word apostle in this context does not have direct reference of to the New Testament apostles. but that might be disputed. I think that in the context it refers to Moses.

As though Moses were in the nature of an apostle. And of course ~~he~~ Aaron was the high priest but Christ is after the order of Melchizedec, But let that word apostle develop as we go along. Consider the apostle and the high priest. While our contrition, Jesus, being faithful to him that appointed him, as Moses, in all his house. Now to whom does the other to refer?

This is a reference to Numbers 12:7. Do you want to stop on that now? or take it later? It is a statement that Moses was faithful in all his house Numbers 12:7 in the Septugent. MacRae: We could look at that, I don't think there is much of a proabelm there. Buswell: It is an anology between Christ and Moses who was faithful. Be worthy og greater glory. This one is worthy of greater glory than Moses, according as, according as much as, the one who builds the house, or prepares the house, is worthy of greater glory than the house. Now there is the relationship between Moses and Christ. Not the relationship of rival relligious leaders. I cringe every time people quote

John 1:18, with the wrong inference. The laws was given by Moses over here and the truth came by Jesus Christ as a different religion. No. Relationship between Moses and Christ his relationship between the builders of the house.

Begin H 29

(End of H 28) Christ is worthy of greater glory than Moses, as the (Greek) as the one who built or prepared the house is worthy of greater glory than the house. Every house is built by somebody. And he who built all things is God. Now there I think we have one of the neglected passages in which Christ is referred as (Greek) . It seems to me that the only consistent interpretation is that Christ, being the builder of the house is being identified as God. Some dispute that interpretation but he has just said that the relation of Christ, is the relation of the builder of the house. He who prepared all things, is God. For Christ is worthy of greater honor because he is the one who prepared or built all things.

Moses, indeed was faithful in all his house, as a steward, a (Greek)

(1) a steward that is the word for a relatively high grade type of service but never the less it is service. As a steward for a testimony ~~f~~/~~of~~ of things about to be spoken of. I suppose there you'd have (1½) (Greek) a special form in Greek. for

a testimony of things about to be spoken of. In this epistle and throughout the New Testament and throughout Christian history of believers in Christ have always taken great delight in the symbolism of the levitical ritual.

Symbolism of the Mosaic law. Moses was a steward for a testimony of things which were going to be spoken of but Christ as a son, over his house,

Now there the (Greek) 2 I think brings up the previous references

to his house. Whose house? Oh the house that belongs to the son. Christ, God's son prepared the house and it is his house and Moses was a faithful steward in Christ's house. I think though it is not conclusive, that the (Greek) 2½)

above then refers to Christ's house. Christ has a son, over his house Whose house we are, Now who are we? Are we merely Hebrew Christians? I think not. Whose house we are if we hold fast. (Greek) (23/4)

if we hold fast the boldness and the glory of the hope firm, until the end. That is to say, we who claim to be born again, are ~~in~~ Christ's house, his eventualities prove that we really are born again. Is that putting over a fast translation or is that . It usually isn't read that way. But I think from this explanatory clause, we probably ~~we/don't/it/don't/~~ would all agree we don't give any aid and support to Armianists but rather we do have a description of ~~the~~ who the we refers to. Those who have made a profession of their faith and those who by the grace of God carried through. Therefore ~~is~~ according as the Holy Ghost said, Today, if you will hear his voice. Now here is a whole nest of quotations. Shall I read it and then turn it over to you? MacRae: Wouldn't you say, just a minute, and go on to verse 6 perhaps, that verse 6, this last half of it is incidental. But he says, we are Christ's house. But then you might say, well the question is Are we Christ's house. Some of us surely are only professors not believers, And so he says, we are his house if we ~~im~~prove by our perseverance that we actually are those whom he has chosen. Wouldn't that be the meaning of that? Buswell: I think so, but I think it incidentally excludes the thought that it is merely Jewish principles that are the weak, MacRae: Oh, why? Buswell: Well, because many Gentile Christians are characterized by this if clause, MacRae:: Well wouldn't the Jews just as much? Buswell: Oh, it doesn't exclude Jews, but I mean it excludes the notion that it is limited to Jewish Christians only. If he is, all we Christians, Jews and Gentiles alike MacRae: Oh I see, that is that whose house are we? Not in his house are we, nor part of his house are we, but that we are the entire house. Buswell: Yes, MacRae: And therefore it means all Buswell: Yes, all believers, all true believers, Jew and Gentile indiscriminately. That is what I was trying to bring out. No particular exhaltation enough to be either Jew or Gentile but after we have accepted Christ. That was my thought. MacRae: Yes, well now this next quotation, that we have here, this next quotation is used in this chapter and again in the next chapter. And according to Torrey, Torrey says of the quotation here, that the spirit of it is very beautiful. He says his exhortations religiously

elevated and useful but his exegesis is ^{false} ~~as follows~~: That ~~his~~ that Hebrews exegesis of the Psalm is faulty. Well I don't think we are in a position to judge whether it is faulty or not, and I'm sure have a very queer idea of what he is driving at. And so if you wouldn't mind, Dr. Buswell, I would appreciate it if you would go on until we have in mind very definitely exactly what use the writer here makes of this quotation both in this chapter and in the next. What he is trying to bring out of it and then we can look into the Psalm with our minds ready with the problem to see whether his exegesis is faulty or not. Buswell: Yes, therefore, according to own , verse 7 today if ye will hear his voice, to not harden your hearts as in the provocation, or the imbitterment as in the day of trial in the wilderness when your fathers tried me , two different words, tried me and tested me. and saw my works forty years. Wherefore I was provoked, or I was angered with that generation. There of course, Greek) (7) must mean that with that race of people, with that generation with that brood that is a legitimate translation and I said they wander in their hearts who have not known my ways as I swore in my wrath. ~~They~~ They ~~will~~ will certainly not come into my rest That if is a strong negative of severation. If they shall come into my wrath There is an apotheses (7½) implied. I will do ~~and~~ so and so if they ever come into my wrath. Student: Myers gives a suggestion that that a is an exact rendering of the Hebrew which is probably used in that sense that you gave without necessarily implying. Buswell: Well, I think in Hebrew the een? (8) you unconscientiously think of a terrible ~~of~~ curse or punishment or a something that is on myself. As I remember ~~an~~ old Mr. Norton who was an old heathen out there in Chicago, He gave the illustration I will eat my shirt if you ever do that. That was a , but I mean to say, Just some strong negative. It is something or other, if so and so. That was his grammatically exegesis of the if. MacRae: What was it that Myers said? rendering of the Student: He said that the a is the exact-meaning of the Hebrew een and I've forgotten the exact word, I think he said cursed. Meaning that it surely will be. Buswell: Well, I don't disagree with that. I would say in

English, we don't have anything parallel ~~that~~ so that we simply have to say They will certainly not come into my rest. But I do think that there is a negative curse, rather implied in the background both in the English and in the Greek. MacRae: Of course, in English we have our common use of a rhetorical question which is different from this but I mean as an analogy, it is not so common ~~on the other~~ in a good many other languages. I found in South America that when I would emphasize something with a rhetorical question the interpreter usually would use another form of discourse. Because it wasn't their common usage there. If you say, Do you think I'll do that? Well you mean right away, I won't do that? Am I going to do that? Is it, Who are these men? You mean No, it is perfectly obvious. It is a common usage. Well in this case however, we have pretty firm ground in this matter because in the Old Testament there are many cases where we have the full statement. The Lord do so to me and repeat it again. If I let you come into this place. Or if I fail to pay this obligation. and so on. And it is also used with a negative meaning I will do it. He ^{borrow}~~borrows~~ something and he says, may the Lord do so to me and do it over again if I don't pay this back. And you quite frequently have it in the full form. Then there are cases where we have it without the conclusion expressed where we have the analogy ~~expressed~~ of the others ~~which~~ occurs enough times to leave no question about it. That it is a common Hebrew usage and in the Greek here they are simply translating it exactly from the Hebrew and it is questionable whether it would make much sense to somebody who knew only Greek and didn't know Hebrew. But the bulk of the readers of this, would be somebody who had some knowledge of Old Testament usage ^{and would} recognize from the Greek word what was meant. Or in our English, it means unfortunate day, the bulk of our people don't know Hebrew and so it is probably necessary to translate it They shall not which is not a literal translation but gives the idea. The Greek translation if they do, if we all knew Hebrew it would be perfectly obvious. But for the average person today it is probably necessary to change usage of it. Student: Do you think the provocation here mentioned to be ~~the~~

one specific incident or the entire wilderness of disobedience. Buswell: Well the Psalm refers to the forty years when they provoked him. MacRae: That would seem to be the whole thing would it not? Buswell: Yes, the prophets have similiar references. Did you sacrifice to me forty lyears in the wilder-ness. Why of course we did. Well, you might as well have been worshipping more likely(11 $\frac{1}{2}$) our God because it was all done in an idoltrious self-righteous spirit. Look out therefore brethren lest there shall be in any of you a wicked heart of unbelief in ~~the~~ departing from the living God. But exhort one another. Your recipical pronoun finds the reflects the tone on substituting for it quite frequently so we have to see one another where it it exhort yourself, if it were (12 $\frac{1}{2}$) Exhault one another day by day, say every day according to every particuliarday, while it is called today, it will be an interesting question in the calling of certain time today. That you harden not your heart lest any of you harden your heart with the sin. For we have become communicants of Christ, is indeed the beginning of the substance, he holds fast the substance, he holds fast unto the end ~~but~~ the beginning of the matter that his (13) is sometimes not a material word but a matter of logical content. Which we hold the beginning of the substance firm until the end. IN that he says today, or in MacRae: IN the substance rather than (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

Greek-- I notice the authorized version renders and so does the revised standard. Buswell: Well there is the greeting here, Beginning about faith. Well the ~~passages are~~ (14) is a very rich word. It has a lot of meaning and in aristotle it is a very complicated word. The is very simple. The understand- ing thing, it means stand under. It is the substance, in Latin. But confidence is not wrong for the . MacRae: But I think the verse is rather important to know exactly just what he does mean if we can. Buswell: Well if held fast the beginning of the substance, firm until the end. MacRae: What is the beginning of the substance here. Buswell: Well, I understand (Eng~~o~~/ End of H 29)

MacRae: But what is the beginning of it, you mean the most important part. the foundation, or do you mean that which we had originally? Buswell: No, I understood this beginning to mean the initial profession of faith, that is the beginning in contrast with the ends. These were people who as a group professed faith in Christ and they were in danger of turning back to mere Judiasm and self righteousness and denying Christ. Now if they hold back the beginning of theis substance, firm to the end, that will show ~~we~~^{they} really ~~are~~ people of God. That is the way I have taken Arcaic as to the

(1 $\frac{1}{4}$) ~~In the same/today~~ He is saying today if ye will hear his voice, do not harden your hearats as in the , who having heard provoked, or we would say in English, who heard and provoked, Was it not all those who went out from Egypt through Moses That is, MacRae: Well you differ quite radically from the authorized version and Scofield. Buswell: It says, how be it not all that come out from Egypt. That is ^{is} of punctuation. It is punctuated here as a question mark. And now it could be taken as a declarative sentence . (Greek) (2) not indefinite.

Who having heard, provoked. Is that a question in the King James? MacRae: Well the King James says, For some when they had heard did provoke. Buswell, Ah, well now that would be the,the (Greek) not interrogative. But this is who when they heard provoked. Was it not all those who came out of Egypt through Moses? To whom did he swear, of course if it is a question, it is a rhetorical question, because obvious ^{ly} the crowd as a whole ~~there is a/crowd/~~

~~there is/~~a whole died in the wilderness. Only came when Joshua went In. He was provoked as a whole. Not necessarily every individual. We don't know he provoked for forty years. Was it not with those who sinned. Whose (3) members or carcauses fell in the wilderness. To whom did

he swear? Not to enter into his rest. If not with those who disbelieve This is a series of questions here as punctuated in to those who disbelief. And that of course is the point of the argument anyway, that those who were rejected at that time , the time of the Exocus, were people who disbelieve with reference to the promised land. Or did not with those who

disbelieved and we see that , that they were not able to enter in through
 (4) on account of the accusative. They were not
 able to enter in on account of unbelief. Let us therefore fear lest there
 be left to us a promise to enter into his rest any of you should appear to
 fall short and indeed. MacRae: In verse 18 the Revised Standard says
 To those who were disobedient, it says, those who believed not. Buswell:
 Well, (4½) and are almost interchangeable.

You could say disobeyed but the two are so close as Dr. Alyce had an article
 one time on the Hymn 'Trust and Obey, and he said it isn't two words. ~~The/~~
 I mean to say in thought, it is two words of course, but
 are so closely intertwined that the one content of Evangelical faith is
 faith of my . For those who disobeyed, it is not incorrect.

for those who, but ~~them~~ his conclusion is that they, so we
 see that they feel short through . So I think it should be translated
 that they disbelieved because of the conclusion. The writer himself can
 in the sence of right here in the context.

MacRae: The authorized version leaves sort of an up in the air in the English
 It says to whom swear/^{ye}that they should not enter into his rest, but to them
 that be , no I mean the Revised Standard leaves you up in the air. They
 say, but to those who are disobedient so we see they are unable to enter
 because of unbelief . That doesn't follow. Buswell: It doesn't make sence

and then you say the other is equally possible? Buswell: Yes, ~~certtainly~~
 (5 3/4) Greek) is certainly a believe word . is to

persuade and it means to obey by kind of a derived sense. To be persuaded

MacRae: So the authorized would be just as good. Buswell: Certainly. It
 certainly should be translated these who disbelieved , who wouldn't be

persuaded . Excuse me. Were you going to say something? MacRae: I was
 going on to the next verse. you have more on that Buswell: Now, let us

therefore fear. MacRae: What is after that? Buswell: Lest. The promise
 being left to enter into his rest . MacRae: Where is that promise?

Buswell: Where is the promise? Well, I think that of course is the Old Testament

reference here. MacRae: Are you sure of that? That is the question of interpretation, that I am certain about. Buswell: Well, the argument all the way through here couples together that they shall not enter my rest with the invitation, today if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts and when they did harden their hearts they were forbidden~~x~~ to enter into his nest.

MacRae: And they were all forbidden. Buswell: Well as a whole not as every individual. MacRae: Well what proof then does that leave that there is a

rest? Buswell: Well, his argument is expectedly stated later on since Joshua didn't give them rest, now then the Psalmist later on calls another day today and he says, Today he will hear his voice. Harden not your hearts as they hardened their hearts before. So he concludes that there is a standing offer of rest for the people of God. and he brings in a very interesting reference to the rest of Gen. 2 which throws light on it. Should I, had I better stop

here now and let you take up some of these quotations? MacRae: Well, I think the quotation, the same quotations occur again. You better pick up the whole the whole background. Buswell: Right-0 Let us feel lest any of you should fall short of it and now this is verse two. And we have been evangelized. See there is your perfect para construction.. We have

been evangelized just as those people were. I think that is a very striking statement. Unity of the covenant of gr(8 $\frac{1}{4}$) We have been evangelized just

as those people were. But the word which was heard did not help those people not being , now Good~~s~~ybie uses this word (8 $\frac{1}{2}$)

and not being chemically compounded with faith. And he has some arguments that this word had to do with chemical mixtures as an illustration. Well even if it didn't have an thing to do with chemistry, still it didn't help them because the word which was heard falls down into ears which did not have faith or fell into a heart which did not have faith. The reason why the

word of God did not help these people was that it was not mixed with faith in those who heard. MacRae: Now I noticed the Revised Standard says

because it did not meet with such. Would you say that is quite loose?

Buswell: Well a¹/₂ which means to mix, of course when you meet you mix

And it literally did not mix the thing but then meet is a derived congested meaning and did not , it is a perfect passive participle not having been

MacRae:

mixed with faith. It is a figure that I don't quite understand. It sounds as if the word was not affective unless it was changed or transformed

(10)

Buswell: Well Gisbie has some illustrations from the ~~to a~~ to mix different metal, to perform alloy and if you put pure ~~g/s~~ brass in and melted it without any nickel, you wouldn't get anything but pure copper out of it.

Now if God's word falls upon a heart which disbelieves, Gods word doesn't save that soul and that wouldn't be a theological problem I don't think. It would seem to ~~be~~ to be describing the obvious human side of the evangelism

Student: We say we have been evangelized. Does that refer to actual change of ~~to~~ faith? Buswell: Well/~~it~~/~~was~~/~~it~~ ^{to be} be evangelized is not necessarily to

have faith. It is not necessarily to have faith. We have been evangelized.

Student: (11) Buswell: It is usually translated the Gosepel has been preached to us but it is actually a perfect apra construction a perfect passive participle. We have been evangelized

I think that is a very literal translation and perfreable. There have been lots of people who have been evangelized, but who havent been saved. Now this group of people had evidently professed salvalion. Student: But this is not

contray to that directly a missionary would gather a group of natives and the word around and say they were saved because they had heard the word. They wouldn't be saved necessarily (12)

MacRae: Like Zaphor who threw Holy water on Buswell: But the Lutheran doctrine is conflicting on that. I don't caaim to be any authority on Lukes indoctrinae but H⁰dge quotes quite extensively the Lutheran attitude toward the word and Fatih and the Lutheran statemtn seemed to me to be rather conflicting but I don't think it would be cofrect to say the whold Lutheran doctriated

that merely if the sound of Gospel had been pinched upon lyour ears they were saved. Student: If they don't resist Buswell: Well not that is

probalby where the little ground would come in. If they don't resist that is kind of a half way faith. The Word(13) is a word itself is the dianimic

and it has the power. Well not calvinist would deny that the word has a power but the Calvinist would understand the power of the word through rational and persuasive processes whereas the Lutheran understands it (13½)

so that the word itself is dianimac. Yes sir? Student: Well a friend back home said it was by cooperation that man was saved. That it was God work and then man must cooperate willingly. That it is his will apart from the usual.

Buswell: Well that I think is true Lutheranism and the difference between that and Calvinism is the Calvinists would always point out even the faith is the gift of God. So it is not faith as an active man but it is an act of man energized by God, so this text wouldn't give any particular aid and comfort to the Armianian (14)

used along with other test and it is perfectly obvious that the person who doesn't believe doesn't get saved. Even though he hears the Gospel.

(Ebd of H 30) (Begin H 31) Not being mised with faith with those who heard. We have come into this rest. (Gr.) NOW tere is

a varient ~~read~~ greeting there, Let us come. Isn't that your question of whether it is ~~a~~ indicative or a pository subjunctive. We have come into this rest. We who believe. Well that of course jwoul'n'st need to be a subjunctive and it is printed as the indicative . According as he says. As I swore in my wrath. They shall not enter into my rest. And here is a great questtion of punctuation. I have put a period after that mo (1) ~~They/we~~ I swore

in my wrath. They will not enter into my rest and that illustrates what goes before even thought the works having been finished or brought to pass from the foundations of the world, or someone says, concerning the seven days, Thus and God rested in the seventh day from all of his works and in this event there can not enter into my rest. If therefore there remains or since therefore remains for some to enter into it and those formerly evangelized. I would give a literal translation there again the participle . Did not enter in through unbelief. Again he designates a certain day, today, in David saying After so long a time according as he sazid beforehand Today if ye will hear his voice, do lnot harden your hearts. If Joshua had given them rest, I think

our English author translates that Joshus just because it makes sense in English and we are putting it into English. the (3½) Greek of course but it means Joshua in English. If Joshua had given them rest he would not have spoken after this. He would not have designated after this a day. Therefore there remained a for the people of God.

That is the conclusion. There probably is a point in which we could very well stop and look back at the Old Testament quotations. That is the and that particular argument. For there remains a (3) for the people

of God. Student: Buswell: Well after these events which make it For some of these activities afterwards. Gr(3½)

~~My/ye/ye/ye~~ MacRae: Now we have had three or four different quotations from this Psalm now. The passages here in Hebrews was building around this Psalm for practically a chapter. A sizeable portion of chapter three and a sizeable portion of Chapter four. Suppose I read to you what ^{To} Torrey says about it. First he quotes it in the Hebrew form the Psalm, a translation and then he quotes it from the Septuagint and then he quotes Hebrews. He says after the Septuagint. And then he gives them in the original and then he says, The first clause must be taken as an explanation from the Psalms. And not as a prothesis of a conditional sentence as in the English authorized Version, the Septuagint and the New Testament. Since the following words in which God is the speaker, ^{give} the contents of the voice. How many understand that? Well, I will read it again then. It, our quotation here is: Today is, wherefore as the Holy Ghost said, today if ye will hear his voice harden not your heart as in the day of provocation and the day of temptation in the wilderness when your fathers tempted me, proved me and saw my works forty years. So the first clause is wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith, today if ye will hear my voice. He says the first clause will be taken as the exclamation of the Psalmist and not as the pro(6) of the conditional sentence as in the English authorized version, the Septuagint and the New Testament since the following words in which God is the speaker give the contents of the verse, of the voice. Here we have it in the Psalm. Today if ye will hear his voice

harden not your hearts as in the provocation and the day of temptation in the wilderness. The, it seems to me thalt gramatically there is something to be said for what he says but it doesn't seem to me to affect the logic particularly. Don't you feel that way, Dr. Buswell? Buswell: Yes

MacRae: ^{to y} Torry understands it to be this way, Today if you will hear his voice, well what is his voice, what is his work? If harden not your heart is in the provocation and as in the day of temptat~~ion~~ in the wilderness. When your fathers tampted me, proved, me and saw my works. Well now, he wants you today to hear this message of God. Or we say, today if you will hear this message, today if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts. The, it seems to me the result is quite idlential whichever way you take it.

Mr. S? Student: Do I understand you to say that he deniesthe of the protestants and (x) MacRae: Yes, he says ~~the first clause~~

must be taken as the exclamation of the Psalm and not as the protheseis of a conditional sentence. as in lthe English Authorized version, the Septugent and the New Testament since the following words in which God is the speaker give the content of the voice. Well now of course it is true that in the following words the Lord is speaking, isn't he? Up to hear the Psalmist is speaking. Today if you will hear his voice, the his being God of course, then when your fathers tempted me, proved me and saw my works, forty long years was I grieved on whom I swear my wrath. That is all in the first person so that is God speaking to them. And previous to them it is called His voice. And all through the Psalm up to this point it is God is spoken of in the third person now all the rest is ⁱⁿ the third person. So that would seem to suggest here ~~the~~ the speaker changes and God begins to talk and so the Psalmist says Today if you will hear his voice, well he means , Torrey says that must mean today I wish you would hear his voice, If only you wouldhear his voice. Today if you will hear h~~is~~ voice, then listen to what he has to say. Because up to this it is third person and following this it is ^{first} ~~third~~ person. Now that seems gramatically valid does it not? It is true that in Hebrew, the pronouns are used with not, some~~thing~~/times with not the same consistency as in English

Sometimes the prophets switch from talking about God to talking as God's mouthpiece in such a way that he and my switch back and forth sometimes without much apparent reason. There maybe and we get closer to it and I think in some cases there would seem to be little reason for the switch but in this case it is not a switching back and forth. It is all ^{his} up to this point it is all "my" after this point. And it says today if you will hear my voice and then you go on and you have a message from God. ~~But~~ so surely it would seem to be that the prophet is saying Now, today I wish ~~it~~ ~~it~~ you would listen to God's voice. And that would sound as if grammatically Torrey is right. That it would be just as well to put a break here. Today if you will hear his voice, Understood then listen to what he has to say. Today if you will hear his voice. Today ~~it~~, may you hear his voice, today I want you to hear his voice. It seems as if the change of pronouns was just about requires it. So I am inclined to think that the authorized and the Septuagint perhaps had translated it Well, I don't know whether we should say the Septuagint either, How original are the punctuation marks in the Septuagint? How far back do they go? Buswell: Not in the (10) MacRae: In other words they are in our interpretation of the Septuagint aren't they? If you are going to stop in your Hebrew: Today if you will hear his voice Stop, and then go ahead and say what he says, why can't you do that in the Septuagint? Just the same, so your septuagint wouldn't be wrong at all. It would merely be on modern punctuation of the Septuagint. And how about Hebrew could that not be the same thing in your Greek or Hebrew? Today if you will hear his voice and stop and start again, so that the only one of which you would take exception would be the authorized version. The fact that it has a comma instead of a period. Today if you will hear his voice, harden not your heart. But now if you will hear his voice, then listen to what he says, Harden not your hearts, what is the point of listening to what he says? It is to get the message. The message is you're to do something. So that actually the thought is identical whether you say today if you will hear his voice, listen to what he says, do this and so and so and so or if you will

listen to his voice, and then go right ahead and give the message. The message is imp^{er}ent, addressed to th^{em}, it is thing he want ~~you~~ to hear, so why isn't it just as good that way, I mean the matters of punctuation after all in translating from one language to another, you can not be absolutely literal, it don't make sence . What you are trying to do is get the thought of the one language and put it into the other briefly as possible or as nearly the same length as possible , as nearly the same amount of words and here if the one has quite a bit understood and if that isn't easily understood as the other, and the idea is absolutely id^entical by putting a comm^a

there how would you call it a mistranslation? Mr. Student: I was just wondering what d^o you call(12) MacRae: Yes,

well, what would be the point? Today if you will hear his voice, then I want you ~~to~~ do what he says. ~~Then~~ understood. And then he goes on and tells what he says to do. Well after all what he says to do~~s~~ is to resolve that if you have heard his voice then do it. Then do what he says, harden not your heart and the thought is absolutely identical with, to say, Today if you hear his voice, harden not your heart so it seems to me that ~~Torrey~~ while Torrey has an interesting gramatical point, it doesn't(12 3/4)

Mr. Stewart? MacRae Yes, it would be a wish. He is our God and we are the people of his pasture and the sheep of his hands and consequently today I would I like to have you do what he wants you to do. Today, if you will hear his voice. Now listen to what he has to say . It is not so much it is an exotration, would that you would hear his voice and not harden your heart. If you will hear his voice than you won't harden~~h~~ your heart. If you will hear his voice, you will listen to what he says. What he says is don't harden your heart. You get alittle more lengthy way of saying you have got to do these things ? (14). So that while Torrey explains it , it is rather interesting , gramatical point, why it doen't seem to me that it is ~~a~~very important ~~as~~ part as the idiety. At least not up to this point in his discussion. (End of H 30) ~~(Begin H 31)~~

(Begin H 32) And then he continues Merica and Massa must be taken as proper names and not as strife and temptations. The reference being to the instance described in Exodus 17:1 to 7. That is to say that in the provocation, the Hebrew is as in Meriba, which is used as a proper name in the Old Testament. Which means a place of strife but he goes on and speaks of forty years as surely the particular place, a symbol of the whole. It is not on account of their unbelief at that one place that everything occurred but it is the unbelief ~~that~~ through the forty years of which that is an outstanding symbol. So if you want to translate it as Meriba and Massa (1) pointing to one specific important case of unbelief, it goes on and speaks of the forty years so that since you can't equally translate them as common nouns rather than as ~~proper~~ ^{proper} nouns. I'm not sure that ^{to} Torrey is right in saying they must be taken as proper names and not as (1½). I think he did say they may be taken as proper names but the proper names there are of relatives? same as (1½) given on account of the unbelief of those places and that was typical of the whole forty years as the passage goes on to say. Typical of the whole forty years as the passage goes on to say, so I don't see that we have much to worry about with his argument at this point. He continues then, he adds, As I swear means their wandering afar and ignorance was in accordance with it or connected with my swearing. As thus equivalent to so that I swear, not to whom I swear, as in the English Authorized Version. What do you think of that Dr. Buswell? Buswell: I didn't quite catch that now. MacRae: He says the quotation here in Hebrews was Buswell: The eleventh verse, in the eleventh verse--as I swore in my wrath. MacRae: Yes. Buswell: Now what verse is he talking about in the (2 3/4) MacRae: He says the 'as' in 'as I swear' means they are wandering apart and ignorance was in accordance with or connected with my swearing and is thus equivalent so 'so that I swear', not 'to whom I swear' as in the English Authorized version. Buswell: Oh, it certainly is not 'to whom I swear' I wasn't even conscious that that was MacRae: Oh, that is in the Psalms

The Psalms in verse 11, says to whom I swore. Buswell: And not the Revised Version, It says, Wherefore I swear. MacRae: In the Psalm? Buswell: Yes MacRae: Yes, it would seem then that the King James Version does not show . I see, the King James Version, verse 11 is taking the Hebrew as share as a (3½) whom I swore, But it doesn't have to be , It can be a conjunction just as well. So that the Revised Version seems to be better here to make better sense in the context, but I am not sure that either of the others is impossible. Now then he goes on to discuss the text. But then he says that after the discussion of the text, he says, ' The Psalm passage which is a simple exhortation to the Jewish people not to harden their hearts as their ancestors did. Is cited in The Epistle for a double purpose. First as a warning to Christians against unbelief and hardening of heart Chapter 3, verse 12 to 19, and then to show ~~in~~ chapter 4; 1 to 11 that the rest spoken of in the Psalm is not the rest of Canaan but the Sabbathism or the Sabbath rest, The physical and spiritual repose in peace which shall be the ~~lost~~ of the followers of Christ when He shall come at the end of the present age to establish His kingdom forever. Compare Chapter 10, verse 36 to 39. This conclusion is drawn from the fact that the statement concerning rest in the Psalm was made after God had instituted the weekly Sabbath rest. And also after Joshua had settled the peole in Canaan so that the rest here promised could be only the Messianic rest. The author assumes that the last verse of the Psalm contains a promise. As if it were thus to be construed. Now ^{Torrey} says, the author assumes the last verse of the Psalm is a vivid word construed, Oh Israel your fathers failed to enter into my rest because of their disobedience, but do you take warning today by them so that you may not fail to gain the promised rest. But Torrey continues, 'But the Psalm merely cites the facts of the past and affirms the failure to enter Canaan only of that one unbelieving generation. ^{While} ~~But~~ the new generation together with Caleb and Joshua did enter ^{on} ~~into~~ the enjoyment of the land and the promise. Our author leaves the historical relations entirely out

of view and uses the words for his exhortation and argument without their proper meaning. His exhortation is religiously elevated and useful but his exegesis is faulty. Now that ^{is true} ~~proves~~ many sermons ^{we} ~~hear~~. But the exhortations religiously elevated and useful ~~if~~ when the exegesis is faulty and everytime we hear it , a sermon like that we are very sorry because while the elevated and religious exhortation is of value, there is despite ~~done~~ to the word of God in simply taking the superficial, obvious interpretation which may not be the real interpretation out of it and from that presenting an idea. It is ~~definitely~~ harmful and wrong and so we will be very surprised if Hebrews does that also and we won't expect it to. If it does, it will certainly lower our regard for the Scripture if we find that the author of Hebrews had a low regard of scripture and thought of it as just a series of words to hang his thoughts on instead of a source of knowledge in the forehead. But is that what Hebrews does? Now ~~this~~ 95th Psalm here, lets look at the Psalm and see if Torrey's point is right that the Hebrews exegesis of the Psalm is wrong. In Hebrews, the Psalm is used ~~twice~~ as he points out in chapter 3, it is ~~used~~ used principally to stress the importance of belief importance of Faith and that surely is not at all out of place here. There is no question but what that is reasonable. But then the matter in ~~of~~ chapter four that is the problem. Does this Psalm imply that there is a rest in to which people should still enter. Well now the Psalm begins, 'Come let us sing to the Lord, Let us make a joyful noise ^{to} , the rock of our salvation. Let us come before his presence with thanksgiving and make a joyful noise to Him with ^{psalms} ~~psalms~~ for the Lord is a great God and a great king, above all gods. In his hands are the deep places of the earth, the strength of ~~the~~ the hills is his also. The sea is his, and he made it, and his hands formed the dry land. O come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord our maker. For ~~he~~ he is our God and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand.'" It seems as if you ought to finish a paragraph ~~three~~ at least a verse and yet it goes ~~wright~~ on in the same verse as the Jews divided the verses and sheep of his hands' Up to this point , it is entirely praise,

isn't it? Exhortation to ~~worship God~~ worship God, to praise him, recognition of His greatness, recognition of His ~~great~~ power. That is all we have up to this point. Not a word of rebuke, there is not a word of condemnation, there is not a word of future suggestion, is there here? It is very different from the rest of the Psalm. Now the Psalm, after laying this foundation, then of the greatness of God, and of ~~our~~^{course} our relation to him as the people of his pasture, the sheep of his hand, then the Psalm suddenly goes into a very different note. So evidently the Psalmist had in mind more than just to praise God, he had an exhortation that he wanted to bring to the people. Now what was his exhortation? He says, today if you will hear his voice, ~~and~~ surely ~~he~~ means ~~it~~ 'Here is a voice I want you to get. Now God is this great wonderful one, He is our God, and we are the people of His pasture now it is very important that you get a message that God has for you. And what is this message? Don't harden your heart as of Merriiba and Massa, when your father has tested me and proved me and saw my works You shouldn't today harden~~ed~~ your hearts, they did then. Forty years long was I grieved with a generation. I don;t like that word this generation. In the Psalm. In our modern English it seems to rather, now the Hebrew says 'Was I græeved with that generation. That seems better doesn't it? With that generation. He is talking of the generation which was there at MeribiNasha. Forty years long was I grieved with a generation. With that generation. And said, It is a ~~people~~ people that err in their heart and have not known my ways, so I sware in my wrath that they should not enter my rest. Well now does this imply that the writer, that at the time when the Psalm is written, which is after the time of Moses, and after the time of Joshua after they have entered into the promised land, there still is a rest for the people of God. Does it imply that or does it? Torrey says it does not. Torrey says the exhortation is religiously elevated and useful but the exe~~g~~gesis is faulty. He says the Psalm passage is a simple exhortation to the Jewish people not to ~~the~~ harden their hearts as their ancestors did. It must be

admitted that the reasoning is a little bit complicated of Hebrews ~~four~~ four
 But is their reasoning false or eroneous? Does it depart from the thought
 of the Psalm. What is the though of the Psalm? Don't harden your heart
 It wouldn't be a nice thing to harden your hearts. You remember when those
 people hardened their hearts, they didn't enter into God's rest. So it is
 not a good thing to do and you shouldn't enter, you have already entered
 into his rest. You are in Palestine now, the next generation came in but
 still it is just as well you don't harden your hearts. Is that all ~~the~~ means?
 Or is there a ~~pretty~~ strong implication that those people who should have
 received a rest, that God had to offer, lost it? On account of hardening
 their hearts? He swore his wrath, they would not enter into his rest because
 they refused to believe and if you refuse to believe, if you harden your
 hearts, you also will not enter into his rest. But there is therefore
 as the Hebrew says, there remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God.

Yes Mr.? Student: Are you refering to that generation? Is that in the
 Hebrew or MacRae: The Hebrew simply says A generation. But it means the
 generation of Meribi and Massa, doesn't it? ~~the~~ Student: (12 1/2)

MacRae: Well the revised, the authorized ~~version~~ version puts in this in italics
 there but in the Psalms in Hebrews, what word it it used in Hebrews there?
 Buswell:

(12 1/2) MacRae: Yes. Student: Could that be that? Buswell:

This is (12 3/4) MacRae: Well of course, this matter of
 this and that is a strange thng. ~~If~~ ind. I have always thought, this is
 the one present and that is the one from somewhere else. But , Buswell:
 That has always been my

It may this one present in discord (13). MacRae;; Yes that is usuage that
 I was never brought up to use. But I have found in recent years a number of
 people have used it very commonly. It is this way, now is it this way?

And they go into And this refers to something about to be presnted or
 something in mind rather than something that is necessarily actually.

This generation then, ~~if~~ now if talk about the 16th century I would say that
 century was a very important ~~one~~ one. But there are others who would say, This
 was a very important one. And so of course it is just a question of how you

use the word. It differs from my personal habit and matter but it seems to be a rather common usage. At any rate it is the generation he is thinking of, it is the generation in the wilderness, isn't it? Not the generation he is talking about. Well now it doesn't seem to me then that there is so much of a problem here but it is a matter which I think a good many readers of Hebrews simply don't touch at all. They pass over it and they don't catch what he means altogether. When he says, If they shall enter into my rest. Does that mean there remains a rest for the people of God? No. He says if they have entered into my rest if he swore that the people in the people in the wilderness, that doesn't have anything to do with the rest is today for the people of God or not but if the Psalmists quoted as an exhortation, not to harden your hearts, because you look at what happened to those people, Well they didn't enter into God's rest, ~~if they~~ because they hardened their hearts don't you harden your heart. There is an implication in God's statement through the Psalmist that there still remains a rest even after they have come into Canaan. But that is not the real rest. Mr. Buswell: I think the argument is ~~seemed~~ ~~(15)~~ in verses eight and nine. 8 and 9.

(End of H 32) Begin H 33--- Buswell: God said they shall ~~not~~ enter

into my rest. MacRae; Yes. Buswell: They did get into Palestine but if that isn't what God meant that the next generation would be in Palestine than the context would have been all wrong. Now as a matter of fact the Psalmist indicated that people could now enter into God's rest, therefore ~~it~~ it was not all fulfilled in ~~God's~~ ^{Joshua's} time, therefore it was

~~an~~ an indication. MacRae: So the point of it is not what God said to the generation in the wilderness. The point is that the Psalmist repeated that to his own date. And so he spoke of another death? ($\frac{1}{2}$) ^{afterwards} /as being one in similar circumstances and if they were, certainly we are also. Because there was nothing, You could say, if God says to people in the wilderness, you won't enter into Palestine, that doesn't prove anything in the world but what we are going to answer or not, except by analogy. Nothing else. But if God says to the generation in Canaan, you are not

going to enter into rest. There is no land of Palestine ~~for~~ they are going to enter into. They are already there, so it refers to something spiritual or to something future, something that can have equal relevance to us, as to them. So that when he speaks of another day, what he means is that he refers to the word today. (1) And he is referring to the fact

the Psalmists uses the word. The Psalmist addresses his people and applies it to them. So that the argument from Hebrews of the writer of Hebrews seems to be an altogether valid argument. Torrey seems to be utterly wrong

~~but it~~ in his opposition to it but it does seem to me that it is as expressed ~~but~~ and translated literally into English. I doubt if any English reader catches what it really means. It is a little bit hidden. And many a person reads over Hebrews 4 and says, The Lord said to the generation in the wilderness, if they enter into my rest, therefore, there remains a rest for the people of God and doesn't have any idea what he means

just because the Psalmists quotes, there is a rest. We could express it in language that would be clear to us. But maybe this language is clear to the first generation for centuries, Yes? Student: The whole quotation seems to be identical with that of the Septuagint except on that one place where that variation

MacRae: But there is no vital difference on the Septuagint. Student: Will Dr. Buswell repeat what he said a few moments ago? Concerning the interpretation of the children of Israel

(3) Dr. Buswell: Well someone might argue that ~~the~~ although generation got into the wilderness, one ~~generation~~ Joshua led the next generation into the promised land. Therefore they went in. But in this case, the writer of the 95 Psalm has been wrong in calling a still later day, today. But the 95th Psalm understood that Joshua did not really lead them into God's rest, even though he did lead them into Palestine. Therefore there is a remaining rest. Which we

Student: Well in the case of the first generation and they entered into that rest, what does the rest refer to? MacRae: Yes, / Buswell: That is Numbers 14: 21 MacRae: Yes, does it give the word rest there? Numbers 14: 21, Buswell: (4)

MacRae: Yes, he says in 14:23 isn't it? And have not hearkened to my voice. Surely they shall not see the land which I sware unto their fathers. Neither shall any of them, provoke me see it. But my servant Caleb, because he had another spirit with him, and hath followed me fully, him will I bring into the land whereinto he went; and his seed shall possess it. " The phrase, my rest, as far as I recall, isn't used in ~~there~~, in Numbers. It is first used in the Psalm here and the Psalm here would be referring it would seem ~~then~~, to the statement that the people who had come out of Egypt there would not ~~enter~~ into the land of Palestine and as they didn't enter into the land of Palestine the thing that they were looking forward ~~to~~ there is great hope and aspiration. They didn't enter in because of their unbelief in God beware lest any of you harden your hearts like those people with whom God was angry. They didn't enter into the thing to which they were looking forward. Well it would seem to imply not that the people were already in Palestine couldn't be looking forward to Palestine ~~and~~ as those had and they weren't planning to go to any other place so it would seem to be in the spiritual ~~realm~~ rather than in the material realm, or it would seem to be refering to a new condition rather than new area. And so the, I don't think there is any illusion in it as to whether the generation in the wilderness were lost or saved, I think it is using their relation to the promised land as an analogy to the condition of the later generation. Mr.?

Student: I was just(6)

an analogy to more to them for the fact that they are entering rather than to what they entered into to. That is the ^{writer of} Hebrew says the people there don't enter in. In that case it would be the same to enter into a promised

land In the case of the people he is writing to it is not a case of them entering into a promised land, but into a rest. A spiritual rest.

MacRae: Yes, but this spiritual rest is always taught in the Psalms because the Psalms is applying to people in his day. The statement given to people in the wilderness. And while the people in the wilderness was a promised land he says there would be no point in David using it. Refering to whether people of his day would enter into the promised land. They were already there.

He is refering to them to something much finer. Yes? Student: Was David then just adding to his intpretation or was he own (7) in his day

Buswell: Well the promise of the rest of God is in the whole context ~~and~~ My prseence will go with thee and I will give thee rest. It was understood that the promised land was a land of rest. So he says here now entering into their land offers to fit the intpretated word rest, which is in the context of the (7½) I will give thee rest. That is where

to give kthem the land. So they expected to get into Palestine a land of rest . MacRae: TWell that might not find sufficient fullfillment in Davids ddy in getting led from their enemies from round about. Buswell: Well I

think the argument is Now (8) I want to get into my land which means rest. Well the next generation did get into the land but evidently that wasn't the full accomplishment because David looked forward to something better. As he saw , otherwise David is the one who said that we are pilgrims and strangers with thee as all our fathers were. At the great time when he was bringing on treasures for the temple when he and the temple was going to built. It was right there that he said, We are pilgrims and strangers before thee. MacRae: Where is that? Buswell:

That is in Romans 3 and I Chronicles, and in the 39th Psalm. Romans 3, and I Chronicles , Hebrews 11, Hebrews 11, Those who say this sort of thing just as they pilgrims and strangers. And those are the words of David, Psalm 39:13 or 12 rather ~~SI~~ I Chron. 29:15, I Chron 29:15, Psalm 39:12

David says, right as he was ~~bringng~~ presenting his treasures for the temple as the Solomon was going to build a temple and we are Pilgrims and strangers before thee as though our fathers were and then the Epistle to Hebrews says Those who say ~~these/are~~ things of this kind confessing they are looking for~~ard~~ a heritage . A heavenly ~~Y~~heritage . So David did not feel that Palestine was the fullfillment~~y~~ of the rest which God had promised . MacRae: So that this passage in Hebrews four has to be taken

in connection with Hebrews 11 to get the full meaning of it and the passage from Psalm 95 has to be taken togehter with Psalm 39 and I Chron. 13, did you say? Buswell: I Chron. 29, 16, 15 Yes. MacRae: You take them

together and find that the teaching of the writer of Hebrews that David was looking forward to something that was finer than just Palestine. Now as to Mr. Durhams question again, this would imply certainly that David understood that God promised to the people coming out of the ~~wilderness~~ ^{piece of land} Egypt ~~wantt~~ simply a certain ~~piece of land~~ ^{piece of land} that was Palestine. That was a precious portion of it. But that was only a portion. It was a promise of rest from their enemies around about. It was a promise of rest in the Lord. It was a promise of the ideal life to which they were looking forward and into which we will enter in when we come into the image of Christ and are made like Him. And that was the thing they were looking forward to of which mere entrance into Palestine was only a portion that was cut off for the unbelieving generation in the wilderness and so he warns people let it not be cut ~~off~~ from you with unbelief. Harden not your heart as they did And so the implication is that God promised all along right from the beginning has been for something far greater than just a piece of land but the piece of land loomed very large in it in connection with the Israelites in the wilderness.

And consequently it brings it out in strong belief. Yes?, Student: Was the main influence then of this particular quotation for the presnt day of (12) that they are in danger of Well was he writingg to unsaved people?

MacRae: Well he is writing to , mostly to people who have professed but he is calling upon them to make their profession sure To make sure that they are real believers. Not ~~with~~ to harden their hearts as in the provocation to those who came out of Egypt, want through the service. who had the passover and seemed to be God's people and yet lusted after Egypt and were afraid to go forward in the promised land. It showd unbelief in God in the two ways. And dissatisfaction with what he was giving and lack of confidence that he could lead them where He wanted to take them.

Student: (1,3) MacRae: No, not at all. I would think there ^{doubtless} were many who were saved but that they were probably, there were a great many who were lost and that as a generation, they were given a, from the viewpoint of this wordd, a ~~punishment~~ they were given a punishment which serves as an example

and a type of punishment for those who do not truly believe, in following the Lord. Yes?

Student: (13 1/2)
You mean in Hebrews?

MacRae: You mean it is restricted to

one generation? Where is that? Student; 3:10 MacRae: Yes, ^{No}/I think

that is a direct quotation from Psalm 95 where it says 'Forty years long was I grieved with this generation and said ~~do~~ ^{It is a} ~~the~~ people do err in their hearts, and they have not known my ways'. He is speaking of the generation in the wilderness I think. Not of the Hebrew race. And of course your Greek word ~~day~~ (14) can also mean a race but I don't think your Hebrew

word . I think that is just a generation. And of course that is what is used there in the Psalms. Dr. Buswell?

Buswell: Well your reference to the Hebrew word, but isn't there a possibility that he was

trying to show the Hebrew in was a lot that the Gentiles were lost. And they had not entered in for the

Jews claimed that they had everything. MacRae: Yes. Buswell: And they ~~had~~ must feel like they just like the Gentiles. . Student:

MacRae: No, I think it is generation. But that in his day, this book of Hebrews had the address quite a bit to ~~do~~ ~~those~~ Jews who have not yet taken a position ^{either} /for or against Christ. Maybe specifically trying to

bring to them the knowledge of salvation even though it is more primary application is to Jews who already professing Christians. Some of them true Christians and some of them not and ~~he~~ is trying to point out to them

it is not sufficient to simply enter into God's rest simply to the Jew, that there remains the rest for the people of God and you can not enter into that without faith in the provision that God makes. Yes? Student:

(End of H 33) (Begin H 34) MacRae: Yes, (Gr. word)

can be either a race or a generation. I believe it is and in this case 'geneia' is used to translate the Hebrew word in Psalm 95 where he is speaking to the generation in the wilderness. And I don't remember any case, I haven't looked up more specifically to find out whether it should mean anything other than generation. But I have never come across one word ⁽²⁾ except in generation. And in the Psalm it seems specifically

15
14

to be a statement of that generation in the wilderness ~~for~~ forty years
 so I am inclined to think that that in the case genie? in the particular
 passage would have to be interpreted that way. Wouldn't you think so, D...?

Buswell: (1) the word. MacRae: Yes, that the translation of the Hebrew
 word should represent then, the idea of that Hebrew word. Yes? Student:

MacRae: Yes, I think so, that's right. Buswell:; Is it possible, Dr. MacRae,

it seems to be very divided in this way it seems strange looking back
 from the New Testament and it is possible to get the thought of it like
 something like this: 'He is our God, we are the people of this passage

today, ~~if~~ if we hear his voice, . That would be the logical end of the
 paragraph, then he goes on, holding what his voice was, Harden not your
 heart(2) If you hear his voice, you are all of this.

MacRae: Very interesting suggestion, yes, Buswell: Then you wouldn't

tell about the work provision, then in Hebrews you would say, They're
 uncommon (2 1/2) , today, /if you hear his voice, comma, harden not
 your hearts. MacRae: If you hear his voice, colon. harden not

Buswell: Oh you put it right then or you could say, parenthesis today parenthesis
 if you hear his voice. Student: (3) in Hebrews; Buswell: Well

I think it does, and he goes on to say, if you really have
 then all this is true about the Jews. MacRae: Of course that is one of
 my big theories or I don't know if theory is the word, it is one of the
 things the convictions into which I am more and more coming in my studies
 One of the things that is impressing me more and more, that when the New
 Testametrn quotes the Old Testament, what the New Testament is doing is is
 to remind you of the passages, not to say" Here are three words and they
 prove this, but to say, There is a Psalm which proves this. There is a
 passage in Isaiah which proves this. And to quote for the purpose of
 reminding you of the passage rather than for the purpose of proving, because
 this word is used there, that is the fact. That is one of the convictions
 which I am becoming more and more the further I study the relationship
 of the New Testament to the Old. There are many, many places where it just

doesn't make sense, to take three words from the Old , the New Testament quotes and then go on to Therefore this is true." Well, those three words don't prove it at all. But the context proves it. It is what the Old testament is talking about. And it is my present belief that that is true in all quotations in the New Testament. That it is the context that is vital and not just the particular words. I haven't yet examined all passages, and that is why I say, it is something I am coming into more and more. But I see nothing to leave me to question it yet, Everything I have seen points in that direction but I want to go much further. Mr?

(4½) MacRae: Yes, well the outline here is rather peculiar in Hebrews wouldn't you say, Dr. Buswell? In chapters one and two, the ~~point~~ point was that Christ is superior to the angels and yet at the beginning of chapter two we have a passage where Christ, being superior to the angels, then how ~~extremely~~ extremely important it is that we give special heed to what he says, It is an exhortation stressed in there. And then when we start Chapter three, ~~we find~~ we are trying to show that Christ is superior to Moses, aren't we? And we go on with that for awhile, Christ in relation to Moses, but we devote more space to ~~the~~ the exhortation than we do to the argu (5½) argument. And the exhortation is generation in Moses time is unbeliev~~able~~ -ing. Now let us not be unbelieving. It is an exhortation which is I ~~find~~ would think/you might say ^{only} accidentally connected with the subject of the argument. It is closely connected in vital in importance, but it is brought in here, because it is suggested by the connection, rather than that it is logically necessarily put here. Is that too strong, Dr. Buswell? But I think it is Moses, now that we have taken up as our next subject, verse three, is our logical next step. Three ; three , "for this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, that is our logical next step now. Christ in relation to Moses, but we give more of our attention to, Let's see that we don't make the error in relation to Christ that those people make in relation to Moses. Now I hope you all have your reports ready and just a word about the work

The problem was raised to me, As you know, we have those who are doing one hour of work , undergraduate work, simply turning in each time a report of one hour undergraduate and that only requires one hour work outside and I think if that hour, in that hour, if you go over what is done in class and get a good idea of it so you will have it well in mind for the next class so you read ahead of this. That is about all you can do in an hour. If you are doing of hour of graduate work, you have two hours work to do each week, which means you review what is done in the last class, and look ahead a bit and read the passages in the Hebrew and the Greek and that is about all you can do. You won't have time for much more with one hour graduate work. Now if you are doing two hours of undergraduate work, you have four hours a week to do and that gives you time to work into the Hebrew and Greek a bit and to work in the commentaries a bit. Now if you are doing two hours of graduate work, then you have six hours of graduate work to do outside which gives you time to get thoroughly well into commentaries and discussions and into the Greek and the Hebrew and I would think that probably there would be a danger feeling well, now what will we do with all ~~this time~~ there , There is danger of waisting the time. and so I should think that if you have two hours of graduate work, it would be very wise to make a , to write up a report on what you see of interest in the study of the Greek and the Hebrew in the Septeugent, what you see that is vital and helpful and what you find in the commentaries, list the ones you look into, what are the points they bring, out,, how they compare with one another, How they compare with one another. If you would ~~bring~~ make a report like that and bring it in within your six hours of time, I think it would make your six hours much more worthwhile and all to enable us to see that you are really doing two hours of graduate work. So that I would like to make that suggestion for any that are doing just two hours of graduate work. Now of course, that doesn't mean that if you are doing it for two hours of undergraduate and you find time for such ~~work~~ a report within your four hours, we don't have any objections of making such

a report but I wouldn't put the same stress upon it there that I would do for those who are doing two hours for graduate work, credit. So we will continue there next week.

October 29, 1951

(Begin H 35) At the end of our last class together, I believe Dr. Buswell was discussing the passage we had I think pretty well handled the question of whether the apostle or whether the writer of Hebrews was wrong in quoting the references to rest as referring to something more than the entrance into Canaan. Dr. B. has mentioned to me some further evidence on it which I think is very interesting which he will doubtless mention to us when he starts to speak but I think the main points of it, we covered fairly well. That it was not simply finished, their coming into Canaan and the Apostles misusing it, but actually the reference made by the writer of Exodus, or by the Lord speaking through the writers of Exodus and Numbers was actually referring to the very thing of which the writer of Hebrews had in mind. Yes,?

Student: You say that in Exodus the fulfillment of entrance (1)

M: No. I wouldn't think so, I don't think that the entrance into Canaan would be only a symbol you might say, perhaps a portion of it and yet perhaps you would say it was partially fulfilled in the case of Caleb and Joshua. They did enter into Canaan and they were men who entered into God's rest in a very way. But the rest of them all died in the wilderness. Moses did not enter then into God's rest, though he surely has by this time. And (class laughter) I would think that many of them were saved like Moses was and did enter into God's rest or will at the resurrection but that the others those who were lost, of course did not and I would not think that the new generation entering into Canaan was the fulfillment of that promise. But for them the rest of God would have that as a very slight part of it. It would mean something far more than that, of course in their case, when they came in it had to be conquered. And then the Lord gave them rest from their enemies round about. But that after all was a temporary rest. It was not the rest of God which was specifically promised. I think Dr. Buswell has a little more to say on that and if he can go on in the passage and then he has another

matter of a big general nature, he would like to take up. Dr. Buswell:

On the matter of the rest, just a reference in Exodus the 33 chapter, Exodus 33:14, Moses is praying and is quite concerned about all these difficulties the rebellion that had occurred and the stupidity of the people, their failure to understand and God says: "My presence will go with thee and I will give thee rest. My presence will go with thee and I will give thee rest. And Moses said, ~~Let it~~ If thy presence go not with me (3) Grk:

Moses said, related the rest which God would give to the whole journey. But says, we all do spiritually. Now Moses didn't exactly get into Canaan himself but the Lord did bring him into rest and the Lord's presence was very manifest to Him. So as Dr. MacRae has indicated ^{It seems that} that the Old Testament writers regarded the entrance into Canaan as symbolical or analogous to entering into the promised land ~~hindering into the promised~~ It would be to heaven or to the future blessedness but was not literally that. And the author of the epistle to the Hebrews argues if where Joshua really got the next generation had been rest, in the sense of promise of the Lord, then it would have been wrong to calling another time today. Later on in the 95th Psalm. But David was correct in saying, in this day, ~~Today~~ if you will hear his voice, harden not your heart. He swore at that time that they would not enter into his rest because of unbelief. Now anyone in unbelief does not enter into his rest and it is by analogy anyone in faith, enters into his rest. Therefore the rest into which God invites his people is not a temporal thing like just entering Palestine, but there remaineth a rest. In all nations for the people of God. But that is about what we said at lunch, Dr. MacRae? Something like that. Is there anything more on that heading? AAM: I think that covers it Now does anyone have any questions? Bus: Any questions about Yes, sir? Student: What makes a difference from their writing in heaven. Is that (5 1/4) God is the idea of heaven? Buswell: Well, would you say that whenever anyone really enters into spiritual fellowship with the Lord, through regeneration, that he at that time passes out of death into life, we know And he passes into the rest of God. The spiritual type of life. That is the

way I have taken it. I have taken it not as heaven but as we have already said about the new covenant being always new for anyone who will enter into it. Now that might be (6) . We say when a person dies, that he has entered into rest. Well now that is true in a certain sense. He has stopped from other deliverance but later on in the chapter, the argument is When anyone has believed in Christ he has entered into Gods rest. And he has stopped trying, trusting in his own works. So conversely when anyone has stopped resting in his own works, he therefore has entered into the rest of God. Now that is the way I have always understood this rest. Now as the chronological thing at all. But as a status which is always open to sinners always by grace. "My presence will go with thee and I will give thee rest"

Student: The analogy of Canaan would be entering into a type of life more than people than it is a type of milk and honey so that type of living. (7)

Buswell: I think that is it. MacRae: Would you think however that rest is something which is completely and instantaneously entered into like justification would there not be a fuller phase of it further along in the Christian life.

Buswell: Well I think the rest begins when you are justified and it becomes a deeper experience. I would place this point on the, at the 16th edition change (7½) to in Romans 5. I think

I like the orbitary subjunctive. Let us present our ~~possessions~~ ^{Being} justified, ~~let us~~ ~~we~~ let us have peace with God, we already have it but we don't experience so the rest is progressive certainly. What I was referring to a moment ago was this verse of the fourth chapter, He who has entered into his rest, had ceased from his , just as God ~~seize~~ ^{seize} from his labors. So anyone who is not trusting in his own works. And is trusting in the Lord, is entered into rest in that sense of the Word, Not to deny the appropriateness of referring to heaven or the Millennium or the New Earth as further development of the rest. Student: have been making a contrast with the analogy that you have just mentioned before. Namely as the children of Israel upon leaving Egypt had not entered into the rest, but were to enter into it as they continued to the end. But they did not enter into it

because of unbelief. The analogy that the people could believe in Christ had not yet entered into the rest. That is what it seems to be thought is it not? Buswell: Yes, it is like that, the analogies are a little bit complicated all the way along. New Testament analogies from Old Testament scriptures are not ~~as they~~ (9) but they are complicated

and we are likely to jump to the wrong conclusion. //As Joshua led them into the promised land, so Christ leads anybody into rest. But as one generation of people died in the wilderness, didn't even get into Canaan, so anybody who doesn't have faith, doesn't enter into rest. And I think that is it.

Yes sir: Student: It seems though according to verse 11 that this rest is not something already obtained but something that is set before us as a whole. Buswell: But it is labor to enter into this rest. Student: Now could be saying, you say steadfast as the children of ~~Israel~~ Israel should have remained steadfast, so that when the time comes for them to enter into

the of rest you will be counted as one who is a leader. and ~~do not~~ turn back to Judiasm. Buswell: That is right, but you remember all the way

through here, there are phases in which the Armenians think they get quite a little comfort because he be ¹⁰ ing these people as professing believers who may not really be born again. There are quite a number of faces that would indicate that the writer is not sure of salvation of all these people.

But, let us therefore fear lest a promise being left to us to enter into his rest, any of you should seem to fall short of it. Student: Doesn't that sound like it is future though? Something in the future? Buswell: I can

see how it would sound that way and it is very popularly been read that way but I think it wouldn't fit the total analysis of the book. You are confident in him. Take verse 14. Where you have it a little bit clearer. ^{You} ~~You~~ are

participated of Christ, if you hold fast the beginning of your profession fervent to the end. 3:14, Student: That is a good verse with the Armenians they can't. Buswell: The Armenians take that you know and think they have a case and (some class laughter) and three, six, If the boldness and glory of the hope fervent to the end we hold on to. Greek: (11½)

So I think all the way through here, the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews is dealing with a group of people who are in serious danger of going back to formalism and whereas he doesn't in any sense comfort Armenianists but he says a lot about the continuance with the persistancy of the Christian life which a good many Calvinists need to remember. The, sometimes those 'once saved, always saved' people seek carnal security and not Godly security so this is good diet for Calvinists and they shouldn't destroy Calvinism.

Yes sir: On the basis of what you said previously, was Moses in Exodus 33:14 not sure yet of his rest, God has spoken he was invaded (12½)

Buswell: But not, try this theory and see it is like getting a master key to a lot of different locks. The interpretation is correct ~~but~~ which unlocks all the doors. Try the rest. Is that which is always offered to all people who take it. And into which they enter by faith but in which they grow And in which rest, those who look on from the outside, may not be sure whether they have entered or not if they waiver, if they doubtful if they look as if they are going to throw it all overboard, well then the onlookers just don't know. for sure whether they have ~~it~~ entered it or not. I think that that theory fits all the cases. Student: Why the aggravation in 4:11?

Buswell: Well, I think that is important, 4:11, watch out therefore, verse 12, you mean? Oh I have it. 4:11. Let us therefore be zealous then to enter in. That is this is your (Grk) (13½) infinitive.

Let us labor therefore, not necessarily for future things, your infinitive is is of the very idea. Let us therefore be very diligent and zealous with reference to the business of entering in where whatever the time may be. See I get you going on your English. To labor, to do a thing is always a future reference. Student: In other words you don't ^{have} get the idea here of the (End of H 35)

(Begin H 36) and doesn't mean necessarily the outperformance of works but it does mean the application of zeal. Let us therefore be very earnest about this business of entering in. ^{MACHEN?} Mason's beginning book

you know, he frequently teaches in the early chapters to translate the infinitive

as the verbal noun in order to get the feeling of an infinitive. So this would not necessarily be a future reference. Yes. sir? Student"

and I will give you rest and take my yoke upon you and learn of me seems to imply ~~se~~ (1) B: Yes, for my yoke is easy, my burden is light. Come to me and I will rescue. (Gr. Words)

Mr. Dunneth make a little speech in his . He made a little talk on and . I will ~~cover~~ ^{sell} you up and I will ~~cover~~ ^{sell} you down

(Class laughter) It seems like a contradiction to labor ~~and~~ to enter into rest but I think we understand the verbal difficulties and the simplicity of the . That is what we do when we become Christians. Well we work

harder than we ever did before. But what do we do? We trust completely in Christ and it isn't a contradiction but it is a different way of expressing ourselves. So come to me . When we come to the Lord and commit ourselves

to Him we ~~rest~~ ^{are resting} completely in Him and then we are intensely laboring but the yoke doesn't gaul our shoulders. The burden isn't too heavy. It's is a restful kind of labor. Student: Points of view / ^{James} on salvation by works and Paul

on Justification by Faith. Buswell: James doesn't teach salvation by Faith, but by faith with works. Student: I didn't mean, yes that is what I meant. Student: We try to show ~~the~~ an outward man the basis of salvation

while Paul is speaking about the godly view of salvation. Buswell: Yes, Paul is discussing the thing frequently from the inside although Paul verse says I can say about the outside view but this group of people evidently a group of professing Jewish /Christians , now I imagine the Jerusalem church here, you see they didn't get quite clear on Justification by Faith, and they believed in the Lord and yet they couldn't see exactly why the Gentiles

shouldn't ^{have to} /become Jews first. That was cleared up ~~a~~ in a way but a lot of them just went right along. While they did a lot of good in the old Jewish practices and then as a few years passed by, not difficult to see that ~~now~~ ~~if~~ someone got discouraged back in the home center ^{and all} ~~in~~ /~~Rome~~. How zeal and enthusiasm of in the mission field and the home center just kind of bogged down and while why not this be Jews and be done with it. That was the

way of our fathers and they went through these motions. The motions did them a lot of good and the argument all the way through is the motions that Judaism now after having learned of Christ would be a mockery and it would be just a howl/shell. It wouldn't be true to what the Old Testament really teaches. Yes Sir? How do you account for the verse which has (4 1/2) 4:8 of the King James translating the word Jesus. Buswell: Well they just set the word right over. The (4 1/2) . And all the way through your new Testament. You see, you have a literalness in proper names. Now it is an argue over points but, Student: You wouldn't know if this is Joshua from any of the other/texts contexts. would you? Buswell: No, but like and Jeremiah. No I would argue that in English the word is Jeremiah but they just set over these words and they were textbooks as their texts. and they use Jesus. They knew in the first century that they were lots of people with the name of Jesus Gayseus? (5 1/4) But was a common name. Sometimes the athesists will get excited. Someone will dig up a mummy somewhere with the name of Jeshus Yashus on it. And Oh, now we have discovered the body of Jesus as if there hundreds of them probably that might be discovered. Yes, Sir: Student: Do you understand Paul to be that of in which he in saying that (5 3/4) Buswell: Each, -yes-

you see first person plural in Portetory material, let all of the group be very diligent about this thing. Be very anxious about this thing. Now Paul himself, if , we aren't talking about Paul here, but he says, Let thy might become a "docimaus" See that didn't mean that I might be lost. But I might loose my cutting edge, I might seize to be of any value. But I think, we often in our preaching, speak in the first person, when we if you wjold analysize it right down it doesn't mean me in particular but it does mean all of us. Those who haven't actually been saved. And what he says would apply to many Christainas as well. Let us hear lest some of you should fall short. It would apply to any Christian as well . Let us hear lest some of /s/ you should fall /s/short. That would apply to the inspired writer himself. See, l/s/ lest some should fall short. Every church might

say that to itself . Let us fear, lest all these precious promises being given, some people write in that the congregatinn might not actually be born again people. Well that jwould fit. Yes. Now this leads into the question of the type of analogy. Yes sir? Studetn: This word in the tenth verse, works, ~~Wt/is/~~ as God did from his. Buswell: Well the Genesis 2:2 reference is in the background. God performed a great work of creation. And when he had finished it and saw that it was all very good, he rested from his work of creating and blessed that Sabboth day, that rest day. Now just as God hath performed his work and rested so he invited sinners to inter in to his fellowship of rest and so God after having labored, not of course in self'-righteoulness, but having done the work of creating, seised from creating God is not creating worlds his work of providence ? (8½) goes on but one was believe in Christ hath seised from works because it seems a rather remote analygy lmt that is what the analogy seems to be. Maybe something in there that I don't see. Do you see anything more in there, Dr. MacRae? God rested. I have been dabling in it and I haven't had a chance to look up and see if there is an Septeugent reading or for the word rest in the Numbers passage. In Numbers 14:22 to 23. Has anyone examined the Septeugent there? When I have to go out somewhere and then back to Wilmington, I can't bring all my bookd. Student: Numbers 14:22? And it is also quoted in 14:29 the same word. Buswell: What is the word in Numbers? S^Tudent:(9½) Buswell: Oh, well then the Psalm is quoting from NUMbers. Student :Yes, Buswell: You see in, I haven't had time to get at that. So then not only in Exodus 33: God gives this general reference to rest. Now there is the (10) . The Psalmist then is simply quoting directly from Numbers ~~Wt/is/~~ and if the translators were translating, then they would take the earlier translation. Numbers 14. That would account for the rest part of it. Surely they shall not see the land which I sware to their Fathers, any of them that desired me see it. Now what do you have in the Septelugent? Studetn: I looked it up and it is quoted just exactly the same. Buswell: Well now is that the ^{10½} or is that in Numbers? They shall not

see the land it says in Numbers in the Revised Version here. Verse 29, Say also, Your dead bodies shall fall in this wilderness. that were numbered of you according to your whole number from that twenty years old and upward that have murmured against me. Me shall not come in the land concerning which I swore. In English it says you shall not come into the land and the Psalm it says he quoted they would not come into Grk-(). Student:

B: You were probably were looking at the Psalms . Well that was my impression from the English but then we are back where we were that the Psalmists (11 $\frac{1}{2}$) quotes the fact that that they could not enter into the land as an analogy of the fact that those who do not have faith do not enter into Gods rest. so now we are back where we started. Well, I havent anything more to contribute on that but this opens up to the general question of the nature of an analogy in the epistle to the Hebrews. It is a very common expression we can usually account for it and that is the (12 $\frac{1}{4}$) is something like this. A. is parallel to B and then we go on. A. You have the high priest so now we have the priests then were all priests as here you have the congregation called out, so now neglect the assembling of yourself together and as you have the passover, so now you have Lords supper and as you have circumcision and so on and now you have baptism and all those literal comparisons sustaining the group of gods people in the Old Testament and the group of Gods people (13) in the New Testament. Now that very common way of reading into the Scripture. But as a matter of fact it is a very literal of that in the whole New Testament. Very very little. And very little in the epistle to the Hebrews. We do have, you do have reference like this Therefore let us keep the peace I Corinthians. Therefore let us keep now that the old leaven wickedness but with the unleaven bread, sincerity and truth and we infer to keep the peace means keep the Lord's supper. Sp he doesn't even not say that and in Hebrews We have an order whereas they have no right to eat who serve tabernacle. And it is that we have an alter means the Lords supper and you have a comparison between a church system, a church situation and a Jewish situation. The Jewish

Record not too plain from 10 to 14.

And you can not translate it, you have to explain it. It is impossible to put it all over into English and into translation. I remember that is what A. C. Robertson said about some other things. I asked him how do you translate (11½) and he said he was very brupt you know, and "You can't translate it! you have to explain it." He give you a snappy answer, and he said that doesn't translat it but the was a man. You got to explain it. (Some laughter)

So they shifted from (12) stolen and Is the nonominative. You just have to stop

and explain it but it is the, not too difficult to explain. We are here before you not to change a ritual. Not to ask you to get into religion. Not to ask you to be initiated into our society. That is not the business ^{2, 12/12}

It is a living relationship. We are one before we die, we are ~~laid~~ laid back just like the figure of speech to ks the animal. Now don't try to give that in a prayer meeting talk. I tried it once. (Laughter). And a good old Bible knowing elder came to me. "What were you talking about?" Well, I said, I was trying to explain this greek word. Well why did you drag in that animal? (Class laughter) There is

some things that you have to explain to a Bible class where they can sit down and ^{answer} ask you about and talk it all over. But is is there just the same.

The (13) was the slaughter ax or knife or sword ,a heavy sword and everything before the eyes of Christ, is just like the neck of an animal laid back for the ax to be swung. And that explains the joints and marrows you see. The priests ax swings right through the neck of the animal, cuts the whole thing marrow and everything. And as the rod slaughters the animal. It is simply laid back before the priest, so the Word of God designs our goal and deserns our spirit and diserns our heart our thoughts, discerns our intent, diserns everything. I don't know ifwhehter we need to stop on the for this verse. AAM: the body is made up of two parts the joint and the marrow. isn't the spirtk made up of the /soul and spirit? B: Laughs) Yes, it is funny, (Class laughter)

church and the Gentile church. But it is very in the whole

New Testament and there is a good reason why. Yes sir? Student:

(End of H 36) (Begin H 37)

Student: tabernacle of the church, visible church. B: Yes , very little of that Well now occasionally analogy is wrong and it is not wrong ~~if~~ / if I take for us to take the comparison between God's people in any age. How did the church get along in the early colonial days in American with Indians shooting out of the bushes and all of that? How did the church get along in the cities of Europe in Medieval times. when so much darkness, there is nothing wrong about drawing an analogy between visible things, invisible things but there is very little of that in the New Testament and I think the reason is not far to see that the whole thing that they had to contend with, with the Jews was the magnifying of outward details of contact and actually making that the essence of religion. And neglecting the spiritual things. That is

(1) ism was a system of self-righteousness, neglecting the grace of God. Missing the point of justification by faith which David taught and which Isaiah taught but simply magnifying the idual. Now if Paul had come and said, I could pass over the priesthood of atonement. Now you have the breaking of bread and the drinking of wine. Oh sure, we are just going right on into it. None of us would deny the analogy I guess between the breaking of bread and taking of the communion wine and the day of atonement in ~~the day of~~ the Passover. But if Paul had said that in that day, oh they would have everything would just have gone right over(1 1/2) . If much had been named of analogy between physical things and physical (2) no of the whole

. Get you eyes on the spiritual reality. Get your eyes on Christ. So the analogy is Student: Catholicism in the idols of ~~Heathen~~ ^{Heathen} Edon do you not? where it isn't a far step from the idolatry of the Heathen to the idolatry of ~~the~~ Catholicism . B: That is very true, yes, give up your heathen God and we will give it a new name. And it is the same exactly (class laughter) Of course there you have a difference that the heathen

Record
hard
to
understand.

idoltry is forbidden by God and the Catholics took it over whereas Levitical ritual was ordained by God for the purpose of preparing for Christ. But even there he takes you right into very reluctant to put any great emphasis on any outward offered thing. When the emphasis is put on anything thing, in the tenth chapter of first Corinthians, Paul says 'Don't you think for a moment that you are saved, just because you have been baptised and because you have had the Lords supper. Those people were baptised too land they had spiritual food they drank of the rock and they ate of the manna. But their carcauses feal in the wilderness so there/where he does bring outthe analogy between the visible ordinance and invisable ordinance, he says don't trust in either, so we should be very cautious about this jumping to the conclusion that he is comparing the church with Ismael. That is some of that but very , very little Now then you have different types of analogy. A very common type of analogy is A. is to B as AB is to C. Now you find that in the tabernacle the outward tabernacle to the holy of holies. Is the offered which is the earthly and here is the holy of holies which at that time represented a spiritual thing. That is that this was definitely any extremely sacred place. Now the analogy is A is to B as the whole system is to the heavenly reality in Christ. The whole tabernacle system is earthly as compared to with what it all represented in the Lord Jesus Christ. Now you watch for that mode of comparison as it goes right through. Another one that fits this (4½) is Palms statemtnt of Sinai in Jerusalem . Sinia is to Jerusalem as Sinaia ~~to~~ Jerusalem is to salvation ~~to~~ in Christ. Student: What do they represent there? B: They represent that is in the first case, Student: ~~First/analogy~~. B. ~~First/analogy~~ In the personality the honor chamber of the tabernacle. As the high priest went through this outward thing day by day and only once a year went into the holy of holies, ~~that~~ so Christ did the whole thing wnce for all. and we have a high priest who has passed through the heavens. That you see puts the main emphasis on the reality in Christ. He never is inviting them substituting one ritual for another. because the way in which the majority of them practice.

the old ritual was not in faith. He always is saying "Realize what that old ritual symbolized and then as they realized what it symbolized, naturally wouldn't go back to the old formula they would come to the church as constituted now. So ~~if~~ A is to B as AB is to C. ~~if~~ is a very common type of comparison and then you have another which is also very common simply the AB is to or the AB is parallel to C, that is to say Christ is our passover. Christ is our high priest. Christ is our sin offering. Christ is all of these things. So those two tests of comparison are very common in Hebrew. And we should look for those first. Now I put them put them in a chart form, you break in Dr. MacRae when you have, I ~~mean~~ might top a heresy here. Class laughter) Now throughout the scriptures there is a comparison between heavenly things and earthly things. And the pattern on the mount or the heavenly pattern, lets just use the word, the heavenly pattern and identify that with the pattern which Moses saw on the mount. The heavenly pattern. Now in the garden of Eden, God was with man on earth. Then sin came in and godly worship was represented by the sacrificial system. God communed with man but the actuality of Gods relationship to man was represented in heaven and it was represented on earth through symbols and not for a moment to deny the ~~reality~~ reality of the fellowship of godly man. And Enock walked with God. But from the time of ~~Abel~~ Abel on, you see the blood sacrifice and the Patarical system and then the aLevitical system now when Christ died and rose again, that was a part of the heavenly pattern again on earth. One reason why I personally reject this theory that Christ had to go up to heaven before he could do certain things on earth. That would make the (Grk) (8 3/4) of the cross of none effect. When he died on earth that was not a symble . that was a transaction of the heavenly . That was the place which in all the universe where God did that piece of business. And when he died it was a finished atonement when he rose from the dead, it was a vindicated atonement. Vindicated in open evidence so that is not a type, you see, He right there accomplished our salvation. Now then lyou have ~~Chr~~ types and patterns, baptism in

the Lords supper and Christian assembly in the church as confident here and of course you have the coming of Christ and his being with us. Now in order to have a Jew here in the first century AD where a group of Jews were in danger of going back to Judiasm, well that would mean they would go back to the symble which has been fulfilled in the cross made an appropriate symble and they would make that their ~~symble~~ religion. Make that their idolotry. Just like a lot of people today they fight churchanity they think and

so appealing. Look what you are missing. the Heavenly pattern. Did you not now seize to give all adoration to Christ and go back to Judiasm you are just following ^{the} a pattern of the mount so that type of comparison Very little of this amiss. This and this or this is and the whole thing compares this. There are, that A is to B as AB is to C , I gave you the outer and inner sanctuaries. and Saiai in Jerusaleum and the other very common one is Egypt and the yilderness and the promised land. The wildernes journey is to the promised land as the whole business is to salvation. in Christ. That is A is to B as AB is to C. Now I think that is something to keep in the back of our minds. Dr. MacRae as we go along and you probably will work out clarifications under finements of these formulas but that much after the total overall comparisons to which we look. Now, what shall we do next? MacRae: Why continue. B: All right. Student: As I understand that you said that the (12) Buswell: Oh, the old sacrificial system was Messanic prophecy. It was inteded to be. But that was symbolical. What I said ~~was~~ is the death of Christ is not a symble. The death of Christ is the actual ~~prob~~ transaction of business And God only time. There is wasn't like anything in which Moses could veil his face because it was only symbolical and they were learning. There it wasn't like the question as to whether this land is just so many days or anything of that kind, or a question of whether you use fermented wine or unfermented wine or leaven bread or unleaven bread or there wasnt any such question as that. (12½) salvation was accomplished.

this is heavenly Business. This is a part of the actuality in relationship to God. Yes sir? Stud: in your formula, would you say that A is to C what B is to C. Is that probable? B: Well, the A in that point is something relatively inferior as the B is something relatively superior as the wilderness is to Canaan so the wilderness and Canaan are to salvation. S: Progressive there aren't they. MacRae: Yes the B was not New Testament in that case.

MacRae: Yes, I thought maybe I would stand up for just a minute or two. I think Dr. Buswell the fact that he has raised a bunch of questions which are vital for us to have in mind. They affect many points in our whole Christian testimony, in our Christian viewpoint and so I think it is perhaps worth a minute or two more or less repeating what he said and stressing it, just a bit. I think that it is very important that we recognize certain erroneous attitudes in which we can easily get. One erroneous attitude is the Jews had some ceremonies. and the ceremonies say we have the cross and the cross saves us. Of course that is utterly false. The N. T. says the blood of bulls and goats can not take away sin. The Jews were not saved by the ceremony. Well of course, another entirely different type of error in which many fall is this, the Jews had some sacrifices which saved them. We have the baptism in the Lords supper and church membership would save us and that of course is extremely common today. And equally wrong. They and of course just as contrary to the teaching of Martin Luther or any of the great founders of the Reformation as anything could possibly be. These are symbols. The reality is what saves us.

(End of H 37) -/- (Begin H 38) I think this is a very important point that Dr. Buswell made to make this diagram here, I have never seen this before made that way. But I think it brings out rather sharply the difference. We have symbols before and we have symbols after and then we have the cross in the middle which is reality. Well that doesn't mean we have reality before we don't have reality after of course here he had no thought in mind whatever. There was reality before and there was reality afterwards and reality before was symbolized in various ways and reality before was symbolized

in various ways and reality since is symbolized in various ways. But the cross is not part of the symbolism the cross is part of the reality and is the most important part of the reality. And is closely related to the reality before and the reality afterwards. Now there are all sorts of false ideas that come from a failure to understand the correct relationship between the Old and New Testament. All sorts of them and you can total them together as if they were exactly identical, which is utterly wrong. ^{And leads} ~~At least~~ to all sorts of errors and you can separate them as if they were different and contradictory and that equally wrong. And the apostle draws many analogies some of which are bringing out the basic meaning of the original symbols. Some of which are just using them as analogy to draw a lesson from but it is very vital that we catch the distinction between them in this regard. Now ^{of the relation} the whole question the relation of the Old covenant, The new covenant is ^{concerns} ~~the~~ one ~~which concerns~~ more fully from other parts of our studies of Hebrews. Because that goes into it more at length and at some later places, we will find that people have been lead to misunderstanding through incorrect interpretation of these passages. Try to make out the old Covenant was nothing, the covenant of death, all that it brought was death. The new Covenant was the covenant of life. Well in so far that is true that the New Covenant was present before was present with Moses. There was the covenant of life there. The same as now. I think too it is very important that we ^{have} ~~the~~ in mind the difference between New Testament symbols and Old Testament symbols. ^{Are} ~~One~~ New Test. symbols better than Old Test. Symbols? Old Test. symbols were much more fuller and much richer . That had much more detail. than New. Test. symbols. Old Test. symbols were very precisely specified. New Testament or not. The Old Test. tells us exactly how the sacrifice is to be made. What parts of the animal are to have this done and that done. that and the other. Exactly when they are to be circumcised. Exactly under what conditions all the different things are to be done. We have nothing of the kind anywhere in the New Test. The New Test. has not even specified the form of any of its ceremonies in such a way that ~~it~~ is clearly expressed

in the New Testament. All determinations of a particular form is necessary. in connection with any N. T. symbol is largely a matter of inference. It is not specifically mentioned in the scripture so that in one way you can say that the Old Testament symbols are better than the New Test. symbols they are much more detailed. They are much more specific. They are much more exact, they are much fuller, they are much richer. The difference is I think that the New Test. symbol is much more sketchy than the old because of the fact that the thing which the Old Test. symbolized has been performed

(3 $\frac{1}{4}$) And consequently it was necessary to use all sorts of precise ~~and~~ analogies to drive home to your mind, the great facts of the death of Chrsit and its meaning for us and now we can look back on this reality . We know so much more about its meaning now than they could know then as we look back to it. That that which they could aprehend through faith, much of it we can comprehend more fully than they could simply because it has happened. Therefore out ceremonies can be much more skeptic than they were then. And at that time it was necessary to have these ceremnies more full because of the fact we didn't have the full knowædge it couldn;t be made clear entirely until the thng happened. And so we had to have much more ceremony to drive the thing home. to you and when you have more ceremony there is ^{that} ~~a~~ tremendous danger that comes with it inevitably a formalism and ritualism that is a ~~a~~ tremendous danger and when it is no longer necessary to have its full ceremonies, it is very very vital that we cut them down~~y~~ as the New Testament has in order to decrease the danger of ritualism and formalism . But ritualism and formalism were just as wrong under the Old Testament as they are today. And we know how much we have in many of our churches today of ritualism and formalism. even a feeling that you go through a ceremony and something id done. Rather than that you have a relation to Christ and you typify it by a ceremony. There is so much of that that we can see how great the danger was with the more extensive ceremony. All these are different points that Dr. Buswell had brought out. I don't think I have added anything to what he said, but one or two questions

made me think that it was perhaps worthwhile to discuss it a little more and perhaps to look at it from two or three, I won't say different angles but, express it different ways, a little simply to add to the expression he had given. Because it is very important. I don't think we are so much reaching a conclusion here as we are in some things. We are getting these problems in mind ^{in order that} ~~so~~ we can keep them in mind as we go on in other passages in Hebrew. Particularlity passages which if misinter~~pre~~ted, can easily lead people astray. Well now would you like to go on there Dr. Buswell?

B: Thank you. We had just concluded the eleventh verse, let us speak

(5½) to enter into that rest by the same pattern. Let us be zealous therefore to enter into that rest. In order that not by the same pattern of unbelief anyone should fall. Should fall short. Now of course the word is a symbol word by the same periden. You say periden, they said. By the same periden of unbelief as they didd in the wilderness so anybody who doesn;t have faith, falls short of this blessedness. And then this reinforced by a ~~very~~ very familiar word that we all quote out of context. Living is the word of God and energetic and shapper than an two-edged sword and piercing to the dividing asunder of soul and of spirit, of joint and of marrow, and it is (6½)

of the thoughts, purposes of the heart and there is not any creature uncovered or for which is not laid open before him or before it, which shall we say?

But everything is naked and laid back before the eyes of him with whom we have these words. or the account. MacR: What is the relation of verses

12 and 13 to what preceeds. B: I think that is simply a climax. What

we are talking about is your relationship to Christ. And Student: How do you the word here? B: Well, Christ is the Word and he is the living

word. Stud: Do you think this refers to Christ or to the Scripture?

B: Why I think it refers to our messge with is both Christ and the Scriputres It can refer only to Christ because the last phrase, Grk: (8)

Christ is obviously the one with reference to whom we have the word but at the same time, our message is not the matter of works of righteousness. ~~It~~ He has already indicated that, our message is a vital matter so it is not at

all wrong to quote this ~~xxx~~ as a separate text. with reference to our total methods which is Christ and the Bible. and our whole relationship to Christ. It fits very well as a climax of all that has gone before

Take the 95 Psalm here, how glad that it is to be in fellowship with God's people under the blessing of God. Now this fellowship and blessing is open to those who are saved. Now let's be very earnest about this business of Faith. Those who did not enter into the promised land. / Didn't enter in because of / Because of lack of faith. Now don't you fall short of this blessedness because of lack of faith, living is our message, Christ and all of Christs. And so I think that is it. The climax. Fits in with the context very well. and of course can be taken separately. Yes sir? / Student: Would you say that this last phrase is a poor translation in the English, "with whom we have to do".. No, it is not poor translation but you see Grk? 9¹/₂ is a very complicated thought. A statement from your banker is a . An account. literally with whom we have an account. I remember Goodsbie giving remarks on that in the . The may be distinguished from your broker, from the merchants with whom you deal. You owe so much at the bank or you have so much credit that with such and such a merchant that he , the one whom we have to do. With whom we have an account. bring out the whole thought of in English. The living word. Yes sir? Stud: Can you give any further word on the contextual connection here? I don't follow you. I mean I have wondered this all along in my Greek experience what the connection between eleven and 12. You are speaking of rest in eleven. It seems to come to a conclusion there .let us be diligent, the rest of unbelief. Does he mean then that the living word is able to be whether we have believed or not? Buswell: Yes, he means that, you can't fool him, just by outward performances. That is in it. That is the part of it and then he goes right on having ~~xxx~~ then the great high priest who has passed through the heavens. Not merely human heart to what went in beyond the veil. Yes if you take the off whole message which is the living Christ and all of our relationship to him.

discernment between the ~~disc~~ sould and spirit, but it ~~the~~ cleaves your sould and cleaves your spirit. It should be there is any out soul and of spirit. Nothing to it going forward you don't need to take time on that of sould and spirit, having therefore a high ~~pries~~, t a great high priest, who has passed through the heavens. I was ~~was~~ riding in my car one night late at night after a Bible conference. I had been preaching on Hebrews and I tuned in the radio to and I tried to get something. And here was something, here was a reading of $(\frac{1}{2})$ ~~Grk~~ And he was in his last moments both sing My honor has never been insulted. It is a very stiring thing. in the reading of it. I wouldn't ~~be able~~ want to see a show having heard it read. But he explains that he is about to die My ~~phum~~ which deems my honor as I go into eternity, my plum shall sweep the stars. meaning my honor has never been sully. This is purely humanistic. Human honor is something worth while but I, of course, this passage came to me. having then not a human high priest who is the chief ~~the~~ but having a great high priest who has passed through the heavens. Jesus, the son of God. Let us hold fast our profession. For we do not have a high priest who is able not to sympathize, Grk-- there it is, to sympathize with our weaknesses but having been tried in every respect similiarly apart from sin. I never let anybody say, that Christ was tempted in every was, just exactly as we are tested. He wasn't and the Bible doesn't say he was. He was tested, he was tried in all points similarly apart from sin. But never was tempted as a persons acquired for sin, is tempted to go on, for as a person who ~~does~~ sins in discreet and got himself intro~~d~~ cated ~~in a social~~ and got himself implicated in a social situation, is tempted to go on deeper into sin. Sometimes there are morbid, very revolting morbid things said by Fundamentalist people about temptations of Christ. Christ says he was not tempted that way and there is no reason to picture him tempted that way. He is holy . but he endured far worse than we ever will. He endured the cross and so we never need to think of the sufferings of Christ as ~~is~~ failing to prove to us his sympathy. He has gone far deeper in

suffering than we ever could. He endured the cross. Therefore, we don't detract at all from the value of the thought of his trials. when he was tried apart from sin. Yes sir? Stud: I thought that most translators say Christ was tempted. Buswell: Well in this sense, They were all of the outward circumstances, both of trial and infliction and of enducement to evil and failure but there was nothing in him that went on after. And there of course is all the difference in the world. When I get tempted from the outside, there is something in side here that reaches right after it. And that simply was not in Christ and there is no use of ever lying that to be suggested in our preaching. Stud: Is it the real quotation of it? Busw: the Grk (~~3~~¹/₂) but it wasn't an English temptation.

(Class laughter) He had no sin in him. He was tried, he went through in all of our afflictions, he was afflicted. All of that. But ^{it} It is very precise there in its actual construction. We Stud: Bus: It is the sin of humanity. Now we might draw the analogy for that in there, Adam was not made with a sinful nature. There was nothing in his nature as created which would lead him to go out after sin as a person has acquired a morbid appetite. Adam sinned, knowing what he was doing. And he sinned in being deceived. but so Christ had nothing in him to go out after sin and he didn't go out. It didn't Stud: Would you say that Adam was (5) B: Well we usually say that the humanity of Christ is a sinless humanity and now he is to that of the first Adam before the fall Yes, he sinned not because of his nature. We sin both because we are implicated by guilt and because of our corrupt nature and our corrupt environment. We have many many different reasons and causes. AAM: And then just because we choose to do it. B: Yes, deliberately. Christ had a sinless nature and Adam before the fall was not tempted to sin in the way in which one who ~~is~~ has acquired the habit of alcoholism is tempted to sin, or person whose fit his imagination on lust is tempted to go on into worse things. Christ simply was not in that situation. Adam was not in that situation before the

fall and Christ did not sin in any respect had no sin in himself. Stud:

But that analogy ~~breaks~~ breaks down immediately as soon as it starts doesn't it?

Which
B: What analogy? Stud: Adam had the possibility of sin but ~~not/the~~

(6) of sin. Bus: Well you have to define ~~the~~ possibility. He was

Student: The very fact that Adam sinned show that he was able to sin. B:

Yes. Christ was not able to sin. Bus: You mean he did not have the strength

in his hands to strike anybody in the nose. You see that word possibility

is, I heard that Macabee gave a pretty good illustration on that

He said Can I go home and beat my wife? And he doubled up his arm like that

you know, His wife was a pretty husky (Loud class laughter) But he said,

you know I can't do it. I simply couldn't do it and it is not in the picture

Another expression is: Christ was tempted to prove that he wouldn't sin.

But he went through all the trials that is the point. The Bible doesn't

present ~~then~~ to us that Christ was tempted to see what he would do. Never

Not at all. But he is presented as able to sympathise, there is your

whole point. Paul appointed the temptation of Christ is to show that he

is able to sympathise. Now exactly we know that he is able to sympathise

but we can appreciate it a lot better. The incarnation is not that God might

understand us, but that we might understand that God understands us. And

his trials show that he is able to sympathise. That is as far as you have

any right to go. Stud: Is that the only kind of temptation Christ in

the wilderness had? B: I think that is as far as the scripture goes.

The temptation in the wilderness. He went through a typical set of trials

and in everything he proved himself to be who he was. So he has been through

these things. And so if he hasn't been through your particular trial which

he certainly has not in all cases. He has been through fall works?(8)

He had a typical set of human trials. apart from sin. Yes, J. C. Massey

gets off on that once in a while and he pictures Christ as involved with

women and all sorts of things which is very disgusting to me and utterly

unscriptural. And now in the last verse of this chapter, Let us therefore

draw near with boldness to the throne of grace in order that we may receive

mercy and grace that we may obtain grace for a timely assistance. ~~For~~ ^{Grace} to help in a time of need. Grace for a timely assistance. Now begins an analogy with the high priest. Then comes ~~the~~ along interruption, First with Melchidecek and then the interruption of the Melchedicek passage finally after the Melchedicek passage is completed, we get back to the analogy of the Levitical priesthood. So you can't outline the epistle of the Hebrews with just a little simple high school theme or outline. It is a great piece of literature and the outline is intricate and the thought is interwoven as reality is interwoven. Every high priest taken from among man stands for men, in the things concerning God in order that he may offer gifts and sacrifices for sins, able to suffer in proportion which they do sympathise the different word, Greek--(10) able to see you appropriately, perhaps we should say, able to feel appropriately for their ignorances and their errors, since also he is established. He is compassed about with sin and for this reason it is necessary as for the people. so also for himself to offer concerning sin. Now that is the situation of the levital priesthood which as you will see later on is partly an alle ^{10/2} ? to Christ and partly of course not an al. In so far as the priest sympathises ~~as~~ has appropriate compassion on the weaknesses of the people Christ understands us thoroughly ~~as~~ so far as the high priest has to offer for his own sins then of course the analogy completely breaks down and is said to break down. And no high priest takes this honor for himself but he who is called of God is also Aaron was. So also Christ did not glorify himself to become a high priest and then we take up Melchidecek. And it was he who glorified him and who said to ~~him~~ , My son art thou, I today have generated thee, according as in another place, he said, you are a priest forever after the court of Melchedicek. And Melchedicek is dropped for a moment and then he goes back and tells him why he has got to postpone Melchedek discussion. He in the days of his flesh, having offered up entreaties and you could say ¹⁰ out his pleas I suppose or prayers and entreaties or entreaties and pleas to him who is able to save him from death was a

strong cry and with tears and he was saying Grk--(12½)

Now I have the opinion, ~~which~~ which some of our faculty don;t agree ~~with~~ wit. I never sought out Dr. MacRae on this. but I think Dr. Harris quite sharply disagrees with me on this and he is a fine scholar. So don't take it as from me but look it up. I have the feeling that the prayer in the garden was not a prayer ~~that~~ that he delivered from the cross but a prayer that was to be delivered from the physical colapse in which he found himself. He was actually

in the state of collapse and if he had swooned or died in the garden, the whole thing would have had to be started over again. You know if Christ had died in the Garden of Eden, if the worst enemies would have collected money to set up a monument to him. They would ~~have~~ have posed as his best friend ~~because~~ because he would have been out of the picture I have seen that in current experience. If a person would only die and get out of the way then we would praise him but they had to put him to death you see. They had to put him to death. I don't want to be too personal about any of these things but it was an issue and it is clear your mind. You stand there and let them ¹⁴ you. I think that is the thing to do. Let them see what they have done. Christ there in the garden as I can see this was to be delivered from fainting and collapsing physically right there and he was willing to faint and go through any experience that the Father might will but he ~~was~~ preferred to carry through and go to the cross. That seems to me to be what it is. And here it says, He imputed him who was able to save him from death and he was saved . He was saved. Now translate that (14½) Grk from the matter of concern and that is a difficult phrase. Yes, sir?

Stud: I was wondering if you you make anything out of Grk-- might be saved form out from the . (End of H 39)

(Begin H 40) Then what does this cup mean? This clearly is the reference to the prayer in the garden of Gethesmene and "let this cup pass from me, nevertheless not my will, but thine be done. " This cup,--certainly he didn't even contemplate that God might leave his soul in hell or leave

him in a state of death eternally. G^hk of course means found dead but he was saved from death in the garden he was physically in the state of collapse in the garden and the angels came and ministered unto him and strengthened him and he went on and died on the cross. Yes. sir? Stud" The suffering of the lord as you suggested then do you not, that not my will but thine be done, is that verse superfluous because it certainly wasn't the Lords will to ~~be~~ die as I understand it? Buswell: Now you picture the psychology of Jesus, he ~~is~~ was omnipotent but he did not choose to ~~hold~~ ~~off~~ all back in his conscieneous. He chose to voluntarily to operate in a scale of conscientousness in which he could be surprised That isn't too dificutl in psychology. He knew all things and at the same time he didn't hold all things in his consciousness. Student: Where do you get scripture for that? Buswell: Well he was surprised at their unbelief, he said he did not know that in the hour of his time he was astonished at their hardness of heart. Quite a number of scriptures. and then in Luke he grew in widdom ~~in~~ and ~~stature~~ stature in favor with God and man. And it is not difficult to explain that he had omnicience but at the same time he chose to operate in a plane of consciousness so that he could go to human psychological experiences and be hurt and be grieved and the ⁽²⁾ to prize. And now as he prayed there in the Garden, the symptoms are given that he was as the point of physical collapse I don't think he prayed to be delivered from the physical suffering but from the actual fainting in the garden. Now I think in his human mind at that time he had not held a consciousness ~~of~~ but this is the particular day and hour of the cruxification. if he should think now he would be crucified a lillle later. I think it is all consistant that he prayed nnt to die in the garden or not to swoon in the garden and never the less, if it is the will of God that I should ~~be~~ faint now and be carried to some tomb and then have to stir up this situation again, alright, ~~thy~~ thy will be done, but deliver me from this cup. Student: Well, then you pass from the state of knowledge or of ^{omniscience} ~~omnipotence~~ to the state of surprise and

back to the stat of omnipotence again when he says, behold here they come. Here they are come to take me. And he doesn't know that or he prays, not my will, but thy will be done if the possibility maybe that it was the Lords will that he die here in the garden, He immediately says he is omniscience again he says he knows, here they come to look for him.

Bhs: No the angels came and strengthened him. And he evidently felt strengthened and he saw them coming. ^{Told} ~~So~~ the disciples that is not even supernatural. knowledge there where he says here they come. Don't let it be mistaken there. Christ is omnipotent . at all times. but at the same time he is able to live in a certain plain of consciousness and to hold vast recents of his knowledge not in/^{his}active conscience wherein the knowledge of introc (4) when a Mathematics professor is trying to ~~keep~~

teach his six year old son Arithmetic. The Professor just doesn't have those formulas in mind. He is teaching arithmetic. He doesn't have that in mind.

That gets into the psycholdogy of Jesus but that is just wandering from HFebrews.

Anyway here you have a commentary on the agony in the garden and his prayer was answered. Whatever he ~~prayed~~ prayed ~~for~~, he got it. Therefore he was

not praying to be delivered from the cross and it seems the most plausible theory is that he was praying a very natural way to be delivered from his fainting spell. His collapse. in the garden. But that is a long, long argument. There are reams and reams of literature written on that subject.

But eh theological point is here in Hebrews you have the most exhaustltd presentation of the diety of Christ and the most vivid presentation of ~~this~~ suffering. ~~Ch/ll/ll/~~ (Greek-- $\frac{5}{4}$) see tje

play on . Woe a son . There you have the ascertainment of his eternal sonship. He learns obedience through the things which he suffered.

He learns through the things which he suffers. And there again we have the question, how could he be perfected, if he is always perfect? And we answered it over there in the second chapter, He accomplished in time precisely what his eternal purpose was. So he was perfected. He never was imperfect.

But he operated in time. He did precisely what he always intended to do. So

So how could he learn obedience if he is omnipotent? Well, he went through the experience of suffering he always knows as far as ⁽⁶⁾ position is concerned. But not in the days of his flesh, he literally went through this experience of suffering and being perfected, (Grk)

We read before he perfected himself. Being perfected, he became to those, he became the author of eternal salvation to those who obey him. Being designated by God high priest after the order of Melchizedek. Now we are back to this kingly priest. Yessir? Student: something confined to his life on earth or

did he suffer prior to as he looked forward (7)

Buswell: Well, he had no body before he was born and so he had no physical suffering but as to his mental attitude the Old Testament presents a pleading God yearning over his people, grieved with their hardness of heart. Yes, as far as his mental attitude is concerned. Student: As he looked forward

is there another experience in which he would face the reality to foreknowledge or what he would go through. Buswell: He always had that, but then when it came to his life on earth in time and space and body, he went through it.

Student: That wouldn't constitute suffering. Buswell: Oh it is a different kind of suffering. You see we suffer by anticipation, and then we suffer by actuality and then we suffer by regulation. Like standing on the diving board on a cold day. (Class laughter) You suffer and you shiver

and then you plunge in. I was up at Lake of the Woods in early June and that was just drinking water, that whole lake was icewater and I hadn't been swimming that year at all and I jumped in and it was worse in than it was anticipating. (Loud class laughter) The moment I got out I thought about it

There is a different kind of suffering. But here the reference is to his physical enduring of this thing. He not only anticipated it and know all about it, but he came and went through with it and having actually gone through with it, (8) now doesn't have any more information than

he had before but we have a lot more information, since we know that the eternal son of God went through this thing for us. Why it is a lot easier to draw near, don't you see. We draw near with (Greek) with

boldness because we know that he knows, so it is the greatest value for the purpose of revelation. That we should know that he has been through it .
 Now designated ^a ~~11 1/2~~ ^(11 1/2) after the order of Melchizedek . Now, Dr. MacRae the next block has to do with this matter of turning away after having been fully illuminated, do you want me to go through with that now in twenty minutes or is that the unit/ this reference here, have you something else or shall I plow ahead. M: I think it would be good if you could ,but would you mention right at this point, what would you think of having a special assignment next week to study a bit on the matter of Melchizedek? to study Old Test. references and the New Testament statements and get the evidence. as well in mind and see what questions there are. Was he ever born, did he ever die? Buswell: Yes, there, we don't really get to Melchizedek here so the seventh chapter so next week we could do all that. Concerning whom we have much to say and hard to be understood, since you are become dull in your hearings and whereas you ought by reason of the times to be teachers, you have ~~made~~ me now here is a little question of the accent, it doesn't make too much difference you ~~have~~ me to teach you what are the elements. or if you accent (grk)

(11) if you leave out the accent, then it is "you have me for someone to tach you. In my ninetheenth edition of Nesfleet, tina ^(11 1/2) is taken as an the indefinite you need somebody to teach you. the elements. I am a little inclined to think that it is an interogative. You need to teach you what are the elements. But it is not of any 11 1/2 consequence . If it is it is to teach you what. If it is then it is, you need somebody to teach you. The elements of the beginning of the word ⁽¹²⁾ . Now what does it mean, the elements of the beginning of the word, God and you have then become such as have need of milk not of strong meat. Everyone who drinks milk, drinks of milk who partakes of milk, is ~~an~~ inexperienced in the word of righteousness or the word of justification because he is a babe, is a little infant, They get quite a scolding here. but solid foods belong to mature people who ~~are~~ by reason of use have their sensibilitis exercised ^{for} ~~by~~ the judgement of good

and of evil. Now this is one of Gusbies passages. He ~~1/1/1/1/~~ tries to argue that this is addressed to the church of Rome. That the church of Rome has been leading for quite a while and now in the reign of Domitian that they should be stirred up to teach others, you have need that you, you ought to be teachers~~s~~ by reason of the time and presently we find ^{First} Clements imaniting (13) from Rome a teaching epistle addressed to the church of Corinth and he thought that this epist~~a~~ stirred up Rome and Clements thought, well, I better stand up and be a teacher. so he wrote ~~1/1/1/~~ first Corinthians. Well that (AAM: First Clements) Bus: First Elements, yes excuse me, And I think it is far more probable that it is addressed to the church in Jerusalem by reason of time, you ought to be teachers and I give Goddsby, I marvel at his patience. He used more patience than I have I am sure. He is a patient man. But I need to arague that the church at Rome wouldn't know engough Old Testament to ~~1/1/1/~~ forget all this. Well he said you would be surprised how quickly those Gentiles assimilated the Old Testament well certainly the church at Jerusalem, by reason of time, ought to be teachers but we do not have any positive information. Student: Well we might hav materials. (14) B: Well, that was his aim, this verse 12 says, the . Friends, by this time I think you ought to be teachers because you have such a long time, you ought to be teachers but really you are just babies . The church at Jerusalem was slower ~~but y~~ ^{some of} in getting New Testament truths and ~~someasf~~ ^{some of} the Gentiles as it were but they did have their backgroun court in the Old testament. (End of H 40)

(Begin H 41) The matter of the source of things or the beginning of things (Greek) of the . That is something to puzzle over a/ little but leaving these elementary things I guess is what we should understand. Let us go forward to maturity. I think is a retorichal transition, not a spiritual one, primarily ~~1/1/1/~~ let us go on. Let us go forward to another setting. Though some of the commentaries make it out to be a exhortation to a deeper spiritual life, However he is arguing that they should go forward from the elements to deeper things. Not again laying down the foundation

Now here you have another an indication as to whether New Testament writers were fundamentals. They are now laying the foundation. But repentance from their works or works of the dead and of faith in God, the doctrines of baptism. See there is no ^(1/2) there. According to the syntax the doctrine of baptisms plural is: Repentance and faith. I think the syntax there is significant but what was the doctrine of baptisms and is observed by this generation of people. Well primarily John's baptism was for repentance and then Christian baptism indicated faith, of course not excluding repentance. Paul said we have one baptisms now, the author of the epistle to the Hebrews points out that there were many baptisms in the Old Testament. Now the doctrine of baptism in this generation of people had experienced the two different types of baptism that were new ~~but was~~ ^{while as} repentance and faith. So the foundation is repentance from dead works or works of the dead and faith in God, The doctrine of baptisms. So those two are grouped together under the doctrine of baptisms. John's baptism and ^{then} now Christian baptism. Next-- of the laying on of hands. Student: (2 1/2) B: It is plural, baptisms. Stud: B: Yes, now of course theologially we point out that faith, faith supposes repentances so when a person experiences Christian baptism that is for faith in Christ, either by anticipation as an infant or experience as adult and repentance they can take it either way. Christian baptism is for faith and John's baptism was for repentance. Just an interesting piece of syntax there. The foundation of ~~the~~ repentance from dead works and of faith in God, the doctrine of baptism. ~~that sat~~ It stands in that position. And the next fundamental is the laying on of hands. Well, that of course is why they set aside for special works, for the Christian ministry. For the resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment. We shouldn't say that this author considered this a list of all the fundamentals. But whether it refers to leading the fundamentals: He mentions these as samples or as outstanding ones. Well this shows just a little of the development of New Testament gods. Student: (4 1/2)

B: We are going on to another subject. You know how it is in a class. You take up the subject and we think we have finished it and after an hour the

questions begin to pop and we have to go back. We can't leave that subject, we have to go back to it. You know how to make an Englishman happy when he is old, tell him jokes when he is young. (Class laughter) It is very ture in class, If you go over a subject one week, change ~~ffff/bbffff~~ someone will just pop the following week and then you go back to it. Well that is k just natuural. That is the way it goes. Now he says, do lets get on to something else. And he wants to go forward. He wants to tell them about Melchedicek but now he is getting into quite a little story. Yes sir? Student:

after he speaks of leaving. Buswell: Well the Melchedicek relationship of these peopl,e, so far as their Christian life are concerned they evidently had understood repentance and faith and ordination and resurrection and judgemtn. They had understood those in a simple way. Now he starts out to tell them about Melchedicek and all of a sudden he realized, you aren't ready for Melchedicek so he tells them now you ought to be teachers, you ought to be ready for this you are actually in danger of just going back to legalism and here I am going to tellyou about the kingly priesthood of Christ. That is why this sharp exhortation is put in here. I can imagine the serious people among them j would be quite stirred by this. Hard rebuked and quite mellow. Well, that is true. Well we ought to be ready to go on in greater things. The kingly priesthood of Christ and we have been just slumping down into externalgoies This rebukes in the Scripture are put there for people just like us. So now he tells them what happens. If you are going far away, this is what it is going to mean. This is the k deepest passage in which he warns them of the terrible d calamity that would be implied if they should go back to ~~leg~~ legalism And this we will do if God permits. Because it is impossible that is we are going ahead anyway (7) And we are going ahead because, now they

miss very solomen one, it is impossible and here is quite a series of the accusative there. Those once enlightened having tasted of the heavenly gifts, having (Greek--) (7½) Become communicants of the holy spirt, or having had a portion of the holy spirit. And of the good word of God, Having tasted of the good word of God. And the power of the heaven

and the powers of the coming age. And having fallen back it is impossible to the first word is Greek--(8) It is impossibel on a tiny thing. A it is impossible to bring them back to repentance. To the first of the fundamentals that he mentions up there was repentance from dead works. Now if a person has gone through all these experiences, he is/ has been illuminated. He has tasted of the heavenly gifts. He has had a portion of the holy spirit. And he has tasted the good word of God and the powers of the coming age. If a person is , has done all that and then ~~if~~ turned his back on it he never ~~want~~ will repent. So therefore if you aren't ready to go it is no use my wasting any more time with you. We have to go on anyway. If you aren't on the train when we move off, it is just too bad. A very solomn and very sharp warning here. We could spend a lot of time on this passage. I ~~think~~ take ~~it~~ it to refer to those who have been fully evangelised and by the common grace of God have gone along with the Christian group. They have had every advatnage like Judas Ischarit. Tastingg of the powers of the world to come, having a portion of the holy spirit. I think refers to common grace. I think all of these things refer to experiences, if a persona has gone along with the Christian movemant, follow along maybe said to have had. ~~If~~ If a person then had all these advantages all the way, he just never will repent. So therefore because that is the case, we won't wait, we will go ahead with our advance teachang. Student: Isn't that a case of Buswell: It is impossibaa to renew them again unto repentance. The reason why it is given right in the next phrase, Seeing they have crucified for themselves the son of God all over again Greek--(10½)

having crúciified over again the son of God. He won't die twice and put him to an open shame. Yes sir? Student: Is the blaspheme the H.G Buswell: why I think so by ~~for~~ inference that is to say, to blaspheme the Holy Spirit is to reject his convicting work. And so to reject regeneration. It would seem to be. If anybody has come this far he just won't rēpent. Student: This to renew unto repentance, would you say that they just put on a show of repentance or would you say there was real repentance? Buswell: Well,

that of course if you mean repentance/^{an}actually turning to God in faith, then I would say No. They didn't repent, but you know there are a lot of camp followers in the church. They go along with the social group and some of them are good fundamentalists for quite awhile and then they get with another group and they just turn that way. Student: I was wondered if I had the meaning of being sorry that they had done certain things that they

(12) Buswell: Well, Greek-- doesn't mean that

they were formerly renewed. Student: Well they, what is the fallen. It seems the two words together-- Buswell: I don't think you would necessarily understand that they had gone through an experience of repentance, all the reasons they had. They had full illumination, They know what the warmth of Christian fellowship, they know what it is to be in a Christian group. and all that.

And now they just turned their backs on it. Yes sir: Student; Does this refer to those who had received t gladly at first, who had no group within themselves? Buswell: I think that is the same situation. It sprang up and they fell back, Student: What objection do you have of (13 1/2 to 13 3/4)

Buswell: Yes, I see your point. Student: Is there anything wrong with that particular pint of view? Buswell: Well it wouldn't be since I agree

(14) He said he was giving an illustration, if this has happened and might my answer to your question is this I think, ^{We} ~~X/A~~ see so many cases that seem to fit this picture. Where young fellows went right along with Christian things, nice boys, members of the choir, go to Sunday School tub and scrubbed every Saturday night and (some laughter) and then they get out into the world and they you know some of the very worst enemies of our testimony are people who are brought up in Christian homes. I've seen

out there in Chicago, born on the mission field, and with a child up at Columbia some others, (End of H 41) ^{although (Begin H 42)} So/I can see a possibility of this being condition contrary to actual experience, I don't think it is all necessary to partially attack, It is too real and we can see it today. Yes, sir, It is time to close, we have two minutes. that clock is fast. (class laughter). Some of you fellows are so much interested in this argument that you just break right

out in conversation and I know it is very profound but it does disturb a little bit. Student: (1) Buswell: If a person comes back and repents, then ~~it is his~~ ^{this} isn't true. (Class laughter) I think the answer to all such questions is that we are very thankful that God is the judge. You see, You can see a person that has a rash and he really doesn't have scarlet fever but nevertheless it is a typical scarlet fever rash. Well the Lord is the judge, but such things do happen. (End of Class period)

(Begin Class period of Nov. 5, 1951) Buswell speaking: from among men the fact that the high priest must ~~not~~ be sympathetic with the infirmities of the people but that the priest had to offer for his own sins as well as for the sins of the people and the fact that no high priest taken from among men appoints himself as high priest is afraid, is the thought which introduces the priest Melchideck references in verses 5 and 6 in chapter 5. Thou art my son, today have I ~~begotten thee~~ begotten thee and Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.' Then there is this reference to the suffering of Christ in the Garden which we have recently discussed. I am trying to lead up to the passage in the sixth chapter just to refresh our thoughts. Which would connect on with the thought that the high priest in the levitical ritual by analogy must be sympathetic with his people. Christ suffered ~~for~~ and he is able to sympathize with us and we can understand his sympathy better if ~~we~~ remember his agony in the Garden. Then in verse 10 again the refrain, A high priest after the order of Melchisedec, ^{The} verse 11 of chapter 5 is a sharp break and the author proceeds to admonish them and tell them of their immaturity when they ought to be mature. We went over that and I think we had read just part way in the sixth chapter. I believe that is as far as we had gone. You old people, by reason of time ought to be teachers, I gave you Gorbies theory of that: It seems to me very improbably. There was a church at Rome, seems to me much more probable that it was the church at Jerusalem. At least it was some ~~old~~ established church and some church in which very frequent and very rich allusions to the old Testament could be expected to be understood. Chapter 6, I believe we had finished the

first three verses. We mentioned that we ~~had~~ that we were going on now, not to lay again the foundation. To have a review of certain fundamental things I think that should not be taken as a statement of fundamentals but it should be taken as a few samples of fundamentals and yet these are things of utmost importance. Now laying again the foundation of repentance of dead works and faith in God which constitutes the doctrine of baptisms and the foundation of laying on of hands and the resurrection of the dead and of ~~the~~ eternal judgment. Yes sir? Student: I, some of the commentaries, I noticed said that in the first verse of chapter 6, it was not speaking of the Christian life but it was merely a literal ^{manditore} / . Buswell: I think so myself. I think it is a rhetorical transition. Student: Well what would be the argument against then it being of speaking of the Christian life, let us go on not being babes, but let us go on to the full-grown Christians, Buswell: Well we are speaking of understanding ~~of~~ difficult doctrines. Let us go on, from milk to meat. Let us go in the progress of our argument. Let us go on to this doctrine of the kingship of Christ, kingly priesthood of Christ. Student: Would you think by implication that that would be an analogy than a type of the Christian life. Buswell: Well yes, getting people into a broader and deeper understanding of their theology. It isn't very, it does not bare directly upon the question of growing in what you call Christian conduct. He is not talking about Christian conduct. Of course we ought to be growing in grace. But he is not talking here about growing in Grace. He is talking about growing in mentality. And an ability to get the deeper doctrine of the kingly priesthood of Christ. I think that is it. So let us go on is a rhetorical transition in the step of the argument, but it is let us go on to a deeper and more mature truth I think. You have something? Student: As far extended as thought take it over 12 verses, let us go on and now we are going to jump over 12 verses to the kingly priesthood of Christ. Buswell: Well there is Long's transition, more than 12 verses from verse 11 in chapter 5 clear down to verse 20 in chapter 6. There is a long parentheses there. Student: He is not speaking of growing in grace in 5:11 to 14? Your ability

to discern good and evil is that only educational ability it is an ability of grace is it not also? Buswell: Well it is all grace yes, I didn't mean to make a sharp exclusive definition. But the main thing he is talking about is comprehension of deeper doctrine. The kingly priesthood of Christ. I wouldn't exclude grace of the Lord of course even from mentality naturally as you grow in grace, you grow in in cerbration ? (10½) also. So I wouldn't exclude the growth in Grace, but the main things he is talking about is lets get on with the bigger argument and not keep on with these little things all the time. Not little things, that is a mistake of mine. Not

keep on with these beginning principles. Student: This translated perfection isn't that the usual word for mature man? Would that not be an argument on the side of the Christian life? Buswell: Well if he were talking about maturity of Christian conduct and then it would be on that side. But what he is talking about is, maturity of Christian understanding and ability to teach.

Yes sir: Verse 2 and 3 we look with to Old Testamen rituals which is not and verse 2 speaking of baptisms is refering particularly to Old Test. ritualism, lets say the ceremony of washing and laying of hands, they laid their hands on the head and feet and (12)

Buswell: Repentance to thig he is the doctrine of baptism which is constituted by repentance ~~with~~ and faith. Student: Well,

Buswell: No I don't think so but he says he is going on from is the arcai Greek-- (12½) leaving the matter of the

first principles of Christ. See that is what he is going on strongly, I made an actual but a very significant one when I said these little things. That was very bad. So then you are going on to not little things but they are elementary things, things that all Christians must understand if they have any growth at all in the Lord.

~~with~~ MacRae: Wouldn't you say that to intrepret baptisms and laying on of hands ~~with~~ at the beginning of verse 2 as being referring to Old ceremonies of the Law rather than the new ceremonies of the church. is extremely trenious to say the least but the word could be so intrepreted but then the rest of the verse, and the resurrection of the dead and of Peteranl

judgment" Surely you couldn't take that as a part of representing requirements of the Old Testament. specifically. ~~Not~~ Buswell: Not represent the Old Testament and the introductory phrase, leaving the matter of the first principles of Christ. I think the writer has no thought here of any difference between the 39 books and the 27 books. He has the difference. He is going right on in Old Testament exegesis. but he has in mind the difference between both very fundamentals. which every born again Christian must get hold of and then ~~the~~ doctrine of the kingly priesthood of Christ. Which is broader and deeper and you wouldn't call that a fundamental but is something that he wants to get on to in order to inspire them to faithfulness to Christ, not to slip back into leviticalism but to go on to kingly to recognize the kingly priesthood. Yes sir:

Student: Do I understand (Eng of H 42) (Begin H 43)

Buswell: And usually that is the actual experience of all the people fo that generation in the early church. They had the doctrine ~~of~~ ^{from ?} which primarily emphasised repentance. and they had the Christian baptism which primarily emphasises faith although it/does not exclude repentance. But the doctrine of baptisms is repentance in faith. Student: How does that

Buswell: Well you see you have the Greek (3/4) the foundation not laying again the foundation and then you have a series of genetives which are genetives of that position Grk . Repentance from dead works and of faith in God and then no Greek-- you se just a comma , the doctrines of baptisms. If the doctrines of baptisms were not inclusive of the first two members, you would have to have a there so the way to read it is: Not again laying the foundation, of repentance from dead works and of faith in God, comma, the doctrine of baptisms. and then comma, of laying on of hands, Greek-- (1 1/2) and of the resurrectin of the dead. The connects the laying on of hands and the resurrection of the dead, and then you have a I woldn't make any great big point of it. That is the way it stands, the doctrines of baptisms includes repentance and faith. ~~So~~ ~~the~~ So the doctrines of baptisms is one item ~~with~~ with two subheads laying on of hands is another

item. Eternal judgement is another item. And all of these are the matter of the first principles of Christ, the foundation. These are fundamental. Student: Well how (2 1/2) laying on of hands and the resurrection of the dead.

Buswell: Yes, Greek-- is usually rendered both and. Student: Buswell: Greek-- (2 1/2 - 3)

Student: Buswell: That is a regular structure with three numbers, with as the first and as the third. No you don't need anything in between. If you have and It is, we use both and the in Greek is not a dual. is usually rendered both which can include three members. I wouldn't make any great big point about the order but that is the way it should be read. Yes sir? Student: on the basis of an overall understanding of the chapter, the main reason that the writer is writing this book and this is our is to warn those who have not yet gone on and paid the price and therefore because of the persecution that the Christian is going through or danger of going back to levitical system or whatever it is, but it would seem to me that to warn them ~~not~~ help them to go back to the first things of Christ, and the elemtns of the Gospel and so forth

Buswell: No, sir, I didn't say and Dr. MacRae didn't say either that the purpose of the book is to warn people who are not yet saved. The purpose of the book is to warn a certain visible group of people all of whom have made a credible profession of faith in Christ. But some of whom may not really ~~have~~ be saved. And all of them are in danger. All of them are in the state of perishment. If the born again people for a time fell back into Leviticalism we know that they would repent and get back out of it then. If some of the fell back into legalism and self-righteousness and never did ~~repent~~, well as far as our answer is conerned, we would say they never were saved. But the purpose of the book is to warn a certain visible gkroup of Hebrew Christians who are presumptably saved , not to fall back into Leviticalism recognizing that some of them might not really be saved. Student: I still

think thought that is what I meant by my first statement. The references in this chapter is for that particular group but then the larger group that would be in danger of falling back because they ~~weren't~~ weren't saved to start with.

Buswell: Yes, not how are you going to deal with the church? Where are you going to . You had a revival, a real revival, well you can think of some individual churches ~~in~~ in your experience. And people have got saved and resumptably they are all born again and then something happens and they don't grow and then discouragement comes and they slump down and ~~maybe~~ maybe they have had milk and water for preaching. Nothing but noise and salvation and nothing to really stimulate them to a greater appreciation of the sovereignty of God and eternal purposes of Christ. Now ~~of~~ one of the ~~of~~ very best ways to take that group, all of whom are very fundamental, is to lead them into something deeper, don't you see? And that will mature the born again people and that will induce the people who just been camp followers to see that this is a great big step of truth here for them so that is the way ~~to deal with~~ to deal with a church where there is kind of a ~~slump~~ slump. Some great big doctrine that will challenge them to help them see a bigger view of God's universe God's total plan so the kingly priesthood of Christ is ~~calculated~~ calculated to jerk these people ^{up} /out of the mud and presuming that they are saved ~~get~~ get them into more vigorous life and the saved well then be more stimulated.

He is not for one minute going to abandon the fundamentalists. You know, there are churches around where all the here ins John 3:16 and Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved. Nothing but the 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ of Evangelists. Now the Lord knows, we have got to have that but a church can't be fed for years and years and years on that. They have got to have the sovereignty of God, they have got to have the doctrine of the Lords return, they have got to have eternal judgment, which is now a much neglected doctrine. All that. I think that is the purpose of it. Anything else before we go on? ~~And~~

And the reason why we can go forward to deeper doctrine. Did you have something? I though you had your hand up.

MacRae: Would you say that the chapter division is (made) rather poorly there? Buswell: Oh yes, you would, It seems to

me in this it isn't even a paragraph. The paragraph begins with verse 11.

And then there is not another main paragraph until the end of verse 6, end of chapter 6. ~~The division~~ MacRae: The division of chapter 7 is well made.

Bswell: Oh, yes, then in chapter 7 you take up the Melchizedek doctrine in all seriousness. I mean systematically. Now verse 4, this we will do.

Now what is Greek? (8 1/2) in verse 3. Well let us go on

The refers back to We will go ahead in our argument because if you have actually fallen away after all the evangelism you have heard, and rejected the gospel then it won't fade away any more time ~~with~~ with you.

That is rather harsh and bitter word. This is one of the bitterest parts of all the New Testament truths. This we will do for it is impossible With reference ~~to~~ with those once fully ~~with~~ having been illuminated and having tasted the heavenly gifts and

being participators in the having becoming participators of the holy spirit and having tasted of the good word of God and having tasted the good word of God and powers of the coming life and having fallen away, it is impossible to renew them again to repentance. MacRae: What does that

mean? That one who has professed Christ insincerely forever can never be won ?

Buswell: Well I don't think it means naything that we can ever positively diagnois but it means something that we can observe in the outside and say probably that is the reason. MacRae: And what would that be? Buswell:

Well a person who has had full and adequate understanding of the Lord as Judas had and then has rejected Christ. It means that incrutibele to us there is a time when the lost make their decision. It is never ours (10 1/2)

to say of this other man, I know that you are going into eternal punishment. We have no right so say that. But we know that there is a time when the lost make their decision. Christ refers to those who call his work the works of

Beelzebub. He said they are guilty of eternal sin. MacRae: Now what do you think of a man like Churgore ^{Q110} father? Did he not quote tase passages and say that he had fallen away and ~~had~~ ^{could} never be restored and was lost forever?

No mourning about it, the last half of his life? Buswell: If he mounned

about it then these passages don't apply to them. You find a lot of people in your pastoral ministry, middle aged people whose health is somewhat underlined who rather enjoy being worked over. And the ^{it is} psychological partly. They will say they have committed the unpardonable sin. And you spend hours with them and that is what they unconsciously want. The psychological~~ly~~ craving for attention. Now if you start in to give them attention and kindness but suppose a person is lived a life and is not now living a wicked life but is falling into a psychological~~ly~~ state of mind. Well you have to patient and as kindly as you can but you have to recognize that is that it is

(12) If a person is deeply concerned over having committed the unpardonable sin then it is clear evidence that these verses don't apply to them. MacRae: You feel ~~that~~ anyone who is really concerned has not done this. Buswell: Has not done this because it says it is impossible to renew them again to repentance and they are brought up to the point of repentance Now not everyone ~~is~~ who is concerned is necessarily saved, He might be a morbid person who is just hanging on to drink and holding back all the time and not willing to commit himself to the Lord. That could be. But, MacRae: What he is really talking about ~~there~~ ~~is~~ then is not any word of despair to the person but it is advice to the Christian worker, not to waste or spend all his time on a few individuals. Is that it? Buswell: Well the

MacRae: They recognize that there are those who have degrees⁷ of talking (13)

Buswell: Yes, I think that is the point right here as ~~far~~ far as this book is concerned. I am writing, this writer says I am writing an epistle to the Hebrews to a group of Hebrew Christians and I not going to spend all my time on the fundamentals that is ^{fair}. I wouldn't be ~~spared~~/those who are capable of understanding greater things. And that I feel justified in going on to Melchizedek priesthood because if after all that you have had, you have actually come away. Well there is the spirit of having some of them falling away. Very omnisciously we can sometimes take refuge in a verse like this we have to be very conscious that. You heard about the old priest in the Kentuckymountains who was very proud that he had preached for 35 years and

nobody had got saved yet. Must have convinced them of the doctrine of
 And it was a fact off view. if you preached and preached and preached and they
 reject and reject and reject I know one case, an actual case in Duncan
 committee many years ago there was one of the workers (End of H43)

(Begin H 44)

It may be just like filing nails when you talk to him.
 And that fellow had said, I don't want anything to do with the gospel. And so
 this fellow reported back, I remember his long face like a donkey, and he
 thought he had committed the unpardonable sin. And I just thought to myself
 you better pass that card to somebody else and see what happens. I don't
 think he had rejected the Lord I think he had rejected that sour-faced personal
 worker and he just dōdn't want to hear from him anymore. It irritated him.
 Now there a lot of people like that. And so we can never kpass the judgment.
 For we know that there are such cases. So as you know, not everybody in your
 congregation is going to be saved. I have heard of a preacher saying, I will
 come and see you and if you don;t accept Christ, I'll give up the ministry.
 Now that is a terrible thing to say. Of course you should expect to get
 converts, ^{for them} so that you may obtain, You don't just go out to preach to ^{1/2}
 the heathen as their character is ^{represented} presented you know. To preach to women heathen.
 But you know that some people are not going to be saved. And you as a pastor
 constantly weep over them. You don't spend, ^{here is a} use a salesmans illustration
 don't spend all you time trying to strike a match. Suppose that the person
 that you are dealing with is very stubborn and very resistant, It may very well
 be that the best thing you can do is let him alone for a while. Let him see
 some other people get saved. You don't have to say I' know that ^{That fellow} ~~the Lord~~
 finally rejected Christ and I ~~know~~ won't have another thing to do with him.
 You may find it work there not to waste your time with ~~it~~ him for a while but
 let him see ~~it~~ other people get saved. And when you let him alone for a little
 while maybe then he will be open. Now Peter says that about the wives in the
 home. After you have given your testimony to your unsaved husband, it may be
 that without a word by your godly manner of life ~~he~~ will be convinced and
 in other words he advices Christian wives not to keep nagging that husband.

(2)

He doesn't mean not to give your testimony but after you have explained the gospel and made it clear, maybe the best thing you can do is to keep still but that is no excuse for keeping still when you ought to speak. I think that every one of these descriptive phrases could apply and does apply to a person like Judas. For to a person who has had every advantage of a Christian home and a Christian church fellowship. A person who has gone right along with the believer. Yes sir: Student: Does the writer here use much stronger language to describe someone who has been generally converted. Buswell: Oh I think so. If he said that he had been regenerated, born again, born.

Student: Manifestation of the heavenly gift, ^(3 1/2) with the Holy Spirit

. Buswell: Well those phases are all true of the convicted under common grace. Every one of them. They are illuminated. They are fed with the word, instructed. They have the warmth and glow of Christian fellowship. They know what it is. They know the atmosphere of Christian communion. Everyone of these phases. Student: Could you take the Holy Spirit too? Buswell: They could take of the Holy Spirit in common grace. Certainly, the Holy Spirit works upon the hearts of unbelievers. He has the particular work of convicting aside from the general work of common grace. You see your memory of scripture language is not an algebra. Now when we say a person has the holy spirit, we mean it in the context of the 8th chapter of Romans. If anyone has not the spirit of Christ, he is not his. But a person who is under conviction, and has had the light of the gospel has in another sense the minister to by the Holy Spirit. Student: Well then, what ~~was the~~ ^{would they} fall away from? Buswell: From light. O. Olsen told this story in Percey Crawfords camp one time. He said, "When he was young he was in a gospel team that we were all saved. He just made that statement. We were all born again. One man, Did I tell this story to this class, I used to, watch ought or I repeat my stories? We caught up with George L. Robinsons stories one time. We told him we knew all the stories he was going to tell in the next month. It embarassed him to death. (Some laughter). So if I tell a story over again, you just put up your hand and give me a special signal. (Class laughter) He said, "We were all saved.

But he said one fellow got to going with very worldly crowd. He married a worldly girl. Became a drunkard. He denied his Christian faith and he died denying Christ and died a drunkard. And O. Olsen says, Now you see young people, he was born again. He went to heaven. But ~~for~~ he didn't have nearly as many stars in his crown and I think that is terrible. The case he described I don't know a thing about it except what he said. The case that he described is one that had been illuminated. You had known the wants and the glow of gospel testimony. The Holy Spirit had worked through him as he did ^{through} Judas in casting out demons. The Holy Spirit had evidently had convicted him because he had been right there with the Christian people. But he gave evidence so far as our knowledge goes of being a lost man. Yes sir?

Student: The question is aimed though whether that person thinks himself to be saved or not. Is that where ^(6½) really did not think himself to be saved. Buswell: I don't think that is a criterion. I think there a lot

of people who think they are saved, that aren't. I picked up a tramp along the road one time and tried to talk to him about the Lord and he said, Oh I reckon the almighty will be kind to us, I'll take my chances. He was perfectly contented. He knew he was going to face God. I reckon He will be kind to him.

Student: There isn't a ^{chance} ~~case~~ of us being mistaken, that is the point.

Bu: Well, I wouldn't say there was ^{no} a chance of us being mistaken, No. but I say there is plenty of opportunity for us to be sure of our salvation.

There is plenty of chance to be mistaken too. Carnal security, which is a very harmful thing. Carnal security. I think as a pastor, what you have to do when you see a person going on in a wicked life, is to say, Brothedr I am not your judge, but you don't llok to me like akman on the road to heazven. I don't think we should say, let them then, if it is a persistant carelsss life. I heard a good pastor, I won't name him for anything, but I heard him, he is a good man too but he had actually a king of purgetory and at the judgment seat of Christ, that we are going to have to ~~sat~~ stand there and be reminded of everything and shed a lot of tearsx and say we are sorry and all this and that, my, my. I think, If he get is straight in his mind, that the person

is living a wicked life, there is no evidence that he is going to stand before the judgment seat of Christ, then you have clear evidence in the Scripture that at the judgment seat of Christ, there will be degrees of rewards but you have possibly not one reason to think that there will be punishment at the judgment seat of Christ, but on the contrary, we know that when we see him, we will be like him. for we shall see him as he is. Yes, sir.

Student: I know there are many illustrations of those who have been raised in Christian ~~the~~ homes to have all this light, have rejected for many years and have come back, I think (9½) would that go as

contrary? Buswell: Well, you would just simply say then, that obviously then that is not what was talked about here. I talked to Newell and there were great problems and obstacles in his life, great conflicts that never were resolved and made him very rebellious. And it took a long time to get those rebellious things settled. ~~That~~ Take John N. Wolf, he was saved as a little boy, and then he got in with a socialist party and he got to be an atheist preacher and in New York City. He preached on the streets, preached atheism. And then later on the Lord brought him back. He said one time down in Wilks that he fell, he fell into the wheels of a truck and he said it flashed through his mind that at that moment, God isn't going to let me die this way. God had his hand upon him. And he said he wasn't restored even right there but he was restored and for many years he was a very effective evangelist. He knew all the tricks of socialistic preaching and ~~very~~ very affective in street work up in New York City. Paul Conohory is another illustration, saved as a boy and then educated in modernism, and then shaken out of it in mature years and became a great evangelist. Standing for the Bible. Prepare your people who have a lax that doesn't amount to what he is talking about here. Endureth him and do come back to to the Lord.

(11)
You can see the structure of this illustration in the chapter anyway and I think it is clear what he is talking about. They crucified to themselves the son of God afresh, putting Him to an open shame. There you have two illustrations which drinks in the rain which comes often upon it and brings

forth herbs fitable for those who till it receive a blessing from God but that which bears briars and thorns is (Greek) (12) rejected.

and it is supposed to be burned over. Now some~~one~~ have tried to make that mean that the land you can just be burned over and saved. And the thought is that that crop is lost. It is a crop that is burned off and another crop has to come up. Just like the generation that died in the wilderness they didn't get to Palestine, the next generatlion did. Take this as the same type of thought there. One crop has to be burned off if its briars and thorns and another crop has to be planted. so individuals who completely reject the Lord and are not going ~~to~~ again, are going to be in eternatl punishment.

V^Erse 9, But we are persuaded that in things concerning you beloved, the things which adhered to salvation. Yes sir? Student: These people that believe in lost and saved and lost and saved over and over like that, how do they intrepret this passage? Buswell: Well, you don't find hose people going into careful systematics egegeisis.. They just don't. He says, if a person is of ~~it~~, this type he is never to enter into repentance and they just get out of this passage ~~just~~ the fact that somebody can be illiminated and then fall into darkness that has already heard, just so they get illunineated and they fall into darkness and they are illuminated and fall and they are saved and lost and saved and lost but they are not careful Bible students. That is the answer, I think, they son't see it systematically. Now verse 9 seems to me clear evidence ,verse 9 seemskto me very clear evidence thatt the inspired writer regards those of whom he insists in talking as not saved people. ^{Because} Of ecourse, he says we are persuaded these very things which concern you beloved and things which relate to salvation, even thoush we do talk this way, lyou see he is ~~it~~ very sharp very severe with them. Now he says, I don't really belve as to our lost people. If you were and it could be true of you that (End of Record H 44

for God is not unjust to forget your work of love which you showed toward His name. Ministrying unto the saints. Ministrying unto the saints and continuing to minister that is these people are now getting many of the evidences of salvation. That is one of the passages which shines through light upon the book to which the epistle was addressed. We urge each one of you to show forth the same example as here and to do it fully, holding forth your confidence unto the end. Here is another reference, verse 11, Holding forth the same confidence unto the end. This is the ~~34~~ third or fourth time that he has said that. We will not know without preadventure that this group of people are saved, until we see the issue of their lives. God knows and they may have assurance. Be ye imitators of those who have gone before in the matter of faith and long suffering. ~~And~~ Inheriting the promises and etc. Now this verse 13, you see that is of course where it is transparent and clear exhortation to the christian life. God having spoken to Abraham since he had nothing greater by which to swear he swore by himself saying, I will bless you, blessing I will bless you, I will certainly bless you, as your Hebrew construction that you are familiar with. I will certainly bless you and I will certainly multiply you and so having patience they attained to promises for men indeed swear by something greater. and in the case of a dispute an oath is the end of the argument. That is you may get an affidavit there you have to stand your penalty in the Law court that you have really taken oath and made affidavits. The illustration is the gods swore by himself. In this we have a more abundant confidence. In example of Abrahams or God's oath to Abraham, God swore and God will not repent of His will. Verse 18, that the two-^{immutable} ~~invisable~~ things, the two ^{immutable} ~~invisable~~ things are God's oath and God's word. His oath is a duplication of his word

To ^{two} immutable things in both of which it is impossible that God should ~~supply~~ lie. There is a great positive statement about the character of God himself. It is impossible ~~to~~ for God to lie. We have a strong consolation to have fled to lay hold of the hope which is set before us which we have as an anchor of our souls. Sure and steadfast and pertaining to that which is redeemed.

the va#1. where our (Greek) (3½) . Another illustration of Christ has coined before us, has entered in for us. even Jesus designated the high preist forever after the order of Melch#sedec. Now we are pacing through a lot of this, Student: Imagine the two illustrations, but

I only got one , Buswell: The two things, two immutable things? Student: No, the one with Buswell: Ah, I beg your parden, I am afraid I did

mislead you there, the land which is burned over is one of the illustrations and the fifty , the promise to Abraham the sureness ~~of~~ in (4½)

I think I really missed my count there when I said two things if that is not the best way to outline it. Land is clear illustration and there he says but we think better things of you and we have a sure confidence now you see everying preverts 9:20 ison the side of eternal security. We are confident if you are saved, you are saved. So you have strong evidence there of the

5th point, ~~of~~ Calvinism. In the last part of this chapter. MacRae: Well didn't in this you have the two things, the two lands, the land that abring in the rain and is blessed and the land that bears thorns and briers is cursed.

Buswell: Say I could have crawled out through that, couldn't I? (Class laughter) (5) I reallythank you I misspoke myself. Thank you now, that is what I meant. I always like to go over a lesson just fresh, but I came from Indianapolis this time and I am stumbling worse than usual. You could say two kinds of land two illustrations, but from ~~this/line~~ verse 9 clear through verse 20 you have great assuracne of the security of the believer

(5½) saints and it goes on. Yes sir? Student: I was just thinking that should the two kinds of land or would it be a result of God's blessing upon the land seeing that in one phase it brings forth fruit in the other case that which is no good. verses 4-6. Buswell: God sends the rain

on both kinds of land that is the lands and the rains that come upon it. Now ~~both~~ it is bring forth useful herbs . MacRae: Is that the grammar of that verse. Buswell: What's that? Macrae: Seven, isn't it the land that brings in the rain that is blessed. You mean God sends in one both but only one drinks it in? Buswell: No, both lands drink it in. Both

It is impossibel if they fall away to renew them there is just the immediate obvious (9 1/4) idea you get is a comparing I 'm still compare but actually he is on as I understand that he is on a he has wandered away or journeyed away from the main point of discussion to a little practical exhortaion and a little explanation of why he is going forward instaad of staying any ~~saying~~ any lon longer on these particular points. But he feels that it is worthwhile to go forward. You can't stay forever. And so we have Melchesidec introduced here and it is interesting that Melchesdic is kmetnioned much more in the New Testament than in the Old Testament. In the Old Testament, we have only two passages mentioned I believe that mentions Melchisedec . He is mentioned I believe, He is mentioned in Genesis 14 and in Psalm 1:10 and as far as I know, nowhere else. And just once you accont for in Palm 1:10, onve verse and in Genesis of course he is mentioned just in the later part of that chapter in the incident where Abraham meets him. Well now, Melchisedec, what does the word Melchisedec mean, Mr. Shedd? Shedd:

King of Peace. MacRae: Peace? Melchi would sound perhaps like contract of melick, king of , but peace is sabome. Not Melchisalome. What is Melchisedec? Righteousness, Melchi is righteous, ~~Mel~~ is the infinitive of verb to ddealare righteous or justify and so Melchisedec is King of Righteousness or king of Jerusalem. Did any other king of Jerusalem have a similiar name Mr. Cassell? Student: Zedeciah?

~~MacRae~~ (Class laughter) MacRae: Sure enough, Zedeciah means righteous is the law. But I mean Melchisedec was not a Jew. And I meant to say, anyother King of Jerusalem at a time whan it was not a Jewish city. Now a greater part of Old Jerusalem today is an Arabic city and the king of it has been ~~plashed~~ ⁽¹²⁾ ~~the~~ the ~~man~~ ⁽¹²⁾ the man who recently died of a servant of . But how about Jerusalem at any ~~other~~ other time when it was not a Jewish city? Student: of Edict? (12)

MacRae: Melchisedec, adozonic ~~edec~~ ^{Adozonic} What does adozonic mean? Student: Lord of righteousness. MacRae: Well King of righteousness or Lord of

Righteousness would be practically the same thing wouldn't it? Practically the same thing and was ^{Adonizedec} Adozonic just like Melchisedec? would be the same sort of man exactly? Student: I couldn't say, MacRae: You couldn't say, Mr. Kay what do you think about it? Mr. Kay, I never heard of Adozonic.

MacRae: You never heard of him. Well if we know that about Melchisedec we ought to know about Adonizedec after all the word is practically the same, they were both kings in Jerusalem (class laughet) meaning practically the same.

Student: How do you know he was king of Jerusalem? Melchisedec? We do not know (laughter) but we are practically certain about it. We are very very sure that. We will turn back to Melchisedec, it is in Genesis 24 and no not 24, in 14 of course, in Genesis 14, you find that Abraham had gone up toward Damascus and there had defeated the king of the east, he is coming back with the recaptured people he comes down towards Sodom so he is evidently somewhat on the eastern side if not down the costal plain as he comes down there the king of Sodom comes forth to meet him Sodom is down near the dead sea near the southern end doubtless of the dead saa and as they come, we read in verse 18, And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine and of course Salem and Jerusalem are not a(14)

but they are similar enough to suggest very strongly that it may be the same thing. (End of H 45) it suggests very strongly it is

(Begin H 46) it suggests very strongly it is geographically and approximately the location in which Jerusalem is. we have no evidence of any other city in that area which has a name like Salem which would, which might be the place and then we have a two or three or four centuries later we have a man who was called the king of Jerusalem whose name is almost identical with Melchisedec Adozonesec. so that you put those all together and it pretty good evidencē so it is not conclusive proof that it is Jerusalem Wouldn't you say so, D_r. Buswell? It is not conclusive but it is ~~pretty good proof~~

~~that~~ pretty good proof that Jerusalem is what is meant. ^{After} That there was another city whose name was similar to this in that same general area known to us, you might feel like saying, we just don't know, but then we

have this further to a man with the same kind of name being king of Jerusalem later and that is the further rather strong emphasis. So that I would prefer to say, we don't know but I would say I have but little doubt it being so similiar I think that if it were different the Lord would have left us an indication. Reference to Adonizedec, is Student: Joshua 10:3 MacRae: Joshua 10 and we look at Joshua 10 and we find out a little bit about Adonizedec and certainly everyone who studies Melchisedec ought to be familiar with Adonizedec. . We read in Chapter 10, It came to pass when Adonizedec king of Jerusalem had heard how Joshua had taken Ai, and had utterly destroyed it as he had done to Jericho and her king, so he had done to Ai and her king and how the inhabitants of Gibeon had made peace with Israel and were among them. They at they feared greatly because Gibeon was a great city wherefore Adonizedec the king of Jerusalem sent to the king of Hebron and king of Jarmuth and king of Lachish and king of Eglon who are all named here and said come up unto me and help me that we may smite Gibeon and so the five kings of the Amorites, the king of Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish, and Eglon gathered together and encamped before Gibeon and made war against it. Melchisedec, you'll say is the leader, the king of Jerusalem is the one who comes out and congratulates Abraham brings him bread and wine, participates here now Adonizedec here the King of Jerusalem is the leader. He takes the stand he is the first one the leader in it. He gathers the forces together. But the direction in which he gathers them is the opposite direction to that in which Melchisedec had cast his influence upon him before. It is a repetition of that again in which we find over and over and over in history that the great force the great leader for God had a son or a descendant who had his father or his ancestors power of leadership and position of importance and who turns in his influence in the opposite direction. That which is ~~the~~ father does. It happens repeatedly. Here we find it happening. in Jerusalem And so we can say that Adonizedec was similiar to Melchisedec in being a man of importance here a man in a position of real strategic importance in the whole land and a man of personal initiative. Who didn't just wait and see what

others were going to do . He made a decision and he acted upon it and he led up in the direction in which he went. We have no evidence of Melchidecek leading out but Adonezedec did h lead out. And very ^{likely}lightly the fact of his lpredicesor of the so similiar name ϕ in Jerusleum having been such a great figure contributed more to his influence and his power of leader. And so we ahave this similiarity ~~of them~~ between the two mean nad yet we have this very great difference that they kep their influence in the opposite direction. The one had been a force for the advancement of God's kingdom and he had sttod with Abraham with the people of God ~~against~~ against unbelief this one is un~~ied~~ied with the forces of and trying to destroy the Israelelites. And so in the end the Israelites conquer him and kill him and put their hand or put their feet upon his neck his neck becomes a footstool so to use the figure or the Israelites as they put their verse 24 , the people put theri feet upon the necks of these kings to show that these great powerful rulers ^{here}would sink so low that the common soldier of Israel could put his foot upon his neck as an evidence of how God was turning things over temporarily a little eddly in the kingdom of Satan in the world of Satan rules during this age in which God for a brief time w rolled back the ppower of Satan and established his forces as triumphant in that area. Yes? Student: Does the meaning~~that~~ necessarily indicate mean the same family? The title? S(5 $\frac{1}{2}$) MacRae: We do not know exactly a great deal about that, see we have no other evidencne. The only other evidence we have on this is the (5 3/4) Tellam letters. And I meant to look them up for today and didn't. There is in them a king of Jerusalem ast a time not very long from the name Tima and I was trying to think what his name was. And I don't recall but there are t two or three letters from thim to the Pharoah of Egypt at this time showing that he not exactly his time but within a century or two at least, showing that Jerusalem was an area of reäl leadership unquestionably at that time. But I'd like to look into those ~~and then to and~~ I meant to and then I didn't get to it for the class but I don't think there , I have in the past years ago and I don't thnink they show a great amoutn of light on it but they

do simply back up the historical atmosphere of Joshua here and of Genesis that Jerusalem was important city at that time. Yes? It is important in

(6½) MacRae: We don't know we haven't the proof. You have Napoleon first and then you have Napoleon third, Well Napoleon Third is not Napoleon first 's descendant, What is it a great (7) is same fact

Buswell: Napoleon had no son did he? MacRae: Yes, it was Napoleon II, the young boy who was taken to Austria and made the countthere in Austria but the king of Austria gave him lots of honor but saw to it hat he would get into a position where he would meet an early death. something of a danger to the throne. His mother was the daughter of the King of Austria. the Emperor of Austria so he was treated with every honor for that reason. But he died young there was no other descendant of Napoleon and no one to carry on but Napeleon III took over the tradition and the fame of Napeolon well right in this country, we have the Rooseveltdynsasty.. (Class alughter)

~~And~~ We have ~~Abraham~~ Theodore Roosevelt and we have Franklin Roosevelt and of course they are not related too much . Now we have Benjamin Harrison and William Henry Harrison . It is my impression wasn't William Henry Grandson or great grandson ? Student: Grandson. MacRae: Grandson, yes, and then we have of course John Adamas, and John Quincy Adama and John Quicny Adams was the son of John Adams so you see onlyan analogy of John Adams and John Quincy Adams fathers and son and Benjamin Harrison and William Henry Harrison, father and grandson you have absolute lroof by analogy that Franklin Roosevelt was Theordore roosevelts son, wouldn't you? If you didn't knwo the fact. It just shows that that sort of thing does not prove they might even be utterly unrelated as ~~far~~ far as that is concerned. WE have two professors on our faculaty ~~and~~ i of the same name who as far as we know are absolutely unrelated. There is no reason that we have to think that they have any relationship and but when you have two kings, of the same town with similiar names like this, it would be that they may be descendants and then carried on the name or it may be traditional for them to have that name or it might even be that to have a name of that type or it might b even

someone of a similiar name had made such a great reputation for himself that even the usurper of another race might have carried on. We just don't have ~~that~~ evidence. But we do know that Jerusalem was a city there before the time of Abraham because we thought arch(9) and we

know that from the Letters that Jerusalem was an important place before the time of Joshua. We have letters from the King of Jerusalem. We have that ~~adage~~ And then when we have two men with a similiar name it is an evidence of considerable weight but not a conclusive proof. Yes?

Student: (9 3/4) MacRae: Well, of course we have a historical situation. Abraham has five kings who come and fought against four kings. And they were kings of places and the five kings have taken off the ;plunder and gone away and Abraham has pursued them and he has over come them and resuced material and he comes back and he meets the king of Sodom and then anoteher king comes. We;l you have plenty of analogy. So you arespeaking of kings constatntly and of real kings. Now under the circumstances that one of them should be a title doesn't seem very likely. It seems as if it would be antural under such circumstances to indicate if that was the fact . to indicate the ~~the fact~~ idfference. Now of course King Henry VIII of Englsnd when Martin Luther wrote a friendly letter to him he heard that Henry VIII was beginning to befriend ~~the~~ the reformation, he wrote a friendly letter and said he hoped he hadn't bben hurt by what he had said about h's writing a before because ~~that~~ doubtless you didn't write somebody else would have anyway. Why Henry VIII wrote and answer and published the two letters and in his answer he said from the King of England to the King of Heritage. And he used the term king in two different sentences of course. But it was ~~perfectly~~ perfectly obvious to everybody just what he meant what the situation was . It wouldn't be confusing but in the chapter where you are talking about all these kings then to say the king of Salem came and to mean something else, it is not impossibel but I would ~~say~~ think it is very unlikely. It would seem to me much more likely that we have a definite historical situation and when you add to that a king of Jerusalem with a similiar name later on it would seem

to me that the indications are sufficient to make me feel extremely likely that we have an actual historical person in here, Melchidecek who is king of Jerusalem and it is the sort of thing where you can't not say this is absolutely certain but where you can say the certainty is sufficiently great that if you want to have another theory, no objection but you should label them as a theory and say now I like to think this, Don't say it isn't. And unless you ~~it~~ and the burden of proof is on one with another theory to give evidence. There is enough evidence this way to make this scene most prominent.

Mr. Cassel? Student: Would you then ~~that~~ take the author of the book of Hebrews to mean in verse 3 that there was no record of his father and mother? Macrae: Yes, well now verse 3 there is getting them to the discussion of the relation of Christ and I'd rather leave that at the present. It is a very important point but I would rather take it up along with certain other points. I'd rather leave that for the moment.

Just at first glance we'll say there is a suggestion then that he didn't have a father and mother and he wasn't a man at all. But he was just of was a divine figure of some sort and different ones have thought so. One of the fathers thought he was Christi and another thought he was an angel, some of the church fathers thought he was Shem. That this was Shem son of Noah. There have been various suggestions of that sort all of which are pure guess. And we will, I think our present point of discussion I would say if we do not find an explanation of that phrase which seems reasonable

in the contrary ever than it is specifically saying that Melchidecek had no father and mother and then we will say that is against sort(13 $\frac{1}{4}$) But the evidence I pointed out so far, I think looks rather strongly in the direction of his being. It is the nature of the 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ th chapter. There is nothing in it to make clear that it is anything other than historical character who is here spoken of.

Student: Without Hebrews we know the passage comes to that conclusion. M: Yes, Yes, Mr. Student: What was the character that was of Jerusalem or the state/of Jerusalem at the time of Abraham or do we know

city

Mac: It was not as large a ~~thing~~ as it was at a later time. That it was a city of some importance in the earth. There is a wall which is much inferior of course to the later wall but it has wonderful natural surroundings ~~the~~ protection and on top of it a fairly decent wall there. There is a place on it where some wave suggested looked like a ticket window ~~of~~ where some might have come by and paid their typhes. And that suggestion has been made but I think ~~it~~ is a bit fancy. But it is a little bit from the some other ^(14 1/2) city ~~sh/dz/~~ and I think somebody was looking for ^(14 1/2) But you see the difficulty is that at Jerusalem those cities ~~th~~ at that time unfortunately were ~~by~~ very near Egypt. If they had been further east, would be in a much better position to have (15) because they a ere near enought to Egypt to have a good source of good writing material where they got papyrus and doubtless they did a great deal of writing. with that papyrus and preserve anyone in the world even in Egypt except when buried. And only buried in Egypt. ~~in a very~~ ~~in a very~~ ~~dry area.~~ ~~sp/t/r/ds~~ Papyrus is speciafially like our paper , not as bad as our paper today, much better than our paper today but if this ^{place} ~~paper~~ is left to ruin, you come back a hundred years from now you sgy we were an illiterature people. There would be no paper, no (15) and you would have a difficult time trying to ^{reconsturct} ~~even-construct-~~ th history Where if you were over in Babylonia where d they didn't have paper and they had to write on clay tabless, they would last forever and so you have the that is ^{they will be buried in} ~~you will-be-buried-~~ the ground and will last forever if you dig them up and expose them to (past 15) they may disentrigate.

(End of H 46) (Begin H 47)

A Catholic priest who was much interested in Babylonian materials, who went to the New York Public Library and found some very interesting tablests there ~~sb~~ which he copied. And one of them was ~~despecially~~ interesting so he didn't like to handle ~~th~~ it. And they hadn't been baked, been taken out of the ground and keep fairly well but he thought this was important ~~it~~ enough, it ought to be baked and made absolutely firm so he spoke to the, he told me he spoke to the officials there and he said, are you equipped to bake these

447

tablets and know how to do it? Oh certainly, Well he said, before I handle this and copy it or anything or risk injury this is a little bit soft, I think it would be good if you would bake it and then it would be safe, because it looks very important. So they said they would be glad to do it but actually they didn't want to and so they just baked it in a very amateurish way and the thing disintegrated, went to pieces completely lost. And so there is a danger of losing them after they are dug up and often in addition digging them up, the pick cut through them and they may be injured in that way in the digging of them up if you're not careful but aside from that well say that 95 percent of all the writings of the Babylonian cities is (1) So, we are able to get from them not merely what some king wants to tell us, but what the actual writing of the people was. Of course they didn't set down and say Lets write a story of my life so that people two thousands years from now can tell about it. But they did write a tremendous amount of material from which we can learn a great deal. Well they doubtless did the same thing exactly in Palestine but they had good papyrus that just disintegrated. disappear and we have a few clay tablets here. Fortunately when they wanted to write letters to Pharaoh of Egypt, these were too important to put on ordinary papyrus, they, it might get injured on transit or something so they took clay tablets like the Babylonians did and wrote and they have been preserved in Egypt and so we have a number of clay tablets from just one period. There was a Heretic King of Egypt see, well he only believed in one god instead of the hundreds like most of them did. And he ~~wrote his~~ moved his castle ~~away~~ away from ⁽²⁾ ~~thieves~~ to another city which he originated so that there should never be worship of anything but the one God, the God of the Sun ⁽²⁾ Troy says that is where Moses got his monocles from this man. But at this, he lived there and after his death, his sons - in-law, he had no sons, several daughters, his sons-in-law ~~should~~ succeeded one another as Pharaoh and they moved back to Thebes and so the place was left

deserted and his ~~art// /^(2½) /~~has~~~~ Archives have ~~And thus~~ ~~But~~ we know a great deal of material from this one brief period. But after that the Archives and before were kept in Thiemes and there was so much stuff there that probably the time came when they cleaned out the shelves and through away the tablets . Usually we do not have tablets like this from Egypt from any other period except (3) his life. But we have a great many tablets discussing all sorts of things with kings in other countries and from them we get a great deal of light but all ~~bf~~ it is not a fraction of what we might have if it had been in Babylonia we would have 50 times the evidence. And so as it is we have the projector or at least to say here is what we know and here is what we don't know. There is a great deal we know nothing about about Palestine at this time but it would seem ^{accounts} from the ~~cause~~ of Genesis 24 and comparing it with Joshua 10, it ~~is~~ would seem extreme likely that we have a man here who was a king of this place who came out and received Abraham and we read what he did here in Gen. 14. We read that he came out and he brought forth bread and wine. And he was a preist and a most high God. And ~~the~~ ^{Roman} catholics try to get out of that that it was an offer , they try to get an offering out of ~~that~~, and they make it an argument for the mass as the offering in which we offer up the body and blood of Chrsit to God. But most Protestants feel that there is no evidence of any such thing in it that he wasn't bringing offering to Abraham and he wasn't giving any, there is not evidence of his here making an offering to God, he is bringing braad and wine to Abraham and to the King of Sodom. And it would seem that this is not an offering, but it is nourished He is bringing to them that which will be nourishing for them and which will strengthen them rather than that it represents an offering to God. And of course the Protestants that in the communion we seed upon Christ, we receive nourishment from him. Weare strengthened through him as we remember what he has done for us. But the Roman Catholics feel that that is true but ^{that} /in addition to that that it is a repition an unblooky repition of the sacrifice of Christ which we offer up the body and blood

of Christ to God and that element of it surpasses the other becomes preeminent to them, the offering and Protestants always say the communion is not an offering at all. Has only one element, the us feeding on Christ, it is not us offering up Christ to God. It is in memory of what he did but it is not a repetition of Christ's suffering and so this passage has been much discussed ~~and so~~ from that viewpoint but simply as you read it in a simple way, you certainly have to say there is not suggestion, verse 18 here of any offering. It is Melchisedic coming out to bring them nourishment is all that is suggested here. Mr. Cassel: We don't have any thing in a religious aspect to Jerusalem at this time do we that would throw light on the fact that he was priest of the most high god here? MacRae: No, there is no evidence archeologically ~~but~~ whatever, but of course the thing is the writing has all disappeared. And Jerusalem is a bad place anyway to get evidence from because it has been occupied for such a long time and so many upheavels. So many ~~discussions~~ ^{destructions}, so much turning over that it makes it very very difficult to get precise evidence about the ancient history of Jerusalem, Much ⁽⁶⁾ harder than most any other place. And there is much that is ready to dispute about Jerusalem. I remember up in Nazareth, going ~~to~~ into a place which they said was the house of Joseph and there a Franciscan monk in his long black garb with his beard and a very marked New York accent talking to the pilgrims and telling them about the place and how this was where they ate their meals ⁱⁿ and ~~that~~ this was where the cradle was and all these different things in the house of Joseph but he said now this one over here people say is the carpenters shop but he said that is very questionable if that is the ~~carpenters~~ ⁽⁷⁾ shop. It more likely that that was a cistern not a carpenters shop at all. Of course the whole thing was highly questionable as to whether it was Josephs house at all. There is no way in the world to tell anything about it. But up in ~~the~~ Gallilee there ~~is~~ are evidences far greater than down in Jerusalem. Because it hasn't had anything like the upheavels or turmoils that came that you had down there so about Jerusalem here we know there was a town there and it seems we have the same type of

name used later and ~~for~~ geographically it fits the right area and it seems most likely that this is indeed a king of Jerusalem (7½)

and this man comes down and brings bread and wine and he was a priest of (Greek) which is here translated the most high God and he ~~was~~ blessed him and said Blessed be Abraham of ^{God} . The ~~is~~

of heaven and earth. ~~is~~ is often translated for buy or purchase

A possessor is not a mistranslation but it is only in one aspect of it. If you buy something, if you purchase something, you are then the possessor creator of what you got but it is not simply creator, There is more than creation in it. There is also possession. So I don't know if there is any English word that exactly presents the idea here in ^{the}

of heaven and earth. It seems to be giving God his glory as he won ^{the} through God the creator and sustainer at the of heaven and earth

Whether the who has delivered your enemy into your hands and he gave him tithes of all and who is the He and who is the Him.

Well now of course it is very clear here that the man who gave tithes is Abraham even though the pronoun can be translated anyway you want. ^{doesn't}

It ~~just~~ states it is clear in the context. Abraham gave tithes of all he had taken to Melchisdek . And that is all we have told here in

Genesis about him. We have no backgrounds, about it. We wonder who he is, where he comes from what about it and of course we find over in Acts

that Peter says that he recognized that God is no respecter of persons by which he doesn't mean respecter of persons in the sense that preferring

the rich to the poor or the king to the slave. He means respecter of persons in the sense of picking a man of one race necessarily ~~but~~ ^{as} we see from the

context. God is no respecter of persons. Peter says but that in every land those that do his will are approved of Him. So that God may have his people

wherever he chooses. ^{to} You can not restrict God to Israel and as a proof of that even in the Old Testament which was jealously guarded by the Jews that

were so very, very strict about their peculiar, special, right of God's people. You have the book of Job which has no trace of Job being a Jew of of this

specific Jewish ordinances in the book. You have had Job who was represented as a godly man one who was truly one of God's people but there is nothing to tie him specifically with the Jewish rights. And that is one of the books preserved by him showing it was the teaching right from the start that God had set apart the Jews to be his instruments for his purposes but that God didn't bless them because they were Jews and that salvation was not limited. And so here we have this man who appears and disappears and nothing more is said about it. There is no further reference to him until you get over to the 110 Psalm. And when you get to that 110 Psalm you indeed have a strange thing. Here is a Psalm which appears among the Psalms of David. And most interpreters say this phrase of Psalm of David is a late insertion it was not written by David. They say this is Psalm about David or about some king in the Maccabean time or some other king but it is a Psalm, not a Psalm written by David because they say, ^{if} it is written in David's time it is about David. It is about the king, whoever it is. Jehovah saith to my Lord, to the King, sit at my right hand till I make your enemies your footstool. The Lord of hosts and the rod of your strength out of Zion rule in the midst of your enemy. Your people will be willing in the day of (11½) the day of your wrath. They will come willingly. In the beauty and holiness from the womb of the morning. Thou hast the dew of thy youth. The Lord at your right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath. He shall judge among the heathen. he shall fill with the dead bodies he will ~~judge/among the/heathen/he/~~ wound the heads over many countries. Well now you take these verses which I have read, one to three, five and six, and it is just exactly what somebody might say as David has established himself as king of Zion, and he is about to go out to conquer other nations. And out of Zion will come forth his strength the Lord will bless him in the future ~~and~~ as he has blessed him in the past. David will, God will at David's right hand strike through the king and overthrow the leaders of the other nations. wound the heads over many countries.

David will judge over the heathen. Great areas will be filled with dead bodies because of Davids wonderful conflict and that is just exactly what happened. David, after he made Zion his captial went on and conquereed areas round about and was very successful in building up a great emprie and it fits quite nicely there. But you have got to very strange 4th verse. Interjected. What has it got to do with the context. The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. What has that got to do with God's promise that this king is going to conquer and rule? Melchizedeck never conquered anybody as far as we know. There is no evidence of it. It doesn't have any particular retlationship to what is said about Melchizedek. ^{this} just conqjuering king. And that 7th verse is a strank one. He will drink of the brook in the way, therefore shall he lift up the head. Well we have had the climax in verse 5 and 6 he is going to conquer other nations. He is going to overcome the heads offer the nations. Well then in the way he is going to ^{take a} drink of water. Rather queer climax. Sort of an anti-climax. And so this doesn't, it seems it is very simple just get rid of verse 4 and (14) and you got a nice little form addressing David urging David on to a great victory. But how does 4 and 7 get in 7 get in there? That of course what do they have to do with it? And of course it is part of the Psalm of David and the Jews considered it as Messianic as the declarafion of the future one not as about David. Now of course the attitude of the average intrepretetor is of course that this is from the Macabeen time. This i very late . Any Psalm that presents difficulty in that they are late and they , that was the tendency of a great many intrepretetors to make this ~~11/~~ a very late Psalm but the difficulty comes there and you find some of the liberal books like (14½) would bring it out . Your king after the order of Melchizedek, well here is a man who is a king your priest (15) And now to say that this king is going to be a priest. Well the people of the Macabeen time work priests. They were the tribe of Levi and they became priests so it is just reversed and it doesnt fit and so the liberals come ⁱⁿ to feel it doesn't fit the Macabeen time.

I have here a commentary by (0) who is Professor Americos in the Biblical Exegesis in the Hebrew Union College at Cincinnati. The Psalm is chronologically treated with the new translation published by the University of Chicago Press in 1938. And the and Professor Butenveiser says that in the close relationship between Psalm 110 and Psalm 2 and Isaiah 63:1 - 6, it follows as closely to it. It seems to have been written later than either of these thesis. Well now the (1/2) is not written about any king at all. It is imaginarry as β telling about a waste of time. Now of course that fits again as to intpretation with the statemtn that the Psalm of David but it is not about David. But by David. I mean at different time but the same general idea in that regard, Now it wouldn't be λ after giveing his own ~~trans~~lation of it which is not on the whole a bad translation in this particular case. He said this commonly overrated Psalm in which far more has been read than it really says, is an ^{essance}essane but another ~~ex~~position of the wild dream for world power. The first part ~~of it~~ bears close resemblance in ~~that~~thought(1) Psalm 2 while the second part touches chords strikingly similiar to those in Isaiah 63 1 - 6. And in Psalm 2 the (1 1/2) is not a historical king as he translates my lord and my son is not a historical king but a visonary picture, the Mesiah of his dream having a crude Idea of God. Now he hears God not only telling the Messiah to sit at God's right hand but also follows ^{promise (1 1/2)}him world dominion. And then he promise s him he will fight at his side to vanquish his enemies and bring the world under his power. Well he dontinues in the same strain and then further down he says there is a gap at the end of verse 6. Many Many critics agree some lines ~~mus~~h have been lost. This being the case it is futuile to speculate about what the line from the book of the wayside shall he bring means . The promise made in verse four, Thou shalt be ^{priest}preached forever after the order of Melchizedek is but loosely connected with the rest of the Psalm. Either it was added later as an afterthought or if we had the complete Psalm but now seems incoherent like

he found to be coherent. (2) Genesis 14 tells us that Melchisdek king of Salem, that is Jerusalem, was a priest God most high the promise implied that priesthood and royalty should be united in the person of the Messiah. as it was in the ancient ~~K~~ priest king in Salem. Well now I think that his statements ~~by~~ bring out the fact that I have just been pointing that it is a Psalm which is difficult to explain on the basis simply of Backgrounds as far as we know. Of the historical situation. What does verse 3, 4 have to do with it? What does verse 7 have to do with it? There are ideas there that are rather hard to fit in it. Now Briggs make a very interesting suggestion. He says that when David brought the ark in, maybe then they said this. Thou art a priest after the order of Melchisdeck . Melchizedek was a king of Jerusalem who was a priest. (3) say that to David he is a priest after the order of Melchizedek he being the one who brings in the off(3 $\frac{1}{4}$) Well of course if we take it as a Psalm of David and that is the ~~int~~ interpretation that Peter, that ~~Christ~~ spoke of it when he said, "Whose son is he?" He says, He said David calls him ~~Lord~~. How is he David's son. He raises the question. Showing us that the people to whom he talked considered the Messianic Psalm. They consider as directly Messianic they consider it as written by David and talking about the Messiah. He doesn't enter into argument with them about it That is the pre (3 $\frac{1}{2}$) of his question to them assumed that he and they are united upon them and accepting them. David wrote it and it is directly Messianic. and talking about the Messiah. Well now that is the interpretation. then which the Jews took of this Psalm. And of course Bothenzier (4) says it is a Messianic Psalm but is written by somebody who had this wild dream of world power. An orthodox Jew would hardly interpret it in that way. Well the two verses are certainly strange. And it is another instance where we must say that the Lord has directed and has led in the writing of the Psalm and has put thought into it. Has t led the writer to use words which surely would have not occurred to more than

others which gives us a suggestion in of ideas which might not be fully clear to us . Perhaps as David wrote it, he was his son. Not the immediate son but of the line which God had promised. And of the fact that in this line there was to be a climax. There was to be the great Messiah. The one who would be the great son of David. This one whom God had promised and as he writes this, he realizes that the Lord is promising wonderful conquests like the conquests which David had to this line and he might even have thought of the fact that he brought the ark in. He might have thought of that a little when he combines the priestly power with the kingly power. When he says the Lord have sworn and will not repent but this statement is certainly not to change simply giving a wish or hope . The Lord has sworn and will not repent. This is God's declaratlon and the first verse, The Lord said unto my Lord. The word

Grrek--(5½)

is a common word in the Prophets

not just said but the declaration of the Lord. is a common word for that which God revealed and is never used of the Lord anywhere else in the Psalm except in this verse. So that here we have a Psalm which makes in verse 4 and verse 1 a very definite thing to be the product of Divine revelation. To be revealing some certain great facts. As we study it as one studies in those days to see what those stripes are, we can imagine that he might puzzle over it. Thou art a 1 priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. You have the Arronic priesthood You have the very definite regulation. The priest must be one who comes from the line of Ardon. He must have a father of the line of AFron as is clearly explained in Exodus. And then you have tthe regulation which is set down in Leviticus 21. He must be a man of whose mother is a woman of a woman with a special requirement that she is a woman without blemish a woman of ~~worthiness~~ a worthy character a woman the proper mother of a priest. And you have to have him established in the priestly line H You have to have / him put into it by the laying on of the hands. Y⁰ u a have all these requirements. For the priest. The high priestly

line. Well now here is one who didn't have any of these. We have Melchizedek, we have he is a figure that appears suddenly a wonderful out pouring of Gods mercy ~~by/any/~~ a ~~man~~ who has turned to God ~~by~~ been a great leader for God and no knowledge of any background fo him there no. he is not a descendant of Levi. He is not one who has the preistly heritidy . He is not a descendant of Levi He is not one who has the priestly heridity, There is nothing known about his heridity. Not one who is conđinued with true succession of Godly priesthood becuase the only successor we know of is king of Jerusaleum is Adozonizedek who led the attack against the people of God. It is something entirely different from the Levitical priesthood and here we have this in this strange 110 Psalm. Thás sudden interjection of this idea in verse 4. Then in verse 7 we have this very strange thing. You migh say as you go out to fight a that you will find plenty of good water on the way you will have nourishment you will ~~have~~ drink of the brook in the way and Battenwhizen translates: He will lift up the head therefore you will be victorius. And lift up the head of my king to be victorius but not necessarily. But this is the end of it. Therefore he will be victorius or therefore he will lift up the head he will drink of the brook in the way. And in the light of the fullfillment of the first coming of the Messiah, it is easy for us to see the coming of the Messiah it is easy for us to see ~~the~~ how the Pslam here is describing the great victories which the Messiah is going to have. the wonderful conquest over the whole earth which he is going to establish ^{his} is complete destruction of evil and yet it has brought in with it two other estential ideas about the Messiah. The Messiah, the ture Messiah is not merely going to be a king, he is going to be a priest, He is going to be one who brings God blessing. Oen who preforms the priestly work. The Lord has sworn and will not repent. Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. One who at the right hand of God makes intercession for us and does the priestly work on our behalf even today. ~~And/~~ I don't

know what this verse 7 means. Is it a somewhat figurative expression of what the cup which he had to drink. Is it the cup by the way in which he drank as he passed through the suffering for us? The Bishop of Gerry in his book of "On the Witness of the Psalm of Christ" has a very brief reference to this where he speaks of the 110 Psalm / In brief and rapid touches there follows the subjectgation of the head of a vast confederacy of different companies, yet the victor drinks of the brook that flows by the ordinary path of mans trials and sorrows with a dark tint of some strange elevation from the earth. Now possibly that is ~~really~~ reading a little too much into it. Possibly to lift up the head is to be taken as ~~both of these are taken~~ just as ~~to lift up the~~ ^{Bootenviezer takes it} ~~head~~ therefore he will be victorious . But if so, therefore he will be victorious. Why? Because he drinks of the brook in the way. What does it mean? Does it mean some experience he had to pass through or does it mean he takes a drink of water from a nice stream somewhere on the way to the battle . It hardly seems sufficient ~~expecially~~ to put it as a climax at the end here of the Psalm. And so it is a principle of property that very often we have a suggestion given and then we have another suggestion and then we have the thing brought out a little more clearer and then we get the full explanation. It is a good principle of (10 3/4)

You waken people interest. You present an idea and then you present it a little more clearer and then you go on and you try to get some interest that gets them following and then you get them used to the idea and then you bring out the full explanation. And that is a very common practice in the Prophetic books. God reveals step by step. He has constant prophetic progressive revelation which does not mean that anything ^{once} ~~was~~ revealed ~~is~~ was proven untrue. But it is the beginning of the picture and then we get more detail put in and more of an idea until you have the whole thing clear before you. And so here we have this very interesting statement here which is in the Psalm , we know it, we can not trace it back to the time of David. It says the Psalm of David but we know that it leads long

before the time of Christ, the Jews were reading it in their services. They were familiar with the statement. There is not Psalm more quoted in the New Testament than this Psalm and this Psalm which is so much of what quoted-about Christ says, different verses have been quoted, the first verse is quoted a number of times. This Psalm has this very interesting reference ζ to Melchisedek in it and this very interesting statement in verse 7 which may refer to the sufferings of Christ and to his being lifted up, although not necessarily. Buswell: Apart from the 12 $\frac{1}{2}$) theft and allusion of Gideons band, drinking with their heads lifted up not laying down on their bellies to drink. AAM: That of course is occurs, has occurred to various interpreters because it is the lifting up of the head in connection with the drinking in the brook. And the brook by the way. Therefore, shall he lift up the head. If you had more context, he will drink like Gideons mean by lapping up and therefore the enemy says (13) but it needs a little more background. If the therefore wasn't in there if it said, so, something like that and it would be a possibility but it doesn't seem to fit in the general background idea. Student: There is no meaning at all in Therefore? AAM: I don't recall. I haven't looked it up just lately but it is very commonly therefore on account (13)

Student: as Dr. Buswell said last week, he was about to die a physical death and he saw the victory and he went through the experience and then on to victory. AAM: I don't think that is what this means. That might be a portion of it but I don't think it is the whole thing what it means if it refers to suffering of Christ, I would think it would refer to much more than just that. I would think so. Now where is it that Christ says to the disciples Can you, Is he taking a drink of the cup out of which I will drink and baptise you with the baptism. Student: That is where ~~change~~ James and John are AAM: Yes, do you remember the reference? Student 18 and 19 of Matthew.

AAM: 18 and 19 of Matthew? Yes, He says are ye ablt to drink of the cup that I shall drink of? And they said, We are able. And he said Ye shall drink indeed of my cup and be baptised with the baptis~~sm~~ that I am baptised with. But to sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give. Now I don;t think the cup there means to suffer and that cup means the whole/^{and to suffer}suffering of death (14 $\frac{1}{2}$) And of course the same figure can be used for something entirely different but then can be used for something else

there is no reason in the world why we can't use the same figure for something that is similar but I would think that this rather then Gethesmene would be what would be brought in connection with Psalm 110. If that is what Psalm 110 refers to. Yes? Student: I was thinking

(End of Record Side H 48)

Begin H 49

David said, I am going to die if I can not have a drink of the water of Bethlehem I must have it or I will die. And the brave men went and fought their way through and risked their lives and got the water and went - brought it back to David so that he would not die but live and he poured it out on the ground and didn't die anyway. So that in the king, I don't think that the power was victorious I think it was, the law had waight that he never dreamed of would mean the people poured it out. It was a wonderful time for royalty on their part but it really was rather silly to risk their life for that if he felt that way and felt sorry and he gave them such a wonderful evidence of their loyalty but not as (3/4)

Student: (1) AAM: Yes OJB: It was victorious and nothing refers to the Messiah suffering the less you take verse 7 that it refers to his suffering. AAM: That is right and so if so that verse 7 is certainly not a clear suggestion of it not at all but verse 7 seems to come at the end I personally would not be dogmatic about it but I would be inclined to feel that possibly he is saying, I mean that is not just an off hand guess I mean it seems to me to fit in would teaching of (1 $\frac{1}{2}$) the passages and it probalbe fact but not to be

dogmatic , I am inclined to feel that in verse 7 he is saying that his great victory is all the result of the cross that it is because he drinks of the (2) that he will up the head that all the victories we have in Chrsit are based upon that and all of his coming

Coughing from class

(2) Now perhaps we read too much into it it certainly would be if it brought out verse 4 but berse 4 brings in very definitely his priestly work which finds his great expression in ~~1st~~ his first topic rather (2~~1/2~~) than second. Busw: Do you find any reference

in 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ drinking of the brook as bitter experience, that is the cup was bitter ^{taste} ~~grapes~~ or poison or the cup can be bitter experience but you take the brook as a bitter experience that seems ? AAM: That,

maybe not. Mr? Student: (2 3/4 to 3 1/2)

AAM: Well if it is just victory, if it is not his sacrifice, that is not here bit kist voctpru ^{but just victory} it is a peculiar way to express victory.

If you are going ~~1st~~ into the book by the way to be victorious, you remember the kings going against. (Coughing from class hinders)

(3 3/4) and they got a to give them some word and God sent a rain and the water came but that is not the cliamx . That is on the way to victory and it doesn't 1 seem like an end. That is simply, they are going to get victory because they have plenty of water it seems it ought to be somewhere along the way instead of using (4)

Studetn: It seems to^{be}/sure that the Lord is my right hand and then I will make thine enemies thy footstool. AAM: It isn't logical

but it tells what God has done. Christ sits at his footstool. now. He is sitting at his right hand until he makes his enemies his footstools so that is what he is doing now. But is he now drinking by his , by

the way in order that he might Student: Because he wants to he is causing us to drink of the water he is drinking of the water

AAM: (5) / ^{some questions here} I wish we could go on with another hour and maybe we can a mounth from now but next week we had better see how well

you have gotten the material up for this time and so (coughing from class 5)
a little written lesson on it which Dr. Buswell might give a couple of
questions and I could give a couple and then the next couple of lessons
after that Dr. Buswell will go with you into the exegesis of the passages
and I wish I could be here to hear it but unfortunately I will be far away
and I hope, I wonder if there is someone here \int who could run this for me
and I could hear it when I come back, you could bring it in to, will
somebody volunteer to do it? Thank you. from the office and
bring it in and I would appreciate it and then. Buswell: Could you
give me just a word what you think this phrase, this Melchisedek abideth
priest forever. Have you any special thought on that? AAM: Yes.
Forever? OJM: Yes, Melchisedek, AAM: Well where does it say
Melchisedek Oh, Yes, That Melchisedek abides as priest forever
He is the only one. He is the only one (coughing ¶ 6) so would
you have any other suggestions? B: Well there is a start but this
is just the theo ($6\frac{1}{4}$) sort of character from the
whole Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego and he acts to Gideon
AAM: Then the is not likened to ($6\frac{3}{4}$)
Buswell: Yes, well he is very like Melchisedek in that he is
You can say that looks like Dr. MacRae coming down the street
but Melchisedek abides as priest forever. And that Christ is priest
in that order. AAM: The (7) says of it that the
positive
type is always inferior to the anti-positive. Now I don't know if you
can take that as an absolute rule but he grew very strong that the type
must be something that was less than ($7\frac{1}{2}$) and it
is certainly true that Melchisedek could not be as great as
He feels that Melchisedek was thoroughly an ordinary man. Now if he wasn't
a man you have in this situation here someone here who just comes in and
interjected with the experience (coughing $7\frac{1}{2}$)
Well we'll take this a month from now. (End of class)

†8) Beginning class with Dr. Buswell during Dr. MacRae's absence

I think we should start. It is time to have begun. Shall we ask the Lord's blessing. Our Father in Heaven we pray for thy blessing and guidance this day. We ask that thou wilt open thy word to us and teach us by thy holy spirit. We pray that thou wilt bless Dr. MacRae in his journey. Give him fruitful experiences and gratn that as he proclaims thy word that he may be helpful to the saints and that sinners may be convicted. Guide and direct our thoughts in this study period. We ask it for Jesus sake. Amen.

The 7th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Are there any questions or remarks or contributions as we go forward? I suppose that a lot of people, Yes? Student:

B: I havent read the papers yet but It was material that I had lectured on. Now the questions covered the points on which I had lectured. I've forgotten now what the questions were. ~~pp/da/~~ If you tell me what they were, I could answer them and Stud:

B: Oh yes, the Christology, two topics there you see, I had brought out the pointt that Christ is the Lord of the angels, he is the one for whom everything and through whom everything He is the captian of our salvation, and he became flesh. He took to himself not the nature of angels but the nature of the seed of Abraham. Quite a bit more of course about the Christology there in the second chapter. Then the homilitical point brought out quite a number of different homiletical points in the process of the lectures so it is the substance of my lectures that I expected to get back so I would know what I was talking about. Is anything obscure? Yes sir.

Studentn" Well Prof. Toy two verses 12 and 13 B: That wasn't mine. (Class laughter)⁽¹²⁾ B: Well Dr. MacRae was constantly reading from Toy and Toy gave the modernistic view of the use of these quotations. It was on the use of these quotations Toy constantly made it ridiculous that is made it out that the author of Hebrews was walking

in this misintrepreting thing so you just say a few kind words about Toy and you will probably (Very loud laughter from class (12½))

But D^R. MacRae will do that part. I expected to get through those papers this week but I failed to do so. Yes sir? S: (13) homelitics

B: But what are my words? Student: Buswell: Pastoral teaching?

You see Homelitics has to do with preaching and Pastoral work has to do with shepherding. We said quite a lot about the pastoral application of the passages that I read and in the first 4 chapters. S^Tudent:

B: Well we have a merciful and faithful high priest in the same as related to God he has been tried in all points like as we are tried therefore let us come bodily is pastoral. Stud: Yes, the portion right before that would be Bus: Since he has been tried, that is logical therefore let us come bodily. That is pastoral. I gave a lot of shepherding remarks along there. Yes sir? S: I thought

for pastoral teachings would they be not to fall back (14)

B: Yes, that would be patoral, yes, There is a lot of pastoral material. You see, St: going out in that work. B: Now, yes, that work

Now the way I explain the test like this to a class is just turn on the faucet and you can tell whatever you know about the subject (laughter of class) My remarks are mostly under the heading of Doctrine of Christ

His deity and his Humanity or Pastoral application. So I hope you gave me a lot of wisdom. Anything else? So we start then with the 7th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. This Melchisedec free of sin, priest of the most high who met Abraham coming from the battle of the kings and to bless him, to whom Abraham gave a tenth part. Now this Melchisedec he begins to tell who Melchisedec is. In view of quality from characteristics (End of H 49)

Salom (Begin H 50) Salem, King of peace. Salom is peace and Salem is not too far from the word peace. So King of righteousness and King of peace. I suppose if h I had studied Toy I would find Toy ridiculing that intrepretation. Going on the meaning of a name but I think that this

intrepretation of the name is Homelitical. I don't know if that would meet with your approval or your ideas of exegesis but I don't see anything wrong with working on the meaning of a name to bring out a homelitical point. That is it isa a rehotoriaal device. It is a literary device but we all have to use literary devices. The Bible uses literary devices. I don't know that this author is if you would ask him a critical question, do you solemnly solemn ly mean that this word Melchisedec necessarily means king of righteousness. Well, he would say, yes that is a derivation of it. That is what the word means but does that mean that it wasn't a proper name that is was simply an abstraction. Oh, not necessarily what was the other King of Salem? Adonisedec. No, Lord of Righteousness See, Melchi-xedec, king of righteousness , Adoni-sedec, Lord of Righteousness. Now we don't think that Adonisedec was a lord of righteousness but there was his name just the same. So taking the name and since it is a character of Melchesidec it was that of righteousness the name is a neonomic device. It helps us to remember. And then King of Salem ~~was~~ well other/^{wicked}people of Salem from time to time but Salem is similar to Salom and why shouldn't he play on the name since he is illustrating a truth. Yes sir? Is this Salem actually (2½) separate from Salom I notice in the Hebrew it is Salem in the original (3) B: The Consonants are the same aren't they? As I remember it, so he had an unpointed text before him. And put it over into Greek , Salem, it is very similar anyway. I think that we should take this frankly. As a perfectly legitimate literary device. Now I might be wrong about this. But it seems to me entirely consistant with the character of inspiration. AS inspired writers should use a device of this kind in order to bring out a lesson. It isn;t an argument it isn't ~~it~~ doesn't prove anything but it illustrates a thing. Yes sir? Would that be similar to what they call spiritualizing. B: Well yes, spiritualizing is very broad word. It isn't illigetimate, spiritualizing. It doesn't take any historical meaning. Sometimes spiritualizing means taking away the historical meaning.

Now he doesn't deny that this mans mane wasn't Melchisdec. And he doesn't deny that he was king of this town of Salem. But that being the case he makes it play on the words to bring out its spiritual meaning and spiritual meaning is perfectly true without doing away with the historical meaning. You had a point? St: ~~W~~ Well if we can't do that, actually then the whole meanings of Old Testament names are valueless are they not? Well, not all, that is to say-- Student: If we cant' do what the author of Hebrews did here, we are not arguing with the principle, he has already done it here and he has played on the names which is, g he goes on to say which is the King of Salem which is the King of Peace. He has given us an intpretation . Already in the text. We are not doing it. He has done it for us. For arguing with the text rather than the principle. BUSW: Now I sold you a bill of goods and I better show you the othr side now. (Class laughter) Now there are names in the Bible and New Testament and Old Testament, which are deliberately taken for their spiritual significance. ~~A~~ the changing of the name to bring out a certain point or the prophetic name Thou shalt call his name Je (5½) Grk. For he shall save his people from their sins. When a person was converted from heathenism he took to himself a Christian name. He took an appropriate name on purpose and deliberately so it is always the possibility that Melchisedec deliberately took this name, King of Righteousness and he might even have named his town Salem Salom ~~W~~ and the name in a very ancient time and ~~W~~ so there is the possibility that this is not a play on an existing historical name but that these names were delibertely chosen. I wouldn't rule that out but I do think that it is not wrong, it is not contrary to infallibility (6) to frankly play on a name. Now take the case of onosemos, Onesimon is the proper name and when Paul says oneme onimi I think is the form of it anyway he is putting on onemie to gain prophets. He asks that onemoses be released to him by making a (6½) on his name. Not a precise omnkmon doesn't exactly

mean prophet but is translated Let me have joy of thee , it means give me ~~the joy of thee~~ oneisumu s ? (7) realse Oneimus

to me so he make a little kind of pun there which is perfectly reasonable.

Any other points now on these names? S: You have that similarly

use in Isaiah do we not? Where Isaiah was bodld to name two boys

B: Oh to ~~deliberately~~ deliberately chosen. Those were not c names that you will find elsewhere. S. Chosen for the B: for the

purpose. Now St: They were entertained the kings too.

B: Yes, (Greek) (7½) of people of the people.

And Jacob changed to Israel. The change from Saul to Paul. It is a little bit obscure but it had a definite meaning. The adoption of such a name as theopholois was evidently intended to convey a Christian meaning. People were named for heathen gods and they renamed themselves when they were converted. So it just doesn't go with out saying that he is playing on the names. With us we play ^{very little} ~~vital~~-attention to a name . WE may make fun you know. Thay always pun on my name Buz. Buzwell. W^Ell you can make all sort of puns on that but aside from puns, nobody thinks about my name, it is ujust a name. You might say Mr. Bloough or Whoosit or Whatever, you could go around a nd make a pun ^{on} and every mans name. If you had some spiritual point to bring out and wanted to make it easy to remember you might very well make a play on the anme and it would be a litle memory helping device. I am of the opinion more or less that this was a (9) (H50)

he is trying to bring out that the first Covenant is not faultless. Hebrews 8:77 If the first Covenant had been faultless there should have been no place for a second but he said Christ is the mediator of a better covenant established on better promises because finding fault with them he says Behold the days come saith the Lord I will make a new Covenant. Because find ^(6½) following here is what we read and this particular phrase if I regarded them not with what it was based on, I would say that is what the original had and our Hebrew is wrong in preserve . But it is not. It is incidental to the argument altogether and under the circumstances I do not think it has been necessary to say that Hebrew has preserved it incorrectly and the Septugint correctly.

a very obvious way. That is it might be a letter change but

AAM: I don't understand why it is that Manross and Buswell
(14 $\frac{1}{4}$) in the book of Hebrews. AAM: yes in the Book of
Hebrews in 8:9 at the end of the verse (End of Record Side H80).

Begin with 4 on H81

I think when the New Testament says this is true because the Old Testament
says this , it means that the Old Testament does that the thing which
he is arguing. But I don't think that it means that the words are
otherwise exactly what the Old Testament . I don't think it means
that and it would be very very difficult and I don't think the Lord
set out to do it. Well then you get into cases where the Septugint has
mistranslated a phrase. If the phrase is not essential to the argument
it is my impression that very statement the New Testament will simply
quote the passage and it is dealing not dealing with that specific
phrase. And it doesn't bother go to into it to correct the mistranslation.
Now of course this is another big area which is very interesting
and but we want to gather a lot of inductinnal material before we are
ready to drqw conclusions. D^r. Buswell? B: I onece wrote a short
paper on the introductory phrases to quotations in the Epistle to the
Hebrews. I have forgotten all the points but anyway this quotation
is introduc~~ed~~^{ed} by Legey . It says and another striking illustration
where recording for the Septigunit and the Septiguint (Greek--5 $\frac{1}{2}$

Somebody somewhere stands But they where it says
the Holy Ghost says you will find that it is not off the exact point
as you say. There is I think some determination then in the introductory
phrases. You see you wouldn't implicate to quote a rather rough
translation now it says so and so and you wouldn't bother to correct
if it didn't affect your point. AAM: Yes. B: If you were telling
the absolute truth just the same. AAM: Yes, that is right and here

point of comparison. It may take study. It is not just a matter of that is going to be apt to be obvious and superficial. It is not necessarily. Mr. ?(9½) AAM: I was a husband, yes

Student: Is that reference to what the covenant was in

AAM: No because that was my covenant they broke though I was a husband. Yes, they broke it though I was a husband. In other words, you would expect that it was all the goodness God chose for his own. The goodness of a husband in carrying for them and loving them and having a permanent relation not dependant upon their action. You would think that with that they would have kept their covenant. It is not, it may be an essential point of the covenant. On his part of the verses concerned.

(10) But the message does not ~~mean~~ suggest it as being suggested rather as being simply a reason for describing the fact that they broke it

You wouldn't say it described it though?
Student: / AAM: No, it could be a description of it but the- f as the verse stands, it could not be selected for them however.

Well now he has, the negative then, this covenant is different from the Old Covenant? The Old Covenantn he made when he took them out of the land of Egypt. The Old Covenant was a covenant that they broke. The Old Covenant was a covenant they should not have broken because he was a husband to them. Now that may mean because an essential part of the covenant was because he was a husband to them or it could even be another factor which wasn't a part of the covenant as far as the expression of this verse is concerned. But these three things we learn about the covenant from this verse and I think you can say that that is all that this verse tells us about the covenant about the Old Covenantn.

Student: (11) You say these three things are it is imperfect, AAM: The first one is told us clearly, is that is a covenant which was made at that time when he took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt. That is when it (11) And then we are told that is a covenant which they

and brought out the point to know what opposites, two things that are different aren't just necessarily opposites, You have to have opposites must be related. They are similar in many ways and very different in some one specific way. The opposite of a big man isn't a little woman. The opposite of a big man is a big woman or else it is a little boy. It is a they are quite apt to be an opposite isn't usually opposite in a hundred features. It has to be related in some way. The opposite of a house for instance isn't a dog. There y are as different as two things can be. But it is not the opposite The house may be big, the (Loud class laughter) (8) the dog may be small, the house may be something you live in , the dog may be something that lives in the house. And you see opposites right through Because a hundred opposites doesn't make an opposite. So in the case what gives the opposite to the New Covenant? Well if you just said the New Covenant is big and that is all you said about it. You say the other is small. But when you have several features, it is pretty hard to say what is the opposite and they it doesn't say it is the opposite anyway, it says it is different. That is all it says. Being different, we can expect a sharp difference in some regards You might say, now a hundred is different from one and a thousand is different from a hundred. But when you say something very different from a hundred, you immediately want to know which way. It is different from being smaller, is it different from being larger? Well now in this case, then, the way to find out what the Old Covenant is is not to see what the New Covenant is ~~is/nd/~~ and look and determine what is as different as possible. But the way to do is to follow ~~Mr/d/~~ ~~W/s~~. Mr. Smith's suggestion and look at the book of Exodus and see what kind of Covenant he made at that time and then to compare that to this, Well now the book of Exodus might have a great deal of material in it and so when you try to get the change to see what is the

broke and then we are told it is a covenant which you would not expect them to have broken in view of God's relationship to them. Well now that does not necessarily say whether this relationship to them is a part of the covenant ^{91½} persay or something that existed prior to the covenant. You can't get it from the expression. Student: You say the husband is a sign of permanent relationship? ~~AAA/~~

AAM: No, that is not the whole of it but that is the vital part of it but it is essential portion of it is the terms of the relationship. He was a husband to them. It doesn;t mean a Hollywood type of relationship. Well so that from this passage you can't tell a great deal what the Old Covenant was. You only tell these three things about it. Now in order to tell more about it you look back to Exodus of course and we have a great deal of material in Exodus which I hope is fairly familiar to all of you. But as to just what of that material would be what he means by the Old Covenant, that is not obvious on the statement. That means further consideration in order to (12½) . The Statement I made a few minutes ago is a possible guess about the matter. A possible guess. And we want to in fact in anything you have to make hypothesis. Now that is a hypothesis which can be made but it has to be examined to see whether it has- is te-be- correct. But- It is not stated that way in this book. Now it goes on then to talk about the New covenant. Buswell: The (greek- (13) Is that the only translation of that word that interpreted in the New Testament is entirely different. AAM: How is it? B: I disregarded them or I did not care for them. (Greek) In the Septugint and in the Epistle to the Hebrews and I did not care for them Grk- The Septugint is the same. AAM: Now that is very interesting. I did not know how you can get that out of Grek and I disregarded them Does anything occur to you Mr. Mansross as to how you would relate that to the Hebrew? Speaker: There may be

of them, says the Lord. I said to a man once, I said What does this mean? What does this refer to? I said this refers to the Christian church. Well he says how is that. Well he says, it means that everybody in the Christian church knows the Lord. Consequently it isn't that one of them say to to the other, Know the Lord? They all know the Lord. Well now if the Christian church is in error, if the Christian Church is United States or Chile, or Peru or England or some area and you say within this area nobody says to another one, Know the L^ord because they all know the Lord everyone is a converted man. Well you might say that this is fulfilled. Nobody says to his neighbor to his friend but you notice it says his neighbor and his brother. Well now if the church is not an area but if the church is scattered, to the world, well, the church grows by the people going to their brother and their friend and saying Know the lord and trying to bring into connection with the L^ord and really know their duty toward the Lord and the wonderful grace that the Lord has for us if that is the way the church grows, how can this be a picture of the church. He said it means no one in the church says to another one in the church Know the Lord. It seems to me that that is simply saying, of course he doesn't mean by that then even the visible church because certainly the visible church it is necessary for us to go to other members in the church and say Know the L^ord. 5/2)

Well you say he wasn't Israel's God in the past, they weren't his people and now in the future he is going to be their god and they are going to be His people. Because this is just from the Old Covenant . Well that is definitely false. Because if there is anything we can say about the Old Covenant it is that God ^{was} Israel's god and Israel was God's people. So that is not the conflict, is it? I will be their God and they shall be my people is a part of it . But it is not a part of the contrast. That is (2½) . But what preceeds, maybe that is the contrast. I will put my law in their inward parts and write it on their hearts and will be their God and they will be my people. Maybe the contrast is a spiritual thing. now as compared with the ~~spiritual~~ material thing before. Before you had the ten commandments written, you had a written book of law. Now it is going to bein the (3) A spiritual contrasted to a ~~ritual~~ ritual you were supposed to follow. Well that is a possibility thus far. But it is not a possibility but the differences is/^{that}in the future he will be their God and they will be His people and He wasn't in the past because we know he wasn't. So that the fact that this is not the contrast makes it impossible for us to say the other is the contrast. That is to say It may be the contrast. But we have to look further and see whether it is or not. And so we look on and we read He will be their God and they will be His people and they shall teach no more every man his neighbor. ^UW_ell in the past they taught, ~~they~~ had schools, now there is not more schools You get it? They shall teach no more every man his neighbor and every man his brother saying Know the Lord. They are not going to do that in the future as they did in the past. In the past you had to go to some body and say I wish you would know the Lord. God is interested . God wants you to know about it. He wants you to know His love for you and H^Is will for you. Now you are not to do that in the New Covenant. They will not say He is to teach everyman his neighbor and everybodys brother saying Know the Lord for they shall all know Me from the least to the greatest

will continue then but this point that has been raised, lets keep it in mind and look into it further. But although I was a husband to them the New Testament quotes it as I regarded them not, says the Lord, exactly what that means, I don't know. further exanimation of that, but this is the Covenant. Now that speaks not like the Old Covenatn but here is a new one. This is the Covenant that I will make with the house of Israel. Now it seems to be then a thing that is made with these people of Israel. Seems to be the stress doesn't it. He is talking about Israel and Judah before here the whole chapter then about bringing them back ~~to~~ from exil~~a~~ and giving them wonderful welcome giving them wonderful blessings and shepherds and herdsmen and fine material things and the land of Palestine is uniting the two together that is what he has been talking about now he suddenly jumps from that ~~subject~~ to something entirely different or he is still talking to Israel. Well it is interesting how often he repeats references to it verse 31 The day is come I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah and here 33, this shall be the covenant I will make with the house of Israel. Well now that is after those days says the Lord, what is the Hebrew there after those days Student: Yes, you d see very definitely after Israel that ~~after~~ the end of those days would seem to be a chronological reference would it not. Seem to be specifically a chronological reference. This is going to come sometime in the future After the punishment, after the exile, after the misery there comes a time of joy. There seems to be a chronological relationship of these two covenants. ~~The~~ Says the Old Covenatn was made when they came out of the land of Egypt. Now there is going to be a new Covenant that is going to be made with the house of Israel. and it is after those days that it is going to happen whatever this new covenant is. It is a future thing contrasted with this passage. Well now what is it? After those days saith the Lord I will put my law in ^{their} your inward parts and write it on their hearts and will be their God and they shall be my people.

Well 30 is a good round number so is 32. I would say he lived 30 years and ordinarily be anywhere between 28 and 32. Not in a table of tabulation but I mean in a statement. The man lived 30 years. Well so between 28 and 32 now if you say this 31 here that is not a round number. I would say if you say he lived 31 years if he lived 30 years and 7 months I would say he lived 31 years. Or if he lived 30 years and 5 months I would say he lived 31 years you see? Well you say he lived 31 years and 3 months. Well that would be near enough if it was 31 years and 2½ months ^{or} 3½ months. You see what I mean? If you are going to tell how many seconds the man lives it would be precise correct accurate statements. You would have your whole Bible taken up with that sort of detail. And no expense is made to give us that precise chronologically/numerational detail of the Scriptures. Well now I think your somewhat similar position when you get into the matter of translation because it is impossible to translate exactly from one language to another. You simply can't do it because the expression varies, syntax varies, words the area of words vary so that no translation of a passage of any length from one language to another is an exact translation. It is simply impossible. And ~~not/there/are~~ ^{under} those circumstances it might be the precise past of the New Testament when it makes quotations of the Old to give us a translation that will be as exact as possible within the limitations of the Hebrew and Greek language but I don't think would (4) ~~K~~. I think when the New Testament says this is true because the Old Testament says this it means the Old Testament does say the thing which he is arguing but I don't think that it means that the words are otherwise exactly what the Old Testament says. I don't think it means that and it would be very difficult and I don't think the Lord set out to do it. Well then you get into cases where the Septuagint has mistranslated a phrase. If the phrase is not essential to the argument, it seems it is my impression that very frequently the New Testament simply quotes passages and it is not dealing with that specific phrase and it doesn't bother to go into it to correct the mistrans-

I would suggest this. I hadn't noticed that fact of the translation there but I would suggest this, the quick way to do it of course, is to look at commentaries on either Hebrews or Jeremiah to see if they discuss the relationship and they might tell you whether there is an easy way of explaining how the Septuagint got it. Now I am very much disappointed in most commentaries that they don't bother to use them and it seems to me it is the most obvious thing to attempt to do in the first place. to explain how they got it. Yes? Student: David said he recognized the Septuagint proves or writers of Hebrews uses it he goes on by saying Paul doesn't (1)

AAM: Yes, well I would agree I would say that when the New Testament is bringing a point out of the Old Testament it would will commonly quote the common version which is familiar to the New. And if the version brings out clearly the point of the original which he hasn't marked and that point is in ^{the original and} the version he is satisfied ordinarily. He doesn't make a new translation in order to give you a better translation of the original. But if his point is in the original, and not in the translation he will then give you his own translation. So that I dare believe that our New Testament quotation of a passage means that the that that is the correct original type unless that is the point ~~of the original~~ upon which he is placing his argument. If it is then I would say that inspiration requires us to believe that that is what the original was and now he gives it incorrectly (2) . Yes. Student: Doesn't inspiration

require the other? AAM: No, I don't think so. I do not say Student: (2) AAM: Yes, that is to say it is impossible. Now God relates himself to the limitation of human the limitations of human life to this extent. He does not attempt to give us perfection in many different areas in the Scripture. I can think of inspiration more as keeping from error rather than giving an exact truth on the minor (2 1/2) . For instance you say this man lived 30 years. Did he live 30 years or 32 years?

well we werent; married and so we would have to find a wife. So where would we , who would we, what would we get, well he was going to find us one. So he said he would decide he said they say that people are satisfied best with opposties. Opposites are happy together. So what is the opposite. Well D^R. Mason was a brilliant man from the south do a dumb girl from the north would be the best. (Very loud class laughter). And lets see what was I? Well I forget the first part but the last part was I had a mustache so the oppostie was a woman without a mustache. (class laughter) (7) I forgot what was the rest of it was. And Mr. Murray too. I think he was scotch so she was to be Irish. Anyway lyou notice the way he gave it, it made it perfectly confident (7) that the way he gave the particular type of p opposite he picked in each case when there were a hundred other t

very easy. Here it says there was a covenant made when they came out of Egypt. Now it says there is going to be a different covenant later. Now it is very easy for us to say, what is the nature of the later covenant. Well what is the opposite of that? Well that must be what the covenant was when they came out of Egypt. But the right way to do it is the way you suggested. To go back to what it says about when they came out of Egypt and see what kind of covenant was made then and when you take that covenant then you will find a contrast between it and the New Covenant. But what is the nature of the contrast will be is something that you cannot predict until you go back ~~to~~ and see what that covenant was. ^o You cannot guess the nature of that contrast simply from saying here is new one. Now what is the opposite one because as I just said, the opposite can be in one regard or another regard. But the opposite of a big man may be a little boy or the opposite of a big man may be a big woman. There are different types of contrast. We had I think that was brought out to my mind more clearly than any other time when I was teaching at Westminster Seminary. We had a (5½) night one year and the faculty night fell to the turn of Dr. R. B. Kiker and he gave a story which was one of the most comical things I ever heard in my life in which he told how he was going to do something for this fact that he was going to give a great present, hundreds of thousands of dollars to the member of the faculty who was, he picked out 3 of us who weren't married then. Dr. Mason, and Mr. Murray and myself and the one of us three, the first one of us to have a grand child and he would give that one this great prize. A hundred thousand dollars I think it was. Well of course eventually it came out that in order to meet the prize we had to have the grandchild I think 15 years something like that after that date. And of course none of us were married then and w(6) and he said, well that is not my fault. You can't blame me for that. And then he said

interpretation which some would get. The Old Covenant was a covenant of salvation by works. And the covenant that if you keep the law you are saved. If you don't keep the law you are lost. That is the old Covenant. Now some will say that. But notice that is not what the passage here says. The passage doesn't say what the Old Covenant is here. It definitely says this new covenant is different from the Old Covenant. It is not according to the covenant I made with their fathers in the day I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt which my covenant they broke. I was a husband to them says the Lord. But now here is a new covenant. That I will make with the house of Israel. And of course it is always possible when you have something to attempt to conclude what something else is by contrast. But it is a method which must be done with great care because it is very very easy to make a mistake. You see a great big man and you say well now What a change, How utterly different from what we just saw. And immediately you picture a little bit of a boy. Maybe it wasn't maybe it was a great big woman that was just there before. It is ^{the} a contrast in sex, in size is it in age, what is it? There are so many things a contrast can be in that you really need further evidence. than just to say it is different. There is a contrast from that. Mr? Student: (3½) Wouldn't it be permissible to blend this back to Exodus and etc and take that and say this is the Old Covenant? AAM: Yes, not only permissible but highly desirable entirely. He says not according to the covenant that I made with them when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt. Well then you have to go back and see what that was. Student: (4) AAM: Well there is, but what I say is It doesn't say in this passage what the nature of it is. This passage, it goes on to speak about the spiritual nature of the new covenant. Well that doesn't offer-up authorize us to say, Therefore the Old covenant was a material thing because the New one is spiritual. You see? It is

So we have this touch in verse 31 which would suggest that it is literal Israel and J^u_udae . Im not saying that along will prove it but I think it would go quite a distance in that direction. It certainly suggests it very strongly. When you mention both of them in this way. With the house of Israel and ~~with~~ the house of Judah. Now according with the Covenant I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt which Covenant they brake although I was a husband with them. Saith the Lord. You see in those days ~~when~~ when God brought them out of Egypt he said, ~~to~~ to them. Here is my covenant. Here is the law. If you keep the law you can be saved . If you brake the law you will be punished for it. It is all a matter of your works It is a matter of whether you keep the law or whether you don't. You see that is the Old Covenant. Well now you see the Old Covenant they had broken. They hadn't ~~kept~~ kept the law. So now he is going to make them a new Covenant. And so we are going to go from the age of Law and works into the age of Grace. Now this change is going to take place. So he says that it is not according to the covenant that I made with the fathers. It is a new Covenant . In the day that I took them out of ~~took~~ took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband to them, saith the Lord. Although I was one who had this close ~~interest~~ this close interest with them. One who had established a permanent connection with them. In spite of that they broke this relationship. They broke that Covenant. Now he is going to be a new one. Now what is the new one he is going to make? This will be the ~~new~~ new covenant that I will make with the house of Israel. And in those days saith the Lord Here what is this new Covenant in contrast to the Old. Now we know first though that he hasn't told us here what the Old Covenant is. I pointed to you the

Blood of another. On that consideration, he would have had to offer himself frequently. from the foundation of the world . There of course is a great fact only one atonement. Greek (10) . If there are people on another planet and if sin has crept in Christ will not have to go there and die. All that will be necessary if for some sinner saved by grace to go and tell them. He does not offer himself often

here. But many many people are greatly confused about the Epist~~aa~~ to the Hebrews because they have a false idea of what the Old Testament sacraments did and a false idea of what the New Testament sacraments do. I read now verse 22, didn;t I? Without bloodshedding there is no putting away. It is necessary therefore , it is being necessary therefore that the pattern of the things in the heaven, be cleansed with these things, That is to say he rings the changes on the thought that the Mosiac Tabernacle was a pattern (Greek- 7) It was a of the spiritual truth. That the heavenly things themselves must be cleansed by a greater sacrificesthan these. The blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of a heifer and the sprinkling of these things with scarlet wool and hysop cleansed the pattern of the heavenly things. In an outward sence. But Christ is not entered into Grk (7 3/4) sacred things shall we say or sanctuary. Christ is not entered into a sancturary which is the anti-type of the true but into heaven itself. Now there heaven that is the spiritual presence of God, heaven is compared to the holy of holies. You see the symbolism can't be measured out in distances , when Christ's body was broken the veil was torn, when Christ ascended in the clouds, he entered in to the sancturay. He is entered into heaven itself. Now to appear before the face of God for us and there obviously there is the comparison of the high priest who went into the inner shrine before the mercy seat and sprinkled the blood. There to appear before the face of God for us. Yes? S: Would you say (8 3/4) here was heaven? B: That is whät it says. S: Well here it says heaven hand made. (8 3/4) B: No, No. He hath not entered into a hand made sanctuary, the anti-type of the true. Greek but into heaven itself. Not the handmade sancturary but I was impling that the word should be repeated, repeated as implied, not into the handmade sanctuary, which is the anti-type of the true, but into heaven itself as a santucary and there I think you have the comparison of the holy of holies. Now to appear before the face of God for us. And not that he should offer himself often, the high priest went into the sanctuary year by year with other blood.

that the passover covered up anybody's sins. That is as an action but it is true that if anyone had faith in the lamb of God who was going to come, his sins were taken away. Yes sir? Stud: Would not you say that David looked at the tabernacle as falling inclusively all that people proving Christ in that manner is (4) salvation. B: Oh yes, David says "Blessed is the man whose sin is covered" and for David to cover sin meant that God would not ever think of it again. There is a point that Greek (4) That to cover sin for David, meant to just blot it out completely. Yes? S: Was David as far as the east is from the west so far B: Where is that reference? S: (4½) B: The reference to the covering of sin and not remembering sin is discussed in the third chapter of Romans you know in the early part of Romans and Paul uses that as an illustration of complete justification. David speaks of the person to whom God will not impute iniquity. S: Yes, Psalm 103 As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us. This won't cover if you interpret B: Yes, the word covering as used in the Old Testament means turning away, blotting out, annihilating Atoning. S: blot out (5) B: Yes, so I did not know a lot of people hold that way it is quite misleading. If it was just another (5) incident it was no good to anybody. If it meant faith in the Lamb of God then it meant salvation. Complete salvation. S: I think that argument there covering (5½) B: Well, it means to make atonement. It is in the tennicent story, in the Exodus story, I will pass over, I will pass over you and if it was, where I ~~will~~ see the blood, I will pass over you. S: Is that in the same verse? B: Oh, I haven't looked it up for a hundred years. We are clear on this point anyway that to cover sin in David's mind meant to put away the sin. To settle it forever. It didn't mean to cover it up to be uncovered again. That is it. It would be very interesting to look up that word and the word for passover and see what you can get out of the word, but we are clear enough to get the interpretation

the eternal application for it. Student: B: We are all saved on credit. (Class laughter) Student: I mean in other words they were saved after their sins were washed away so the sacrifice of Christ

B: Now the time when all sin was literally atoned for was that one time and we are saved on credit and they were saved on credit. But I don't suppose there were very many people saved at the instance Christ said, "It is finished"

matter. That was the act at which sin was put away. Student: Well use that word (1) B: The passing over of sin done afore time

its often forgotten that God now passes over sins. The passing over of sins done anytime. is only possible because God has provided the putting away of sin. That is if it were not for the cause of Christ in the middle of world history, God would not be just in passing over sins anytime. Because Christ was going to die, God passed over sins and gave men time to repent. Because Christ has died, God can now pass over sin and give men time to repent. There was the passing over of sins done afore time and there is the passing over of sins done now. There is coming a future time when God ~~is~~ will demand an accounting of all to the time of repentance will be over. The passing over is in the present time and in the past time equally. Any other points now? ^{Are} these analogies clear enough? Yes sir? Student: On that

same point I believe both the ideas that means to cover over rather than to make atonement (2½) B: It is

a very common teaching. It is not only in the Scofield notes, but the actions in the Old Testament did a little good. They helped a little bit. What does the New Testament say? It says it didn't do any good. in itself. Not in the least. But it says, "Whosoever calleth upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." There is a point which of course is obscure ~~and~~ in a lot of peoples minds. These Old Testament sacrifices again and again your New Testament writers and your Old Testament writers say, They are of no consequence whatever in themselves. They don't do any good. It isn't ture

B Hebrew
QUESTIONS FOR INDUCTIVE STUDY OF HEBREWS 1:1-2:4

The Whole

1. What are the most obvious characteristics of the author's style?
2. How is 2:1-4 related to this segment as a whole? What observable change is made here in the author's treatment?
3. Describe the trend of the exposition from 1:1-2-2:4.
4. What does the author assume on the part of his readers?

The Parts

5. What is the core (irreducible minimum) of the first sentence?
6. What points are made by the modifying phrases to this central statement? What contrasts do you observe between these phrases? Are there any phrases without a corresponding contrast? Which, and how do you account for the omission?
- *7. What is meant by the expressions: "effulgence of his glory"; "very image of his substance"; "sat down"?
8. Restate the sentence in terms of the contrasts which are developed. What makes this such an important sentence?
9. Into what parts does the exposition between 5-14 fall? What contrasts between the Son and the angels are made in each part?
- *10. Why should the author quote so freely from the Old Testament? Examine the quotations for their Old Testament context; use made by the author; the point made in each case.
- *11. Why should the author bring angels into his discussion at all? Consider the current belief that the law was mediated by angels. See Galatians 3:19; Acts 7:53; Deuteronomy 33:2; and the statement by Josephus (Antiquities XV.5.3.), "The most excellent of our doctrines and the most sacred part of our laws we have learned of God through angels."
12. On what points does the author base the genuineness of the gospel message, 2:1-4?
13. What relation has 1:5-2:4 to the first sentence of the Epistle?
14. What claims does this segment make for the superiority or finality of the Christian revelation?

Summary

* For special report