

This is a course in Old Testament History and I always like to arrange the material

so I'm going to call Roman Numeral I, Introductory, and under that, A, will be Purpose of the (1 3/4) course, — and I have arranged the purpose of this

course under four heads. The first one is, to learn the main facts of Old Testament History. This is an absolutely necessary thing (1)

the purpose of the word of God, to know the main facts of Old Testament History.

It is, however, a purpose for which it should not be necessary to have a (1 1/4) separate report. I remember when I was in college once, our

a big job and to line it up with a little one, instead of saying here take this book (1 3/4) and apply it, to say take this book and get paper

Well that should be all this is necessary for this purpose, the purpose of exercising of Old Testament History. Anyone who has graduated from college should be able to take the Old Testament (2)

or should be able to take a Bible Dictionary or Halley's Pocket Handbook, or some book like that, and get the main facts (2 1/4)

In our class we will give a minimum (2 1/2) of attention to this purpose,

but we will assignments which will divide it up into different sections and by the end of the year you should all be familiar with the main facts of Old Testament

History. As far as seminary courses are concerned, I like to think that this purpose of simply ordering you to do a job which you can just as well do by yourself,

is at a minimum. We are here, not simply to tell you to do things like that but to help you to get inside and understand and to pass on the insight which we

have gathered, to teach a sound message. These are matters in which the teacher can be of help, the class can be of value. It is to that that we try to give the

main stress in our class. Then, for that reason, we do not have any cuts in (3 1/4)

. When you are taking a course in college for which you have a

good textbook with everything that you need for that particular course in the textbook, very often it can be said you have so many cuts. Yes, some people feel very bad if they don't get all of the cuts to which they are entitled, but we feel that our classes should pass on to you certain understanding and certain insight which you would not be ready, as yet, to work out for yourself and having seen them worked out you are ready to work out others later. Therefore, we expect in the seminary everyone to be present who has signed up for a course, whether as taking it or as an auditor, to be present at every class which is held in the course. We expect everyone to be present, unless of course you are prevented by illness. We do not have cuts in class. If you find that certain classes are not worth while, if you feel you're wasting your time, please come and tell me so because it is also possible that I or anyone else may drift into bad habits which means that certain classes are a waste of time, and in such a case we want to find out about it right away, and remedy it, but we do not expect these classes to be a waste of your time to the extent that you are just as well off if you do not attend them. We expect everyone to attend all classes and we want you to be at them promptly. We want our class to start promptly, it's a bad time for me to say that, I was a couple of minutes late this morning but I try not to be and I want all of you to try not to be. And if, during the year, everyone is late once or twice, it is understandable. We certainly don't want to get in the habit of being late. I very frequently in class give a little quiz, it will start at the very beginning of the hour and if you're not here when that clock says 8 o'clock or whatever the class starts, I don't want you to take longer on the quiz, just lose that part<sup>as</sup> if you were not here. You'll probably want to start on it right on the dot.

Number 2, the second (5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) of the course is to study the meaning and bearing of some of the events in Old Testament History. This is far more important than the first, though the first is (5  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) naturally <sup>1,</sup> <sup>1,</sup> important. The walls of the house that keep out wind and rain are much more important than the upright beams, the central structural beams, the skeleton of the house. Without the

skeleton, however, the other would not stand. <sup>You</sup> We have to have the skeleton. You have to have <sup>big</sup> beams, though the other may be more important. We have to know the facts of Old Testament History but for this class we are jointly interested in studying their meaning and their bearing, because they are not simply isolated facts, they are facts which fit together, which have a meaning, which have an importance to the (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) . Sometimes it is said that the Bible is not a book of science, and that is an absolutely true statement. If you wanted to write a textbook of Physics or Chemistry or Biology you cannot do it from the Bible, the Bible does not attempt to give you a comprehensive picture of all that is important in these domains. But wherever the Bible touches on any one of these, you can trust its statements. Because the God who made the world and who made the material which all these sciences try to describe would not describe them incorrectly in the book which he has given to us. He could have given us a textbook in everyone of these subjects far better than any textbook man can write or ever will be able to write, but that was not his purpose. He only incidentally touches it. To a lesser extent it can be said, the Bible is not a book of history. Our histories in the ordinary sense try to tell of the rise and fall of nations and show the facts which have entered into it. They tell of great kings and tell us what is important about them from a political viewpoint. It is possible to say, to a lesser extent than we said about science, the Bible is not a book of history. Because some of the things who are most important from the viewpoint of political history are little discussed in the Bible and some, which from the viewpoint of political history are <sup>of</sup> comparatively small importance have much said about them in the Bible. And some events of a great deal of interest from a historical viewpoint are not even mentioned in the Bible. The Bible does not attempt to give us a complete textbook of the history of the world, or even of the history of Israel. The Bible tells us about man's relationship with God. And so it tells us as much of the history of Israel as is helpful and necessary for our understanding the history of man's relationship with God. And therefore we cannot get a complete history from the Bible. We may from

Archeology or from other groups, yes. Further light on important aspects of history which will fill in very important gaps in the Biblical account of (9 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

history is . We must study the meaning and bearing of events in the Bible and see what we learn in secular history from them but, more important, see why God selects these particular historical events to be the ones about which he would tell us. And how is it that they fit together, and what their importance is in the history of redemption, which is the purpose of the writing of the Bible.

In Bible history, as in every other field of religion, it is natural for the human being, we're all of us naturally quite lazy, to take <sup>most</sup> all of our ideas from those with whom we come in contact rather than to go directly to the source for that, and <sup>so</sup> ~~for~~ all our churches, and in fact every one of us, have many ideas in our minds which we have simply taken over from other people, which may look back originally on someone's misunderstanding of a Biblical statement. We're anxious to see exactly what the Bible says and what does the statement actually mean, and what the bearing is of these different events, and how they fit together in the historical viewpoint of the Bible. That's the historical aspect. Now, of course, every-thing's history in a way because everything is an account of <sup>something</sup> ~~what~~ has happened, but in ~~this~~ course we are not specifically interested in Biblical law though we'll touch on it (10 3/4) we're not specifically interested in

Biblical poetry, we'll touch on it some but there'll be another course which has two hours through the year on that. We're not particularly interested in Biblical prophecy, there's another course that has three hours on that. We will touch on all of them but we are interested in just about everything else in the Old Testament which does not come under one of those specific headings. But <sup>to</sup> ~~you~~ see their meaning and bearing is the purpose which we'll have in mind all through the year.

There is a third group, number 3, to examine some of the arguments that have been presented against the reliability of the historical statements of the Old Testament. To examine some of the arguments that have been presented against the reliability of the historical statements on the Old Testament. During the past

hundred years, the higher criticism has had its rise and tendency in many books today, <sup>(and</sup> <sup>have been published which have nothing to do directly with the Bible)</sup> in many textbooks, is to minimize the dependability of the Bible, to cast doubt on the source of events, and even to deny a great many of them. This sort of denial is very widespread. It is not actually the central thing in the higher criticism. The higher criticism has mainly been a matter of the study of the time in which the books were written, dividing <sup>them</sup> ~~it~~ up into sections according to various theories of (12 3/4)

We will have to touch some of those theories to some extent in this course, but only very lightly because there's another course that deals with that, Introduction of the Pentateuch, and to some extent, the Introduction to the Poets and the Prophets. So we will touch only incidentally on the direct higher criticism, theory of the doctrines of the Bible, but those theories rest upon, to some extent, arguments that the historical facts are incorrect, and also they lead people to believe that still more are incorrect. In this class we will look at the evidence on the historical accuracy of statements and we will see much value in the way of evidence that will, I hope, buttress your own faith and increase your ability to show others that the Bible is true, and to help them to resist the attacks that are made upon it. This is a purpose which will take up, it's not a major purpose in this course but it will take up a fair amount of our time because it is a very necessary thing to do in preparation for Christian service.

And then what I like to think of as of even more importance than any one of these three purposes is purpose number four, although this fourth purpose is a purpose of most importance in the seminary. Number 4, to <sup>learn</sup> work sound methods of Biblical interpretation, to learn sound methods of Biblical interpretation. The Bible, as anything else in life, has to be interpreted. It isn't just a group of words which you quote in themselves and receive blessing just from the sound of those words. There are many to whom that seems to be different (14 1/2).  
When the New Testament, the Revised Standard Version, first came out, there was a church in Wilmington, Delaware, where we were then located, which had a minister who

Tom 12-  
12-4  
nozzle keeps  
sliding + it  
is difficult to  
post the  
material

constantly preached marvelous sermons. He was denying the word of God right straight down the line. He was tearing into Biblical teaching about the deity of Christ...

## O.T. History 2. (1/2)

...through that. And the New Testament came out in the Revised Standard Version, and he began to read it from his pulpit for the Bible reading, and he almost had a revolution in his church. The people would not stand for this new language, they were accustomed to the glorious beauty of the King James Version. They almost had a revolution. Now most of the Revised Standard Version contains much that is terribly perverted and contrary to the (1 1/4) . The New Testament a little. But the amount of modernism in the Revised Standard Version New Testament was nothing, one-fiftieth the amount <sup>that</sup> ~~as~~ they were getting in his sermons. It was not that they objected to (1 1/4) of God. But they were accustomed to those words and had the feeling of something magical about <sup>those</sup> ~~a-little~~ beautiful old words. That's absolutely false <sup>holding</sup> loyalty to the Bible, that was true in the days of the Reformation. People listened to the Bible read in the services in that beautiful Latin and it's a far more beautiful language than English, even the English of the King James Version. People heard that beautiful, sonorous Latin and then when one group of another wanted to read the Bible, not from the Latin which was so beautiful that none of the people understood a word of it, but to read it in the German or the English that they all understood, many people rose up in horror against it. Yes, the events of the Reformation prove that it wasn't the sonorous beauty of the language but it was the thoughts of God that were sent that were vital. And even though a translation is never <sup>as accurate as the</sup> ~~a-factor~~ original and cannot be, one of the great (2 1/4) <sup>^</sup> providences, the great push forward in Christianity, at the time of the Reformation was putting the Bible in the language of the people. If only the Revised Standard Version had been an accurate translation of the Bible, <sup>what a great</sup> ~~but-if-you~~ help it would have given to all Christians to have it to use that people could understand so much better than any translation into the

language of three hundred years ago. I think it is good to read any translation, even if it not be a good translation, even if it not be a particularly well-expressed translation, I think it is helpful to read a different, just to break your mind loose from those words you're accustomed to and see if perhaps you've forgotten the meaning in your being accustomed to the sound of those words. Do not trust any translation that is not a thoroughly accurate translation, better still don't trust any translation, go to the original and see exactly what it says. But if you're accustomed to certain words it's very, very easy to say them over and over and never once think of what they actually mean. Well, if you're going to understand the Bible you have to learn sound methods of interpretation and that's exactly like any other science. The big thing in any science is to get into it and learn how to understand its features, learn how to know what these things mean, learn how to interpret evidence in it, and the interpretation of the Bible is a subject to which you can devote your whole life and be constantly improving and increasing in it. For the Juniors in this class, it is my hope that you will learn a great deal make a very large stride in understanding how to take a Biblical passage and understand what is in this book. For the second and third year students who are here, who already have a large start, it is my hope that you will take a very large step forward from the position which you have reached in your understanding of the methods of interpreting the word of God. And if you have a full understanding of the methods of interpreting the word of God, and know nothing about the first and second purposes, of course you could go on and study <sup>it</sup> for yourself and could work them out. If you have no understanding of sound method and you learn a great deal ~~about~~ the first and second purposes, you just reach that point and you stop there. In fact, you don't stay still or you go backward, because you inevitably forget a great deal of what you already know in any subject if you are not moving forward and making further progress in it. Well, those are the four purposes of our course. And to do those through the entire Old Testament is a very large task and it is always difficult to know what to select with which to deal. The tendency is to start at

the beginning and go just as far as you get and leave the last half ~~for another~~ perhaps untouched. time. That is not good. But the opposite tendency would be to run over the whole and do it superficially. That would not be good. It is necessary that you take certain facts from the Old Testament and study them rather thoroughly or you don't get far enough in it to really learn its meaning and bearing, and to really learn how to interpret (6 1/4)

must of necessity be somewhat uneven. In some parts we'll have to move rather hastily and hope that you will study further into them later on. In other parts we can move quite slowly as I think we ought to in order to get the real meaning out of it.

So much then for summary of A, the purpose of the course. Now B (6 3/4), some remarks <sup>1.</sup> about the methods of the course, some remarks about the method of the course. First a mention of the fact with which our upper classmen are by this time familiar, even though not perhaps all of them entirely, but which may be new to some of the new students, and that is the question, what is a credit, what is a credit hour? This course gives 3 credit hours each semester. When I was in college I remember going to one or two classes in which you came to class and listened to a man talk on something that didn't seem very interesting, unless you really paid very close attention. My observation was that if you didn't pay <sup>strict</sup> ~~close~~ attention, you might get quite a bit out of it that wasn't necessary, and most of the class didn't. They sat there (7 1/2) , thinking about other things. Say two hours a week through a term, and at the end of the term they spent two or three hours skimming over some notes that someone else had taken, and got a very creditable mark in the course and received two credit hours. That was true of very few courses. But there were a few courses at the opposite extreme where you would have two hours of class and yet you would get an assignment that would take you eight, ten, twelve, sometimes fifteen hours a week (8) <sup>?</sup> suit yourself. And students would work day and night getting ready for this course, for which they would receive two credit hours, exactly the same as for the other course. And if these happen to be required courses, very few people would ever



take them. But they were required courses, and much more work involved in it because people had to take it and an elective course <sup>which people</sup> wouldn't take if they thought it was hard, <sup>perhaps would</sup> ~~would~~ have much less. And thus some got the idea that a credit hour meant that someone had sat in a room one hour a week, that that is what constituted a credit hour. Well, it's very easy to get that idea if the matter isn't very carefully studied, but it's not a logical right idea. We try to think of it this way, that a credit hour is approximately three hours of worth-while endeavor during the course of one semester. In college, when I was there, there were laboratory courses, in which you had two or three of the three hours in class and hardly any (9 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

In the other courses in which you had maybe one hour in class, the understanding was that you had considerable studying to do outside. It isn't fair for a person to sit in a class an hour a week and do nothing else and receive one credit hour, and in another case for him to be in class an hour and also have a great deal of other work to do, and so we are trying hard to standardize it and to have one credit hour represent three hours. Well now, in this class, the three credit hours represent nine hours of work a week. (9 3/4) But whether <sup>spent</sup> ~~presented~~ <sup>part</sup> — nine hours is to be ~~presented~~, one of them in class and eight in study, or three of them in class and five in study, or six of them in class and three in study, makes very little difference to the (10) <sup>7</sup> ~~10~~ that it is approximately nine hours of work. And naturally with different portions and different sources of material there is a difference as to what way you will get the most value out of how many hours in class and how many hours in your own study, as your own work. So in this course it will vary somewhat during the semester from week to week, how much time is spent in class and how much time is spent outside in your work, but there will be weeks, in which out of the nine hours five will be spent in class, we hope it will never be more than the nine hours. Naturally, if we have five in class I'll try to give you ~~so~~ much less outside assignments than if we have only two, but it will vary in different weeks. But it's hard to do that sometimes

because naturally you have more to suggest to do in connection with it but I'll do my best to keep it so that nine hours a week and if in some weeks it runs over, you are perfectly free to stop the end of the nine and to leave that to do in other weeks when we have less than nine. As I say, that will vary somewhat. But that is very important, to understand that, what a credit hour is. We sometimes call a class a section rather than a lecture hour and some people have a tendency to think of a section as less than a (11½) actually it

Thus in this class I will give the lecture with all the students together and then we will have each week, as a rule, not every week, but approximately every week, we will have one section which will be only the Juniors. And we will have one section which will be the Middlers and the Seniors. The difference is made in this way because the one thing that are certain basic concepts in this course with which the advanced students, I believe, are all familiar <sup>from</sup> but their previous work, some <sup>may be</sup> are more familiar than others but all Middlers and Seniors are at least somewhat familiar with these certain basic concepts. We will have to touch upon them in class here, they are important to stress for everyone, but my (12½) observation in the past has been that the advanced students simply accept these concepts because they're already familiar with them from other courses, while some of the <sup>Juniors?</sup> ~~Seniors~~ have a tendency to have a very considerable resistance to some, and I'm glad to see that they do because I don't want you to take anything just because I say it, but I want you to see the evidence and to be convinced yourself of the facts of anything whatever that you accept. But it would be wrong to take a lot of time in class

(13½) and I found that the first-year students would have and we spent a great deal of time in class answering these questions and some of the second-year students would come to me afterward and say what a lot of time you wasted in class today, why of course we know that. We're already acquainted with that, as with the concept underlined, and once you've stated the facts (13½)

because they'd had the drill in other courses dealing with the same problem. While to the new students it was a very vital matter. Now they would've had it in other courses, one course comes in their second year, but if coming in the first we're going to have a section with the Juniors in which you are free to discuss very fully any of these problems which bother you. And we don't want the Middlers and Seniors to have to listen to that unless they feel an interest ~~in coming here~~ to come and hear it. There might be one or two...

...as the Juniors are just beginning Hebrew and the Middlers and Seniors are already quite adept in Hebrew. Possibly we can give them assignments and discussion in the Hebrew material that we cannot give the Juniors. So for these two reasons, we will have the sections separate, one section of Middlers and Seniors and one section of Juniors.

Now the method of the course includes under our first purpose, naturally, a fair amount of memorization, these are skeleton facts which must be known, a hitching post to which with which to connect the other matters, or they are gerses which are necessary because they sum up a great deal of valuable material, or some other reason, something that has to be just simply known, memorized. This should not take much time in class, most of you will take on this (1 1/2) task as a given assignment and then conduct perhaps a three-minute quiz at the beginning of the hour to see whether they have yet been mastered or not, and these quizzes together will make a very substantial part of the year's mark. Then a valuable part of the course is discussion, discussion which ~~might be~~ <sup>my presentation</sup> might go under this head, my presentation of the Biblical material (2) ~~which~~ <sup>that</sup> I have found ~~and of other materials~~ <sup>different</sup> matters with which we deal and discussion in class of the ideas that occur to you which ~~may~~ <sup>might</sup> advance my understanding and be very informative as they nearly always have, and also which would help to clarify my thinking on occasional points where it is difficult to make it clear. There will be a certain amount of drill in the section which it--it might be a ~~certain~~ <sup>matter</sup> of memorization but sometimes it's a real aid to memorization, sometimes you can memorize much more quickly with a certain amount of drill than if you had it all to do by yourself, and of course in the method of the course, Hebrew is of necessity a very important thing (3 1/4) in this course. I mentioned in our discussion of the curriculum to the Juniors the other day that it would be ideal if you could spend three or four years just studying languages, get the language as a foundation before we have took up any study of the meaning of passages. We cannot do that. We have to start with the meaning of passages right at the beginning or we would never get through in our (3 1/2) three-year course.

But our purpose is--the course's--is that we have a very substantial amount of practice and effort in interpreting the Bible in the original. There will be matters in this course that the Juniors will have to take on my say-so because they're not yet equipped to examine the Hebrew for themselves though as the year goes by there will be more and more they can examine for themselves. But with the upper classmen I will not want you to take anything on my say-so but to examine the Hebrew for yourself. And therefore, the upper classmen will be expected to have a little stronger muscles in this class than the Juniors because it will be necessary for the Juniors to bring to this class only one Bible, and English Bible, and I would like everyone always to have an English Bible with you. But an upperclassman I will wish to have in this class always an English Bible and a Hebrew Bible because I may call on you at any time for a discussion on a particular Hebrew word (4½) or Hebrew vowel. And in the quizzes at the beginning of the class of upperclassmen there will be interpretation using verbs or the translation of these verbs.

So please always bring your Hebrew Bible with you, we will try to confine a great part of our discussion of the Hebrew to the Middler and Senior section, but there will of necessity be some of it here because of this substantial purpose of interpretation will necessarily hang on the precise word that is used. Oh, I should not forget to announce the fact that this week there would<sup>not</sup> be much point in having a Middler and Senior section on Friday at 10:30 to instruct only one hour of lecture and that hour an introductory one, so instead of that we will have the lecture hour on Friday at 10:30, and at that lecture they will ~~instruct~~<sup>expect</sup> all the Juniors also to be present. Some of the Juniors may be tied up with Apologetics A which comes at that same hour, and if you are you will then go to Apologetics A next Monday morning at 9 o'clock, the hour at which the Juniors section would ordinarily come. So Apologetics A, this week, comes not this Friday at 10:30 but next Monday at 9 o'clock. And if the Junior class, instead of having a section next Monday at 9 will meet at the same time the Middlers and Seniors have their section this Friday at 10:30, at which time we will have our second lecture of the course. I hope that's clear to everyone (6) and everyone will remember

because the lectures are all important in this class and I don't want anyone to miss any of them, unless it's absolutely unavoidable.

Now then, so much for B in our introductory section, some remarks about the method of the course. C has a title of Basic Attitudes toward the Bible. One time when I was, I think it was my third or fourth year of teaching, way back in the dark ages, there was a, I was giving a course in Old Testament Introduction, and there was a student who had had a year at a modernist seminary and had been prevailed upon by his relatives to switch to a conservative seminary and he had come to the seminary at which I was then teaching. And he was in my class in Old Testament History and it was most stimulating to have him there. His mind was filled with denials of the facts of the Bible and he was constantly raising the most stimulating questions which stimulated the rest of the class to an interest in these matters and made it much easier to prepare them to deal with them properly and to know the answers to them. I wish we had someone like that in this course, but I fear we do not. But I must say this, however, that as to our basic attitudes toward the Bible in this course, this is not a course in which we start in with a blank mind and endeavor together to know what attitude we should take. This class begins with the assumption that the Bible is true and for number 1 (8) its beliefs. I am not a presuppositionist. I do not believe that the proper way to make progress is simply to assume (8½)

But the reason I believe the Bible is true is that I believe that Christ is my Saviour, that he died for my sins and he is my Lord and I should follow whatever he says and he sets the seal of his approval upon the Old Testament. And therefore it is on the authority of Christ that I accept the Bible as truth and dependable. Well, we go into that quite a bit in the class in Old Testament Introduction. We do not duplicate it by going into it here. I merely state that fact at this point. We do not assume simply out of the blue somewhere but for the purposes of this course we assume that the Old Testament is true. So <sup>65 to</sup> number 1 of our attitude toward the Bible is Belief, an attitude of Belief, in this course. It is an attitude that whatever

the Bible says we believe is true. Now we are interested noticing points at which people believe it is untrue (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

but our purpose here isn't to prove the Bible is true, it's to interpret the Bible. And in interpreting to know the evidence to show (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

So that is interpreting is our basic attitude toward the Bible and therefore I'm much more interested in having a student of the type I mentioned in certain other courses than this one. But if any of you in any of your previous contacts, in your reading, or in your own thought, <sup>have</sup> come up against problems <sup>in</sup> connection with acceptance of the historical statements of the Bible, please bring them up (10)

anxious to at least touch upon them

brief resume of them,

but if they're not we will certainly be anxious

and it would make the course much more interesting if some of you happen to have particular (10 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) portions <sup>1.</sup> to which you don't know the answer

But that's number 1, our attitude here is, if the Bible makes a statement we believe that statement. That's the attitude of this course and it's mostly in other courses that we examine the reason why we consider it a reasonable attitude.

But number 2 to our attitude toward the Bible. Our attitude toward the Bible is that the Bible is true and what it says is dependable but not that it is a collection of magical ~~thoughts with~~ <sup>sounds, which</sup> a mere hearing of gives you blessing. When I was in Princeton Seminary we had an Episcopalian student from England, a minister of the Church of England, I believe he was conservative, he was a very fine chap I believe, but I remember when some of our people would read I Corinthians 13, love suffereth ~~not~~ <sup>long</sup> and is kind, he would always insist on reading charity suffereth long and is kind. He said we should stick to those words in the King James Version. Well, we said it doesn't mean charity, charity today is giving something to somebody that's poor. That's not

what this is talking about. Well, he said I know it doesn't mean charity and when I read it I always explain to the people that charity isn't what it means. Charity happens to be there, not because the King James translators didn't know what it meant but because they took over the Latin word for love (11  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) and simply anglicized it instead of using an Anglo-Saxon word. But from that Latin word we have developed a word that <sup>has a</sup> ~~is~~ different meaning than the original Latin word which was simply love. And consequently that is a mis-translation in English. But he insisted you lose the beauty of the writing if you don't read charity. Well, we want all the beauty and the resonance you can get but not at the expense of misunderstanding. But for this class it is important to know that the Bible is the presentation of ideas, not simply a group of (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) <sup>thoughts</sup>, — and we are interested in knowing what those ideas are. I believe everyone here, unless it's some Junior who missed my discussion the other morning, I believe everyone here has heard me stress the fact that words are not <sup>in corners</sup> ~~important~~ but (12  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) areas. — And words do not ordinarily have the same area in different languages and therefore ~~it~~ is important to know exactly the area covered by a particular word in a particular passage. You may have two synonyms and one of them will fit perfectly into a passage and the other one would not fit there at all because the word has different areas, overlapping areas rather than identical areas. And so to learn the purpose of words is a very vital factor. Another thing that makes it vital is the general difference in language, not merely in words but in form, in English we'd say "I have been here since last Thursday." In German you would never say that. You would say, "I am here since last Thursday." Your verb form is quite different. The meaning is the same thing and if we used the same verb form it might have a third different meaning. There are profound differences in language. And not only that but there are differences in approach, differences in methods in <sup>presenting</sup> ~~representing~~ them. And the way to learn what it says in the Bible is to compare scripture with scripture and learn how to interpret different types of expression. Learn the concept and then apply it to other matters. I know some people, some very, very religious people, very orthodox people on the whole, people who, I believe (14  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) are completely wrong in their <sup>view</sup>



And when I present what I believe to be the clear teaching of scripture from Isaiah, they say, oh but that's <sup>a prophetic book</sup> the ~~prophetic~~-~~approach~~. We must base our eschatology on the didactic portions of this book (15). And when I say something from Revelation they say, oh, that's an involved book. We must base it on the didactic portions of the New Testament. Well, I believe that is a false approach to the Bible. Revelation<sup>?</sup> pronounces a curse on whoso takes from the words of this book. And to say Revelation is an (15 $\frac{1}{2}$ )<sup>?</sup> involved book and not paying any attention to it, is not taking substance from it, is throwing the whole thing over...

O.T.History 4. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...is talking about is, I believe, — unchristian and wrong. But, they say, look at this difficulty in the prophets, here's something very hard to understand, here's something you have to study a long time before you see what it means. Look at all these symbols in Revelation. Yes, I agree. Revelation and the prophets are harder to interpret than is the book of the Psalms. But there are sections of the Bible that are harder to interpret than almost anything in Revelation or in the Prophets. We cannot take one section of the Bible and say we build on that. We must build on the whole Bible. But we go through the whole Bible and there's not a book in it but what you will find matters in it that may take you years before you understand them and you may never understand them in this life. And there's not a book in the Bible but you will find some matters in it so plainly stated that a wayfaring man (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ), though a fool, need not err. And the way we make progress in this as in any science is to go through and take the things that are plain and clear and stand upon them and then go through and in the light of <sup>what's</sup> these been clear, interpret more, and get to understand that and then go through with the light of that and interpret more, and get to understand that. And never try to explain away the (2) Bible obscurities. But take the clear, wherever it is, and use it as a basis ~~and put~~ with which to explain that which is less clear and thus we move forward in your understanding and in this as in any other science, move forward to (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

in your understanding of the Bible as a divine book. It's infinite in its content, infinite in its depth, and you can never peer entirely to the bottom of it in its depth, and you can never peer entirely to the bottom of it.

Well, I wish in this general discussion preceding our specific examination of Old Testament History, I wish on this point under interpretation, to take up an example from history of this problem of interpretation--and example which helps in giving us certain general principles but which will in addition to that be laying a foundation for certain vital matters that we will discuss very soon. And for that reason I wish to call your attention to the very first book of the New Testament. The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. Now most of you have read that, I hope. Please open your Bibles to Matthew 1:1. I expect that all of you have read that so many times that it just is common to you and you don't even stop to think what it means. But let us think what it does mean. The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. My mother had a great-great-grandfather who was the Rev. Joseph Sumner in a little town in New England, and he preached 70 years in the same pulpit and only missed seven Sundays altogether in the 70 years. He was my mother's great-great-grandfather, and what would people think if Dr. someone said Dr. Allan MacRae, is the son of Rev. Joseph Sumner, is teaching a class in Old Testament History. You would say it is utter nonsense, wouldn't you? You would say, why, Joseph Sumner died two hundred years ago, how could Dr. MacRae be his son? It's absolutely impossible. And yet here we read the book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. Well, what does it mean? Well, this Christ is the eternal God. When Abraham was living, Jesus Christ was living. Yes. But was he then the son of Abraham? No. He only became a son of Abraham by being born of the virgin Mary. He only became a son of David by being born of the virgin Mary. Consequently, Jesus Christ was not a son of David or a son of Abraham, he came a thousand years after David was, and a much longer time after Abraham. Well, is this verse nonsense? No, it is not nonsense, but it shows us that the word son in the New Testament has a different meaning than the word son in English. And if you go through the Old Testament you will find that

the word son is sometimes used in a rather broader vein, it means more a successor, like Jehu, an Israelite king, killed the descendants of Omri, who had started Israelite dynasty, but in the Assyrian description, it refers to Jehu the son of Omri. He was the successor, he killed the descendants of the man who had lived a hundred years before him but he became the king, he was the successor. The word son is occasionally used in the Bible for a pupil or for a successor, but this is rather uncommon. The common use of the word son expresses a physical relationship, but this physical relationship is a relation which we today would represent by the word dependent rather than by the word son. Son is a descendant, ~~or the~~ (6½) ordinarily a descendant in the next generation but not necessarily. Son may mean one who is a son of a son of a son of a son of a son and so forth. He is a son as the word is used in Hebrew and in Greek. Well, I don't want <sup>you</sup> to take that, my say-so just from the one verse, there are many other verses at which we could look to find clear evidence of it. So we wish to go on with the word begat which we find in the next verse.

What does that mean? I'd like to look <sup>oh</sup> ~~hard~~ at this first chapter of Matthew here. That clock is moving and we won't be able to look this morning. But I expect, between tomorrow and Friday, it would be good if every one of you would make sure that you know the names in order of the first seventeen books of the Bible. Know the names in order of the first seventeen books of the Bible. We may check you on that sharp at 10:30 on Friday, and look, at least a little, at Matthew 1, say the first 11 verses, and see if the word begat always means that the man who begat was the next generation before the man who was begotten. Now in the King James Version it takes the names of the Israelite kings from the Greek instead of from the Hebrew. The American Standard Version published in 1901 takes these names in the form of the Hebrew, the same form <sup>^</sup> used in the Old Testament, which I think personally is the more reasonable thing to do. If you have a copy of the American Standard Version, it may be a help to you in studying to please look into that a little bit before Friday. And then we will meet Friday at 10:30.

(9) We have the book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. And we notice that you would never say that in English. Our English word son here is used but what is meant is the Greek word and the Hebrew word, and they here indicate a

descendent rather than one <sup>in</sup> whom the next generation. You will find many such cases in the Scripture where the word son does not mean the next generation. In English we would say descendant. Now we go down further and we find that Abraham begat Isaac. And this means that Abraham had a child and this child was called Isaac. That is no problem at all. Abraham was the father of Isaac. Isaac was the father of Jacob. Jacob was the father of Judah and his brethren, and so on. When you get down to Asa in verse 8 you read that Asa begat Jehosaphat. And in 13, 15/24/ to 24, II Chronicles 16:13 you'll find the statement made that Asa died and Jehosaphat his son became king. Then you'll read in verse 8 that Jehosaphat begat Joram, and you read in II Kings 8:16 and in II Chronicles 21:1 that Jehosaphat died and his son Joram became king. But when in II Kings 8:25 and II Chronicles 22:1 you read that Joram died and Ahaziah his son became king and in II Kings 13:1 you read that Ahaziah died and he was defeated by his son Jehoash after an 8-year insurrection and in II Kings 14:1 you read that Jehoash <sup>died</sup> and was succeeded by Amaziah and in II Kings 15:1 you read that Amaziah died and was succeeded by Uzziah. Well, now, the passage in the authorized version has the Greek form of the word, the Revised Version of 1901 put them all in the Hebrew form, which I think is reasonable to do. You read Esai<sup>ah</sup> in the New Testament and Isaiah in the Old, and the person who speaks English doesn't know why it should have a Greek <sup>form</sup> in this case and a Hebrew one in the other, in some parts they have the Greek form, in other parts the Hebrew form. It seems to me that it's surely much more sensible to stick to one form throughout the Bible whether it be the Hebrew form or the Greek form. And that is what the Revised Version does when it says Joram begat Uzziah, but in the list of kings you find that after Joram came Ahaziah and then Joram and then Amaziah and then Uzziah. And consequently it says here that King Joram begat his great-great-grandson. Well, now is this a mistake on the part of the writers of Matthew? I don't think anybody can feel it is a mistake. The only thing somebody might say is that it doesn't mean Uzziah but it means Ahaziah who was the first one, but if you do that you only move the problem along (12 3/4) because it then says that Uzziah begat Jotham. Jotham was the son of Uzziah as is shown in Kings and Chronicles. So here in Matthew you have three kings omitted and the word begat indicates the relationship

of a man to his great-great-grandson. It cannot possibly be a mistake because these are not ordinary people, these are kings, every Jewish child certainly knew their <sup>names</sup> ~~then~~ (13 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) ~~because they were~~ kings of the Jews. reestablishment of the Jewish kingdom, they would not forget the names of three of their kings. I have read statements in various books that described them (13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) and it picked out particularly their sins in the light to show why their names are omitted from the genealogy. I don't think such arguments are much good because there are others who are included in the genealogy who had the same sins and other sins perhaps worse than those. (13 3/4)

But we do know that they

and the same word begat is used for the great-great-grandfather as (14)

Now I gave you the illustration in our session with the Juniors of the difference between the word friend in English and in German. In German friend is a very "infinite close intimate one with whom you have a very close relationship (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

while in English a friend is anybody with whom you're on speaking terms, perhaps even some you're not. If you've been introduced to them you call them a friend. So now the word is perfectly legitimately used in one sense

(14 3/4)

in English it is used in a wider sense,

in German it has a narrower sense. The same is true of begat. In English it has a narrower, In Hebrew a larger sense. Yes? (student)

Yes. Fourteen (15) names

that is a very interesting point. After it gives this, <sup>it points out that</sup> they have given fourteen names (15 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) to each of the three divisions. Fourteen names.

review  
from 11/14

...generations mean a line of names. Well, that would vary as the different sizes of the families vary. All it can mean is that there are fourteen people in the (3/4)

Yes? (student)

I wouldn't say that he was (1)

but at least I would say this that he gives us the number of the names he gives us (1 1/4)

Yes. (student)

The third part was the part. The third part was

but we can't check. There may

be some omissions there but at least one.

We don't know why these names were chosen but the thing I'm trying to bring out now is that the word begat was a word which was used to indicate the relation of a man to his great-grandson. There are other people who note that this word is used that way often: So we have to say this, that just as the meaning of the English word (student) begat is <sup>a</sup> little circle and the word begat as used in the Bible is a big circle. The meaning of the word is a little circle in the English and a big circle in the other language. And so we have to learn that in making our interpretation. Now this is easy. Now Bible interpretation, we took under this heading, we took number 1, Beliefs, our attitude toward the Bible, for the purpose of this course we take the attitude that everything the Bible is true. That's one. But two, everything needs interpretation, we have to see what it means. Now if somebody wants to say this, I take everything in the Bible literally. Well, that doesn't make sense. because you can't take everything (3) literally. But there are people who say that. They take everything literally. If the Bible says that yesterday came after tomorrow, I wouldn't believe it. Well, of course the Bible doesn't express time. But in a case like this, the Bible says that Joram begat Uzziah. And the Old Testament says that Joram had a son Abaziah who had a son named Joash who had a son named Amaziah who had a son named Uzziah. And so unless you're going to say that a man can at the same time be another man's great-grandson and also be a son you have to

recognize that in the Bible the word son ~~means~~ may cover a wider area. You have to recognize that. And all the statements ~~in~~ the Bible are true if you interpret them as they were meant to be interpreted. Now of course this is a dangerous matter because some people interpret it in such a way as to get rid of the gospel, but the danger <sup>is</sup> means (4) there's no need for us to avoid examining and seeing what the <sup>key</sup> key to it is. We have some, when <sup>I was a student</sup> ~~the Bible students~~ in Princeton Seminary there was a group of students from our seminary and a number of others went together to ~~consider~~ consider the forming of an organization, the student bodies of the various seminaries. And in this meeting, which was (4 1/2) boys were forming , the question was raised in the first meeting, now let us make a platform for our association of student bodies that will be a platform that will be like should be in getting churches, and so they began discussing (4 3/4) legal points and they found then that some of the various seminaries didn't agree on just about every legal point they wanted. And so finally one of them said, Well, let's just make it on John 3:16, let's <sup>forget</sup> just everything, let's make our union on John 3:16. And a student from one of the liberal seminaries immediately spoke up and said, I can't do that, I can't accept that idea that Jesus was the only begotten son of God. And a student from one of the other liberal seminaries immediately said, Well, now don't worry about that, (5 1/2) you can get rid of it, that he was the only begotten son of God. Now that is an example of the long reach of ~~the~~ church of Paganism, to interpret so as to get rid of an idea because you don't like it. And there's a great deal of that done. But the right purpose of interpretation is to interpret not to get rid of something you don't like or ~~that~~ <sup>to get</sup> something you do like, but to find what's there, to find out what <sup>the</sup> the original author meant. And you have to interpret. I was thinking the other day, I go down the street and I meet someone and he says, it's a nice day, and I say yes, only it looks as if it might rain. Well, I don't think so, and we go on. Well, now what did we mean, what was the interpretation of what we said? Our words were it's a nice day but it looks as if it might rain. But all that was perfectly obvious to me, I didn't need to tell him, it was perfectly obvious to him, he didn't need to tell me. Neither of us was interested in the fact about whether the other thought it might rain. What we were

interested in, what we really were saying, was I'm glad to see you and I have a friendly feeling towards one another. The other said I reciprocate the friendly feeling toward you. That's what we were saying. That's what we meant. But what we said was something different. There our words expressed one thing that literal statement of our words was not true, but it was absolutely unimportant because it wasn't what we meant at all. The interpretation of them was something quite different. Well, there aren't many cases, though there <sup>are</sup> a few, where interpretation is that different from the direct words themselves. But in practically all of these, ~~if~~ you have to think, what do these words mean as "what was the divine meaning of these words?" You have to interpret to find out what to say. And the way that you learn what the Scripture means isn't by thinking what seems reasonable to you but it's by studying the Scripture to see what these words mean and how they are used elsewhere. And it's studying the Scripture to see what is talked of, where and what light is thrown on the sacred passage. Here we find ~~that Kings~~ teaches that there was a king and he had a son who was a king, he had a son who was a king and he had a son who was a king and he had a son who was a king. And we find that Matthew says the first king begets his great-great-grandson. And so we find that in <sup>Biblical</sup> ~~in Bible~~ usage the word beget means, not to become a father, but to become an ancestor. Now when does one become an ancestor. He becomes an ancestor when he has a child born. So that if you have a child born who is the great-great-grandfather of a future president of the United States, you become the great-great-great-grandfather of this man when your child is born. You beget him, you become his ancestor, even though there are other steps which other people have to take in the begetting of that president of the United States. Now that idea ~~makes-for-a-little-bit~~ <sup>may seem a little bit</sup> ~~obscure~~, a little bit difficult to us (8 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

difficult but they nevertheless are important, and this can have a considerable importance in our interpretation. Suppose then I say to you that ~~I think~~ last summer I traveled from Rio de Janeiro to Philadelphia. Well, somebody might say that they saw on our car they saw a little banner on there that says Miami-Paris<sup>^</sup> Junction<sup>^</sup>. But they would say that must have been put on up here. It can't have been put on at



the Paris Junction because I didn't go to Miami, I traveled from Rio de Janeiro to Philadelphia. I didn't say anything about Miami. How then did that get on the car? Well, when I say I traveled from Rio de Janeiro to Philadelphia last summer, I don't say whether I came directly or whether I stopped on the way. I may have flown straight through in one day or I may have stopped a hundred days at a hundred places along the way. My statement does not say, and in my opinion it is just as important for interpretation to know what is not included in a statement as it is to know what definitely is included in it. When I say that I traveled from Rio de Janeiro to Philadelphia last summer you know it was last summer it happened. I didn't leave there a year ago. It was last summer. You know that I left there and you know that I arrived here but how I traveled, whether I <sup>over</sup> stopped, whether I came in ~~the middle of the summer~~ <sup>little jumps or in big jumps</sup>, whether I stopped many, many times or a few times, or no times, you don't know and it's very important to recognize that statements don't include certain things. You will find...  
 ...I tell you that last summer I went to Rio and to Miami you have no right from that statement to say I must have gone to Rio first. If I say to you, be sure you visit Rio and Miami, I don't mean you have to go to Rio first. You might go to Miami.

Turn to chapter 11 and there in Genesis 11 we read these are the generations of Shem. Shem was a hundred years old and begat Arphaxad two years after the flood. All right. Here's Shem and let us say that Shem was, say it was the year 2519 when Shem was born. And Shem begat Arphaxad. Here (12)

Then Arphaxad was born in 2400, but is that true? Does that follow? Shem was 100 years old when he begat Arphaxad. How old was Joram when he begat Uziah? How old was Joram when he begat Uziah? Was Joram a hundred years old when he begat Uziah. I haven't got the figure here and I'm not going to take the time to give them to you, but suppose Joram was thirty years old, supposing he was thirty years old, when Ahaziah was born. And suppose that Ahaziah was twenty-five years old when Joash was born. And suppose that Joash was twenty-seven years old when Amaziah was born. And suppose that Amaziah was thirty-eight years old when Uziah was born. Now, the book of Matthew tells

us that Joram begat Uzziah. How could old was Joram when he begat Uzziah? You add these together you get fifty-five, ninety, a hundred and ten. How many of you would say that Joram was a hundred and ten years old when he begat Uzziah? Would you raise your hand. He was a hundred and ten years old when he begat Uzziah and he died when he was forty-three? How could he beget Uzziah fifty years after he died? (student: by natural generation) Well, Am<sup>^</sup>aziah might have.

The one himself became a descendent when he was born but the one became an ancestor when the child was born to the line of kings.

Shem was an hundred years old, and begat Arphaxad two years after the flood. Well then, two years after the flood Shem had a child born and this child, and by this, Shem touched off a chain reaction. (15 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

was Arphaxad the first one in the chain? Or was he the second, or was he the fifth or the tenth or was he the hundredth? It doesn't say. And Shem lived after he begat touched off this reaction fived hundred years and begat sons and daughters. And Arphaxad lived thirty-five years and...

O.T. History 6. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...first one in the chain reaction, was he the second, was he the fifth, was he the hundredth (3/4)

Well, we go <sup>on</sup> and we read about these different people and we find the age which they were when they had a son through whom the chain came. Now maybe (1) that's right (student)

I think he became Joram himself when he was born. But he became Joram's ancestor when he had the son through whom Joram came. Yes, sir? (student) Well, now let's take that later. I am not saying that Arphaxad was not born two years after the flood. I do not know. I don't know when he was born. Maybe he was born two years after the flood. What I am saying is that Shem became an ancestor of Arphaxad, through having a child two years after the flood, who was either Arphaxad or an ancestor of Arphaxad, and thus

Shem did his part in the ancestry of Arphaxad at that time. So Shem became an ancestor of Arphaxad two years <sup>after</sup> ~~before~~ the flood, maybe an immediate father, we don't know. But we go on through these and we trace them down one after the other until we get to Terah and we read in verse 26 that Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran. How old was Terah when he begat Nahor? How old was he when he begat Nahor? Seventy when he begat Nahor? Well then how old was he when he begat Haran?

And how old was Arphaxad when Salah was born, and Salah when Eber was born, as proof that the chain goes straight on and that as a result give us the figures which you find in the Ussher chronology and it's very puzzling. And according to these figures you will reason (3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) that when Abram was married, Shem may very well have been a guest at his wedding. Well, now if you read the history you will find that at the time of Abram the world had forgotten God. It was a heathen world. Abram was almost alone in the world in his knowledge of God. (4) Now do think <sup>of its being</sup> ~~it would be~~ a natural thing that these patriarchs who were (4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) and in the immediate vicinity, were all living at that time. That it could be, but it certainly seems reticent on that, there's a certain hesitancy about accepting that. I tell you what gives a much greater (4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) , it is this, that for at least a thousand years before the time of Abram, <sup>or</sup> maybe fifteen hundred years, we have in Mesopotamia successive (4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) of civilization and the of the reign of kings from one to the other for at least a thousand years with no place there, no place there for the flood to have occurred. And back of that in Mesopotamia we have (4  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) for a long time. The ordinary chronology will tell you that it was about 2500 B.C. that the flood came, and about 2100 that Abram was born. They will give you those dates and if those dates are true, our archeology is very, very, very (5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) because we have successive accounts of rulers in Mesopotamia for a thousand years before the time of Abram. But I would say that we do not know whether these people came one after the other or whether there were big gaps between them and my personal guess is that the flood was about ten thousand B.C. That's my personal guess. Maybe

it was twenty-five thousand.  
~~you'd want to~~

I <sup>personally</sup> ~~certainly~~ think it extremely likely that it

was twenty-five thousand, extremely likely. The only reason for putting it that length would be to say there are no gaps here, that begat (5 3/4) always means the father of the very next generation, and the result of this is what we have found in the world. Now if the Bible makes a statement which contradicts any science in the world, I don't care what it is, I'm ready to take the Bible statement and stand on it and say let's wait for the scientists to learn more. I'm ready to do that, if I'm sure of the interpretation of that Bible statement. But when I find in Matthew that begat can be used of a man's great-great-grandfather, when I find in other places that begat is used of an ancestor rather than of an immediate father, I feel on the ground of Biblical interpretation I have reason to say that when it says that begat Arphaxad, it means that either he had a child that was either Arphaxad or an ancestor of Arphaxad, and I do not know which it was unless the Bible explicitly tells me, any more than when I tell you I ~~was~~ came here from Rio de Janeiro you know <sup>whether I flew,</sup> ~~as well as I do~~ walked, rowed a boat, or swam. Yes? (student)

(7 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

...Greek and Hebrew are very different languages and it does not prove that a word has a certain meaning in the Greek that it will have the same meaning in the Hebrew, that is absolutely true. But this is also true, that the writers of the New Testament were just filled with the understanding and interpretation of the Old Testament and that in case after case they used the Greek words to pass on the idea which they found in some Hebrew passage, <sup>and</sup> they used the best that they can. And so you have to keep this in mind as a danger you may misinterpret if you do not recognize <sup>the difference</sup> ~~a difficulty~~ between Greek and Hebrew. But in general we can say that when we find, the Greek word, that is translated begat, used of a great-great-grandchild, and when we find a Hebrew word that is used, translated begat, as we do occasionally in the Old Testament, used of a great (8 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) <sup>^</sup>, that they give us evidence that the Hebrew word had that meaning and was the best you could find. Now it might be (8 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) <sup>^</sup> in one sense rather than the other, and that means that I should have brought from the Old Testament

and not from Matthew but since the two stand together here and the Matthew is dealing with kings (8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) of which there can be absolutely no question. I present it rather than one of those from the Old which deal with (8 3/4) but it's a good point and I'm very glad you raised it. Yes? (student)

...we find evidence for the statement made a few minutes ago it is (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) that Abram was not the oldest of the three. And I ~~think that~~ <sup>appreciate</sup> you're bringing that, though we don't want to go into matters about Abram at the present, we take them up a little later but at present we're interested in this matter of interpretation and that is very helpful/for stressing this, that when it says Terah lived seventy years and begat Abram, Nahor and Haran, it means that Terah was not under seventy when any one of these three was born. It means that. <sup>But</sup> ~~So~~ it would seem from that comparison factor that he was a hundred and thirty-five when Abram was born and so, though it ~~says~~ he lived 70 years and begat Abram, in the context you must take it, he lived seventy years and after he was seventy years old he had three sons. And probably the oldest of his sons was born when he was seventy but it's not stated here which of the three was born. As far as this is concerned, we do not know. But from this other (10) we feel quite certain that Abram was not the first one, it is a guess, \* (10 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) of the point I'm trying to get across. ~~What~~ I'm trying to get across now is not specific information about Abram, because we take Abram up definitely later, but what I'm trying to get across is the point ~~to~~ see what the Scripture says and stand upon it. And if the Scripture makes a statement and the interpretation is clear, all the scientists and all the historians in the world can say something else, I will say let us wait till we have more evidence because the Scripture is true, but let's not read into the Scripture but let's ~~make~~ make sure that we have what the Scriptures do mean. And if we see the word begat does not necessarily mean that the next one comes immediately after, and so we do not know how long before Abram the flood ~~was~~. Yes? (student) (11)

(11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...~~may~~ may even be parts of both, the order could even be parts of both. The order, the matter of order there, is a very important thing. In the Acts we read, no in the

Gospels we read of the temptation of Christ. It is described three times. And we have two different orders in which the temptations occur, and there are those who think therefore Satan must have tempted Jesus on two different occasions, because the temptations are in different order. Well, the fact of the matter is, that they both say exactly the same thing that Satan said to Jesus and that Jesus said to Satan and so on, and it would seem to me that the Gospel writers simply gave different parts in a different order. I don't think we have to say he tempted him two different times but to say this, if first he did this and second he did this, we are told the order. If it says he did this and he did this we do not necessarily know why they are placed in that particular order. It may be alphabetical, it may be chronological, it may be in order of importance, it may be in order of (12 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) of the particular purpose which it reviews at the time. Now, of course, in these names, in this genealogy here, we know that these people came in this order, <sup>we know</sup> ~~so~~ that, that is first. That Arphaxad came after Shem and that Arphaxad came before Salah. That is absolutely true. When it says Arphaxad begat Salah, Arphaxad did not come after Salah. But how much space there was in between we do not know, whether they came immediately, whether there was a long period. We do not in the Bible have evidence of which to tell the length of time between the flood and the birth of Abram. We don't have it. If we had it I would be ready to stand on it, but we don't have it. And I said that seventy percent ~~of~~ at least, may be ninety percent, of differences between Bible believers are based upon people reading into Scripture something that isn't stated.

Our next class is going to meet next week, Monday. As you know Apologetics A meets next week, which did not meet at this hour, but we do not meet in this class on Monday or Tuesday but we meet on Wednesday at 8 o'clock, but I know you'll want to get in your nine hours next week so I'll give you something to help you do it. For all those who've already (14) thoroughly review the Hebrew of Genesis 1:1-10. I believe you've all read that. Anybody who has Hebrew I'm sure you have that worked out. Any who haven't yet read the first chapter of Genesis, raise your hand. One. Two. Everybody else has it. So review thoroughly the first ten

verses of Genesis, and then I would like everybody to look at what happened in Hebrew of the days of creation in Genesis. Some of you may know that already. If you don't, have it in mind. What happened in the day of creation? And then I would like you, Wednesday morning, to turn in a paper in which you have looked over in a Bible that has no outline, Genesis 1 to 11, and make a general outline. You can have five divisions, seven, ten or twelve, not over twelve. An outline. This is not <sup>easy</sup> anything to <sup>outline</sup> take-a-let of-time. A general survey (15)

naturally falls, the material

into what divisions it naturally falls. <sup>I'm not interested</sup> ~~Not into~~ what divisions anybody else has made, I want you to do it on the basis of your work. Turn that in Wednesday morning and be ready to answer questions on the Hebrew. That's only ten verses (15 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

O.T.History 7. (13/4) (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...everybody will please take out a piece of paper and write your name on it and today's date. We also have these outlines to collect that are due today. I'll collect them after the test. Take a piece of paper please and write your name on it and the date. And then, Mr. Haffley, would you stand up please, and Mr. Adcock, and Mr. BonFriscoe would you move this way for a second and stand up. One seat here, one seat this way, and maybe, Mr. Sutherland, you wouldn't mind just for an instant if you'd move to this one here. And now, everybody who is behind one of these men write a capital B on your paper. If you're not behind one, write a capital A. Thank you, now you may return to the other seats if you want to, but change that to an A. Then, I would like to give close attention now, because I'm quite anxious that you get this exactly right. First I would like to read to you from the book of Hebrew, the 7th chapter, verses 5 to 10, and listen closely and see what it says there about the relationship between Abraham and Levi. Hebrews 7:5-10. We read there, "and verily they that are of the sons of Levi,

who receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham; But he whose descent is not counted from them (that is Melchisedec, discussed earlier in the chapter) received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises. And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better. And here men that die receive tithes: but there he receiveth them, of whom it is witnessed that he liveth. And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him." When Abraham met Melchisedec he had no children and when Abraham Melchisedec Levi was still in the loins of his father Abraham. Now I hope everyone has that in mind because that will be vital with what we will continue to do. Now I want to read you Genesis 21:5. If you want to turn to this in your own Bibles, it's entirely satisfactory to do it. Genesis 21:5, "And Abraham was an hundred years old, when his son Isaac was born unto him." Now please write, regardless of whether you're A or B, write this on your paper, put a number 1. And then say Abraham was three hundred years old when he begat Isaac, or twenty years of whatever it is. Give the correct number. Abraham was so many years old when he begat Isaac, give the correct figure. I just read it to you, so now you can look back, the verse that you have in your Bible. Abraham was so many years old when he begat Isaac. Now we'll see another verse. Everybody have that. All right. I'll read you Genesis 25:26 and anyone who wishes may look at it either in this Hebrew or in English. Genesis 25:26, "And after that came his brother out, and his hand took hold on Esau's heel: and his name was called Jacob: and Isaac was three-score years old when she bare them." Now put down a number two, and after that say, Isaac was twenty-seven years old or whatever it is, when he begat Jacob. So you put down number 2, Isaac was so many years old when he begat Jacob. Then, number 3 I'm going to dictate to you because there's no Scriptural basis, but I think what I say will be safe.

Jacob was at least twenty-five years old when he begat Levi. So far as I know, the Scripture does not say how old Jacob was when he begat Levi. Maybe it was 45, I don't know. But when I say at least twenty-five I think I am absolutely safe, though we



won't make the statement that way. That is the third statement. Now, if your paper is marked A, if your paper is marked A then please turn it over. If your paper is marked A, then turn it over. If it's B keep it the way it is. If you turn over your paper, put number 5 on it, and then after the number 5 state the answer to this question: What did God do on the third day of creation? If you're A, write that on the back of your paper. What did God do on the third day of creation. If your paper, you have not turned it over; but write a number 4 under 1, 2, and 3, and write the answer to this question: How old was Abraham when he begat <sup>Levi</sup> ~~Jacob~~? Abraham was 23 years old, 672, whatever it is, when he begat Levi. Write the answer to that question for A.

Now everybody turn your paper over again, from what it is now. So that now those who have a B paper have it turned it upside down, those with an A paper are back to the side that says 1, 2, 3. Now all those who have a B paper, the paper turned upside down, write a number 5 and tell what God did on the third day. If you have an A paper, the paper that is not turned upside down, write the answer to this question: How old was Abraham when he begat Levi? Say, Abraham was 23 years old when he begat Levi. Or Abraham was 693 years old when he begat Levi. Whatever he was.

(10  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) I think the data on this subject contained in 1, 2, 3

the first of Genesis. Now this is enough for the Juniors.

Juniors cannot cover as much ground as the Middlers and Seniors who have had more training than you have. So this is enough for the Juniors. But for the Middlers and Seniors write a number 6 and after the word 6, write the meaning of the word that is written on the blackboard, the meaning of that word. It occurs three or four times in today's assignment (11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

thoroughly familiar with it, it's not a word that occurs once

Now having written that, please turn your papers, I guess that side; pass your papers to that side immediately please. And we'll ask the man in the back corner there to bring them up please, immediately. This was all based either on today's assignment

or on the lectures given so I trust we have perfect papers from everyone. Please turn them rapidly to the middle and bring them up and, while that's being done, I will mention the assignment for next time. For next time, please everybody bring me in a list of all places mentioned in Genesis 2. Bring in a list of all geographical names mentioned in chapter 2, with a statement of where they are, find them on the map. All geographical terms mentioned in Genesis 2, to be turned in next time. That's the first part of the assignment. Now the second part of it, for the Middlers and Seniors, is to thoroughly prepare the next ten verses of Genesis, the first ten to date, the next ten, that's probably review for most of you. That's all the assignment is for the Middlers and Seniors, but for the Juniors, in addition to turning in the list of places in Genesis 2, also turn in a list of all events in chapter 2. Now you don't need to go into detail. What are the specific events, not descriptions but events that are mentioned in chapter 2. And there's a third part to the assignment for Juniors, also on your papers give a list of all creative acts in chapter 2, in the order in which they occur. A list of all creative acts mentioned in chapter 2, in the order in which they occur, with the reference. That won't take you very long but it may take a little thought.

So the Juniors have three parts to the paper that is to be turned in and the Middlers only one, but the Middlers are to prepare Genesis 1:11-20. Now the other papers that were due for today, I <sup>don't</sup> think I'll collect now, take a minute. Let's ask Mr. Haffley, Mr. Mitchell, would you mind, at the end of the class, standing at the door and <sup>and then take them to the office.</sup> collecting them/ Please everybody give your paper for today to Mr. Mitchell at the door...

## O.T.History 8. (3/4)

Now we were speaking last time, was I still on C, yes? (student)  
 Yes, we're through at 10:35 (1), through at 10:35. Yes? (student)  
 Yes, well that will meet next Monday <sup>instead of Friday</sup> ~~at 10 o'clock~~. We meet--thank you for mentioning this (1 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) --we meet this week on Friday at 10:30. Apobogenics meets on Monday as it did last week. I hope that's the last time we'll have to do that. And

I had to be in New York yesterday and the day before, and Mr. Rao was kind enough to switch with me so we could get in the class work. So we'll meet Friday at 10:30. These lessons are due Friday at 10:30.

Now did I mention number D, a few remarks about chronology yesterday? I didn't. Well, then don't put it down yet. What I am thinking of overlaps between the two. C leads right into it. I was thinking about the matter of the genealogy and somebody I'd like to have now give me the answer to the question that I asked as number 4 on your paper. How old was Abraham when he beget Levi? Mr. Aschenbach? 185, you would say. You would say that Levi was still in the loins of Abraham until Abraham was 185 years old. Well, then he couldn't very well beget him after he died, could he? It would be quite difficult. ~~The~~ Hebrews says that Levi was in the loins of Abraham when he met Melchisedec. I don't think that he could have been in his loins after he died or Levi would never have been mentioned in history. Yes? (student)

According to the interpretation of the book of Hebrews which says that Levi was still in his loins when he met Melchisedec. According to that interpretation, he was a hundred years old when he beget Levi. How many said a hundred? Raise your hand. Most of you said a hundred. There were some though who did not. Yes? (student: how old was Abraham when he died?) Oh, he lived to be around 180, or somewhere around there. He lived a pretty long while. (student)

Abraham considered it a miracle that he was able to beget a child at a hundred. I don't think (3  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) he was able to beget anybody

Yes? (student)

He came to that--when he had a child to whom (4)

He then perforce took part in the coming of <sup>Levi</sup> Jesus. He then beget Levi. When the child was born (4 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

As Hebrews says, Levi was yet in the loins of Abraham when he met Melchisedek. He was no longer in the loins of Abraham after Isaac was born. Yes? (student)

Matthew 1 gives no number at all. Matthew chapter 1 gives a man begetting his great-grandson. So we notice the word beget in Hebrew does not mean simply become a father,

it may mean become an ancestor. It means for a man to perform his part in the continuation of the race, which results in either a son or a grandson or a great-grandson or some further descendent. When he does that he begets another man. After that the man is no longer in his loins. I mean that's the interpretation of Hebrews, the passage I read to you. Yes? (student)

It says when Abraham was one hundred he begat a child who was the ancestor of Levi.

It should be one hundred. (student)

Yes. Abraham begat <sup>Jesus</sup> Judah when he was one hundred years old. That is Abraham's part was performed when he was one hundred years old. Jesus became a child when Jesus was born. But Abraham became an ancestor of Jesus when Abraham had the child through whom Jesus came, that is the part of either one of them relates to that individual as physical connection, the part of either one of them. Yes? (student) (6 1/2)

Exactly. Abraham begat all his descendants when he begat the child through whom they came. Yes? (student) (6 3/4)

No, I did not mention it. I intended to use the first one. <sup>That's one r</sup> ~~The-only~~ reason I gave you that <sup>little</sup> quiz this morning was to find out whether I had gotten that point across (7 1/4)

to make it clear. And the individual's part is having a descendant is ~~having~~ the part that individual performs, not the part that some descendant of his performs. He begets all those whom he begets at the time when the child is born through whom they come. Mr. Deshpande? (student. 7 3/4)

If that's what Hebrews says it says. When he was still in the loins of Abraham, Abraham gave tithes. Well, the fact it says he was still in the loins implies that a time came when he was no longer in the loins. We would not say that Levi was in the loins of Abraham when Levi was walking around. He was then not in his loins. He ~~says~~ while he was still in the loins of Abraham, Abraham did something. And once he was no longer in the loins he wouldn't use, he might use another term. He might say Abraham as head of the family gave tithes, he might have said that. But this terminology would seem to mean that <sup>^</sup> <sup>^</sup> Levi was still in Abraham's body, as the word loins is part of the body. Yes? (student. 8 3/4)

Well, that's getting into lots of I think it would take us too long to go into it fully. What I'm meaning is, I'm not meaning to discuss emphasis but meanings of Hebrew words, that this Hebrew beget means to perform one's part, for a man to perform his part in the bringing of a child into the world, that's what beget means. But as used in the Bible, beget means not merely the bringing into the world of <sup>the</sup> one individual who is the next generation but of any individual who came through that way, as shown by the fact in Matthew that a king is said to beget his great-grandson and also that there are other places in the Old Testament where this is mentioned. Now I don't want, we have much ground to cover this year so I don't want to spend more time discussing whether this is true or not, what I want is to be sure that you all understand what I mean. And if you don't think that what I'm presenting is what the Scripture teaches, that is your right, to have any opinion you want, but I don't want to take time in class to discuss these views, there's too much more ground to cover. We might do that in sections (10 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) but as far as this group is concerned, I want to go on with lecture. But I want to be sure that everyone understands that what I interpret the word beget to mean in Scripture is to perform one's part in connection with the coming into the world of either a child in the next generation or a child of a child, or a child of a child of a child. After one has his own immediate son he has no further part to play, he has started the process. You might say that a man here killed somebody as he fired the gun, and the other man is a long distance away and it takes several seconds for the bullet to reach him but this man did his part when he started it going. That was his part. Now the other man, the thing on him is when it hit him. So far as this man is concerned, the time when he did it is when he started to pop it. Well, now we can't take any more time on this particular point, unless someone doesn't understand what I mean. If you raise a question whether I mean it's true or not, that we leave for section <sup>(11 $\frac{1}{4}$ )</sup>, we can't take time here (11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

. Yes, Mr. Jaggard? (student. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, but he didn't become an ancestor of him after he himself had died. He did his part in becoming an ancestor when the child was born through whom the other would come. Now, I'm not saying this is what is reality. I'm speaking of what is the meaning of the

Hebrew word, that's what I'm talking about, that this is the way this Hebrew word is used. If I'm in America here I say that everyone is a friend of mine because that's what the word friend means in English. I have met everyone of you but some of you I do not know well enough to recognize but I've met everyone of you, you're all friends of mine. If I were speaking German, I don't know how many of you in this room I would call friends because in German a friend means one with whom I'm on the most intimate of terms. The word friend has a different meaning in German than English. The word beget as an English word may have a certain meaning but what we're interested in here is what does this <sup>(12 $\frac{1}{2}$ )</sup> mean in the Greek and Hebrew word, that's what we're interested in here. And that is what this word means, not that a man does his part in the coming of the next generation but that through that does his part in the coming of the tenth generation

Well, now, we'll take the <sup>1</sup>B, capital <sup>2</sup>B, a few remarks about Chronology, and in that connection I've already called your attention to chapter 11 where Shem was a hundred years old and begat Arphaxad two years after the flood. Now if the word beget here means what it means elsewhere in Scripture, it means that Shem two years after the flood, Shem was a hundred years old and had a child, and that this child was either Arphaxad or was an ancestor of Arphaxad, this is the child through whom Arphaxad came, and Shem did his part in the coming into the world when Shem was one hundred years old. Then Arphaxad, when he was thirty-five years old begat Salah. And ~~that~~ <sup>again</sup> then if the word beget, ~~the~~ Hebrew word, means here what it means elsewhere in Scripture, it means that when Arphaxad was thirty-five years old he had a child and maybe that child's name was Salah, and maybe that child was the great-great-great-great-grandfather of Salah, we don't know. But Arphaxad did his part in the coming of Salah into the world when Arphaxad was thirty-five years old. And the result is that you cannot add up these years and know how long it was from Shem to Salah. That I believe is what is true on account of the meaning of the word as used in Scripture. Now if anybody can prove from Scripture that beget does not have this meaning but that beget means to become the father of an immediate son, rather than to become the father of one who is Salah or an ancestor, if anyone can prove that, then you are justified in adding up these years. And if you can do that, then

there are certain results that follow. If that could be true from Scripture, I would say it is true no matter...

O.T. History 9. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...that wicked heathen city of Ur of the Chaldees and going up through Mesopotamia, it was at a time when the very people who'd been in the Ark were still living and all the ancestors ( $\frac{3}{4}$ ) down through. Well, now that's not impossible but it certainly seems unlikely. But then in addition to that it means that in Mesopotamia where we have one layer under another of about 4000 B.C. up till 2000 B.C. or later, and where we have accounts of this king having a son and what happened when the two reigned together and what happened when the son was reigning and so on, tracing right straight through from 3000 B.C., that right in the middle of that there came a flood. It completely contradicts tremendous amounts of archeological material that has been found. Now if the Bible clearly said <sup>it</sup> I would stand upon it, I would say the archeological is completely wrong, someone will discover ~~it~~ sometime that it is completely wrong. Well, it is foolish to say that if it is not necessary. And if beget here means what it means elsewhere in Scripture then that is certainly not necessary. And then instead of saying the flood occurred at 2500 B.C. we say we don't know when the flood was, and my guess is that it might be 10,000 B.C., it could be 50,000. I just don't know anything about it. But my guess is that it certainly was not later than 10,000 B.C., that's my guess. But if it was later than 2500 then all the <sup>evidence that</sup> archeology can offer is completely false. That could be <sup>true</sup> ~~proven~~, scientists ( $2\frac{1}{4}$ ) often err <sup>^</sup>, it could be true, but it's very unlikely to be true when there is so much evidence and it is <sup>not</sup> necessary ( $2\frac{1}{2}$ )

because that's not what the word beget means in Scripture.

Yes? (student.  $2\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, well, now we're going to take up the flood a little later. (student)

Yes, all right, now let's say, I want to leave the flood till later but I see the point you mention is relevant. And so let's say this, there are two possibilities, one

possibility, the word beget here means what it means elsewhere in Scripture. And the possibility the flood occurred at least 10,000 B.C., that's one possibility. The other possibility, beget does not mean what it means elsewhere in Scripture, beget means what it would mean in our <sup>common</sup> English language today. You can add these dates right through, therefore, the flood was at 2500 B.C. and if you're not going to just throw the archeology out, you say, yes it must be that the flood was a very localized small affair and when the Bible says the waters covered the tops of the mountains it just means it went over some little tiny hills somewhere and didn't go up over any real important mountains, it was just a little bit of thing which would mean that you have to interpret instead of interpreting one word beget in a way contrary to our usual (3 3/4) modern English usage, instead of doing that, <sup>we</sup> you stand rigidly on beget as meaning in the Bible what it means today in common language, but we take thirty other words and we twist them all to make what is described as a great cosmic, tremendous event, in which the waters covered the mountains, into a little local (4 1/2). Now as between the two, I don't think we have to decide because the question is what do the words mean? And to me it's quite clear, this is what beget means. Now, of course, beget still could mean this and it still could (4 1/2) and the flood could be at that point. That could be it. But as to whether the flood was a little local affair or whether it was a cosmic thing, we (4 3/4). Your question was very well raised. I thank you for raising it. I was afraid it would be what we'll have a day or two later but I see (4 3/4) it's necessary at this time to that extent. Mr. Blizzard? (student)

Yes, to give an idea of the change in conditions of life. You notice how, <sup>Shem</sup> right after the flood, he was a hundred years old before having a child. That is very probably before the flood, to have people retain their strength for a great period, but after the flood, longevity rapidly decreased and it gives us an idea of conditions showing how old they were when they had their children. If it was the purpose of description to give us a precise chronology from which we could tell what date everything occurred there wouldn't be the <sup>gaps left</sup> ~~guesswork~~ there <sup>are</sup> later on, for instance we're nowhere told how long Saub reigned



and there are many points in the History of the Judges where no dates are given. Yes?  
(student. 5 3/4)

Chapter 11; verse 11. That's the one we're just looking at, isn't it? Shem lived after he begat Arphaxad five hundred years, and he had other sons and daughters. (student. 6¼)

No, I don't think so. It's as if somebody were to say, let's see, somebody were to say, there's the dog's house. You see that dog's house, isn't that a nice little place? Then we come along here and we say look at all those lovely millionaires' houses here. Well, you say house to use in two different senses. One is a dog's house and one is a millionaire's house. But it wouldn't be true. The word house means a place where individuals live. We ordinarily use it of the place in which people live. But that is not involved in the word house. It simply is a place in which to live and we can apply it to where anybody lives. Now the word begat means to perform one's part in the bringing of other human beings into the world. Ordinarily used in reference to those who are in the immediately next generation. But we have enough cases in the Scripture where it is used of those who are the children of the children of the next generation, <sup>just as we call</sup> ~~Thus-it-is-called~~ Jesus Christ the son of David. And nobody today would say, you see that man there, he's the son of George Washington. Anybody'd think you're crazy if you said that, or the son of Abraham Lincoln. Why you'd say, Lincoln's been dead for a hundred years, he's at least a grandson, maybe a great-grandson, it wouldn't make sense in English. But the word son in Scripture is <sup>just</sup> common. Jesus is the son of David and he's also the son of Abraham, did he have two fathers? No but he has two ancestors. Because the word father in Hebrew means one who is descended from, usually in the next generation, but not always. It is simply that the word has a wider meaning and sometimes is used in the narrow sense, sometimes the wider, the two don't contradict each other. It simply is a breadth of meaning. Well, it's just like I would say, now, I would go to somebody and I would say, please, Mr. Blizzard goes to the bank and he wants to cash a check and they don't, he wants to borrow ten thousand dollars at the bank, and the banker says, well now I don't know you're good for this ten thousand dollars and Mr. Blizzard says, well

here's Dr. MacRae, he'll vouch for me. I go in and I say to him, now Mr. Blizzard is a very good friend of mine, you give him the ten thousand dollars. Well, now, if the banker didn't know much about my financial situation, had heard a lot without proper knowledge, he might say, well, certainly, he's a friend of yours, we'll give him the money. Well, now, I ~~might~~ <sup>would</sup> say about anybody in this room if I met you anywhere, I'd say that man's a friend of mine but I wouldn't go to the bank about anybody here in this room and tell them to lend you ten thousand dollars because you're a friend of mine. You see, the word friend in English we use in two different senses. But these are not two contradictory senses, one is a broader sense and one is a narrower. Friend in the full sense is somebody you have implicit confidence in, but we have extended the word to just mean anybody you've been introduced to. And that's true of all words in every language. They may be used in a wider or narrower sense. Now, of course, there are cases where a word may have two different, opposite meanings, but that really is where two different words have fallen together, but actually the same word is often used in a broader and a narrower sense. You say, last summer I went abroad. You would all immediately understand that I mean I went to Europe or South America because we usually use the word abroad in the sense of across the ocean. But the word abroad is also used in the sense of simply going out. And in anything, in old English and even some modern things, you will read about the man went abroad, meaning he went out and walked in the streets. We have narrowed it down to mean to go across the ocean but we still occasionally and it <sup>was</sup> much used in literature not so many years back to mean just to go outside of your home. Well, we don't want to take too long on this because this is all introductory but this matter of chronology I'm wanting to indicate the fact that the Scripture does not give us every (10½) to know the exact date of every event that occurred. You will read modernist books in which they ridicule Fundamentalist things, they believe that at 4:17 in the afternoon on April 15th, 404 B.C. God created the world. Well, now, of course, that is a very unjust sort of ridicule because no fundamentalist that I know of attempts to give the time of day or the date or the year in which the world was created. But why can't we?

If you're going to give the date, why can't you give the precise date? Simply because God has not told us. God could have told us the exact minute, the exact hour, the exact day, but he chose not to. Did God choose to give us the exact year? You see it's only a matter of comparison. He didn't give the ~~men-and~~ <sup>minute</sup> he didn't give the date, did he give the year of creation? Well, we are often misled in this matter of chronology but our common habit <sup>(11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )<sup>1</sup></sup> nowadays of dating most everything. Now we don't always do it. I picked up some notes from previous givings of this course. I usually make a whole new set of notes but I look at previous notes, and as I do it sometimes I'll take out a key and use. Sometimes those keys get out of order. This morning I looked at two sheets of paper and it said September 29 but it didn't give the year, and I couldn't figure whether that was my giving of this lecture in 1950 or 1946. The date ~~was~~ not on. I know the day of the month, September 29, I know that, but I don't know whether it was 1950 or 1946. I didn't put it on the paper and I have no way of knowing. But we today have a very easy custom of most everything we do we just write down 1958 and it takes you a second to put that date down and we've got it and things are definitely dated, and it's a very, very handy thing, but it is a comparatively recent thing. It was never done to any great extent until 500 A.D. this matter of numbering years consecutively and continuing over a period of centuries. It was not done to any great extent until 500 A.D., it's a comparatively recent development. It's just like the Metric System, anybody who lives in Europe will say, well, now of course anybody knows that a thousand meters make a kilometer, and that a hundred centimeters make a meter, anybody knows that, you just write your figures, move your decimal point, it's just as simple as ABC. But over in this country, people haven't been caught up to that yet, and so you ask somebody how long a distance is and they'll talk about inches and yards and <sup>feet and</sup> rods and get into all kinds of hopeless confusion, relative to dark ages, and yet we haven't got sense enough to have got a decent measuring system. I heard about an Englishwoman who was in Italy and she said, this crazy system of money they've got here, I can't get used to it. She said how many <sup>centagos</sup> are there in a lira, oh yes, a hundred, isn't that crazy? She says I can't wait to get back to where everything's simple, where there's twelve pennies in a shilling and twenty

shillings in a pound. Well, we go to England we find ourselves in hopeless confusion. I asked a man how much will this pile of books be I wanted to buy? Oh, he says, seven and a half guineas. What one guinea would be worth is a pound plus a shilling. In other words it's twenty-one ( $4\frac{1}{2}$ ) and seven and a half guineas, to figure how much that meant would take me half an hour with a slide rule. To them it's just perfectly simple. They haven't caught up to us in America in having a sensible money system. But we haven't caught up to most of the rest of the world in having a sensible measuring system. To the rest of the world it seems perfectly obvious, but we don't have sense enough to do it. Well, that's the way with most advances. Once you get them they seem so simple you imagine everybody had them forever. But this matter of counting by years-- you know, a fact about archeology, there has never yet been found, discovered, an inscription anywhere that said, this was written at 792 B.C. or any such numbers. Never yet.

O.T.History 10. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...about 500 A.D., tried to figure up when Christ was born and he made a figuring<sup>ing</sup> and he said we'll call this the year 467 and ever since--or whatever it was--ever since we say 1958, From what? From nothing. Because you go back 1958 years, you get four years after Christ was born, so why should we figure things from the time Christ was four years old. Somebody made a mistake, they thought they were figuring from when he was born. It's wrong. But we still use it. But it's a very, very handy system and it would be very silly to change it. But nobody thought of that system until 312 B.C. when Ptolemy, the Greek general, conquered Babylon and his followers dated after that, and that date was kept up by a small group of his followers for over a thousand years, and if you get a Hebrew manuscript that ever has a date on, even in the Middle Ages, it's apt to be from the time Ptolemy conquered Egypt in 312 B.C. That was the first use of such a system. But it wasn't very widespread. Dionyseus introduced it, with the Christian figuring, that is what he thought was Christian though he was four years off, and we still

use it, but we're so accustomed to this that to us it seems natural to say, well, now what year did that happen? And then you go to the encyclopedia or to a list of dates and you find it. This happened 792 A.D., this happened 1347 A.D., and so on. But it is a comparatively recent development, it was not known in ancient times. Even among the Romans, through the whole of the Roman Empire, they would say this is the year when Caesar and Pompey were conquered and that's the way they named the year. When was the year when Caesar and Pompey were conquered? Well, that's the year after Scilla and (2 1/4) were conquered. And that's the year after Foli<sup>u</sup>s and Julius were conquered. And so on. And you have to make a long list in order to find out when they were. And they did not think of this simple system we have. Among the Babylonians they would say, or among the Egyptians, this happened in the third year of Rameses II, this happened in the twelfth year of Rameses II. Well, Rameses died and you start all over again. And then the question comes up, shall we start right when he died or shall we say that ~~it~~ finishes out this year and they start the next year. And sometimes they did one and sometimes the other. But they started a new one every time. So this modern idea we have, that you can figure exact years of chronology is a very, very helpful idea, but it is a comparatively recent idea. God could have revealed it to Moses if he chose. He could have said to Moses, I want you to, here's the way to make an airplane, Moses. I want you to make one so people will get more advanced. I'll introduce it to you here and I'll also introduce to you chronology, and I'll show you how to number the years one after the other, and then you put it down in the book. But God didn't choose to do that, he didn't explain atomic energy to Moses. There are a thousand other things God didn't explain to Moses, and we've discovered them since and then we go back and try to read them in to an earlier time. And so this matter of telling what year a thing happened is a new recent development. And these dates weren't put in to enable us to enable us to figure the years when ~~it~~ <sup>they</sup> happened because that was a thought that they didn't have, they never thought of it, of their (4) about these people to tell us how old they were when they had the child through whom the line came which gives us an idea of conditions of life. Yes, Mr. (4) ?

(student)

Yes, that's a very interesting thing. If you go among the Mohammedans, and you ask them, how long something is they'll tell you so many years, but you will find that their year, I believe, has 354 days in it so that it is a different length from our year. Among the Hebrews it was about three hundred and fifty-eight days was the length of the year, and then every once in a while they put in an extra month, so some months were longer than others. The precise length of year which we have today was introduced by Pope Gregory three hundred years ago. That is <sup>a</sup> the year the exact length we have now, was introduced three hundred years ago. Julius Caesar introduced a year which was three hundred and sixty-five and a quarter days long, and that is fairly accurate, but in the course of fourteen centuries it became eleven days off. Pope Gregory had to make it more. But among the ancient Egyptians, they had a year which was three hundred and sixty-five days long and the result was that every thousand years it went clear around. And this particular date which was in the middle of winter now, six hundred years from now was in the middle of summer, and the Egyptians' year was three <sup>hundred</sup> and sixty-five days but it was wrong. And this exact length of year which we have has only been discovered within the last three hundred years. So the length of years varies but the approximate matter of the year is fairly easy to figure because of your change of season, and that gives people quite early an idea of an approximate year, but the precise year that we have is quite a recent discovery. It's very easy to say a man is thirty years old, though even in some languages today, I believe, they say thirty winters old, which refers to the change of season, which is the distinctive thing about the years, but the precise year is a recent discovery, and the Bible does not contradict any recent discovery but it doesn't attempt to give them to us. Yes? (student. 6½)

Because the sheep wouldn't be out at pasture in April you say? (student)

Well, why wouldn't they be? (student. 6 3/4)

Well, I don't know why they wouldn't be. It's entirely possible that there is a peasant custom of not having the sheep in the field in a certain <sup>particular</sup> month but I don't know how he'd prove that was the custom two thousand years ago. (student. 7)

No, I would say a certain very definite thing. Now in Egypt the definite thing was the overflow of the Nile. The overflow of the Nile takes place within a period of two months. At the same time every year. And that's how the Egyptians got the first good calendar, and Julius Caesar took it over from the Egyptians. The Egyptians had three hundred and sixty-five days, Julius Caesar added a day which made it more accurate. But the Babylonians were twenty days or so off because they didn't have the Nile's overflow to give them a much closer idea, as the Egyptians did. But with any statement like that, the question always is, how does he know if the Bible says somewhere they never put sheep out in November. I would say we could stand on it because there we have solid evidence. But if somebody says they don't today, that certainly doesn't prove anything about what they did a thousand years ago, unless you can find that the reason they don't today is a reason which would have been ~~(8)~~ operative at all periods. Well, we'll have to stop there for today. The assignment is given for next Friday and we'll meet at ...

(Record did not give any sound from 8  $\frac{3}{4}$  to 12)

(12)

...that the year 4241 B.C. was the earliest fixed date in history because that is the date in which the Egyptians established their calendar. Well it's amazing to me that a man with the great scholarship and the splendid reputation would make such a (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) in a book <sup>written</sup> review for high school students would make such an absurd statement. Because Professor (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) in the first place knew perfectly well that all our ancient Egyptian dates are based upon the fact that the Egyptian calendar was three hundred and sixty-five days long and so it goes around the (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) turn, and so on that we base the date but no one on earth could tell which of the four years (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) so if the calendar was made then, whether it was 5241, 2, 3, or 4, or 40, 39, or 38. Within four years there's no possible way but in addition to that, writing was not invented till about 3,000 B.C. and how could we possibly have a calendar before writing was invented? And today no Egyptologist, I believe, I don't believe any scholar believes the Egyptians had a calendar previous to 3,000 B.C., and yet in that great textbook used all over the country by this noted scholar he said 4241 B.C. was the earliest fixed date. There are no fixed dates in history back of the time when we began figuring 1, 2, 3, 4. Now I've

mentioned that they did that in Saleucca's conquest of Babylon in 312 B.C., but that was only in a small area, and their numbers were kept up for a thousand years by some people but not (13 3/4)

this excellent system of numbering years

one after the other was not adopted until 500 B.C. and the length of year which we have now was not introduced until about 400 years ago, although Julius Caesar did a year of three hundred and sixty-five and a quarter days which was only about half an hour off. The Egyptians they were only about five hours and twenty-nine minutes and seventeen seconds, or something like that, off. But still it was definitely off and in addition to that, as the earth goes around the sun, the length of the year is gradually changed, so the length of the year two thousand years ago was different by a number of minutes from the length of the year today. So you don't need to worry look for absolute dates previous to the time when this was invented that we have today. Now we are trying, scholars are trying, to get the dates as accurate as they can and we are getting a great (14 3/4)

deal of creative action, but if you will take almost any two Bible dictionaries or books on the Old Testament written within the last thirty years, you will find their dates for most of the events will differ, considerably, in the time of the divided kingdoms, because (15) are not given for the purpose of being sufficient to enable us to establish a complete chronology. Now we have other statements on the basis of which we are getting more and more accurate, though we have not yet attained complete accuracy. But that's only (15 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) during the first thousand years before Christ, before that everything is an approximation, which if you get within a hundred or two hundred years you're doing very well. And when you get back of three thousand B. C. there would be no writing and so anything back of three thousand...

O.T.History 11. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...we know that someone had pretty good evidence (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) for those twenty-three years between those two dates. And for that reason the dates are helpful, they give you a skeleton, but it might even yet prove that those dates were fifty years off, one way or



the other. They are not absolute but they give us a relative relationship. And so the establishment of chronology on these ~~dates~~ <sup>ancient</sup> ~~and~~ times is an open thing rather than (1) a beginning. When it comes to why it should be at the beginning because we have to have on our papers. But with each of us ourselves, our knowledge goes back actually for a very, very brief distance, of our own family, I mean.

Let me just pick somebody in here ~~and~~ at random. Mr. Cook, we'll pick you just for an example. I want to find out how much you know about your family. Would you tell us the name of your father. Would you tell us what year he was born in? 1908? Would you tell us your mother's name, before she was married. Hazel what? And what year was she born? Very good. Now would you tell us your father's, see that's one generation back, we're still in this century, we're back to 1908 now. Now we'll go back one more generation, second generation back, each of your parents had two parents. So you have four grandparents. What was your father's father's name? And when was he born? What was your father's mother's name? You don't know that. Just your grandmother and you don't know her name? That's bad, isn't it? Now, how about your mother's father, what's his name? And when was he born? You don't know that. And what was your mother's name? You don't know that. All right, there's your four grandparents. Now we go back one more generation, each of them had a parent. What was your father's father's father's name? You don't know that. And of course you don't know when he was born. And what was your father's father's mother's name? You don't know that. And your father's mother's father? And your father's mother's mother? You don't know. All right. And your mother's father's father, what was his name? Your mother's father's father's last name, if you could make a guess at it. How's that? Well, wasn't your mother's name <sup>Campbell</sup> ~~Hamilton~~ before she was married? Your mother's father was Campbell and your mother's mother was (3 1/2) All right, then your mother's father's father was Campbell, the last name, you don't know his first, you don't know when he was born. Your mother's father's mother, you don't know her name at all? And your mother's mother's father would be <sup>Stecker</sup> ~~Stecker~~, but you don't know her first name. And your mother's mother's mother, you don't know at all. Well, there you are. Here's Mr. Kurtz (3 3/4)

but you go back just seventy years and it dissipates into thin air. We don't know the names of any of his ancestors that far back, except we do know the one grandfather, George Kurtz, the rest we don't know, we don't know the names or when they were born or anything about them. Well, every one of you five hundred years had perhaps thirty or forty ancestors living and how many could you name, perhaps none. I traced one relative back once to 400 A.D. But you figure that that year, 400 A.D., if I had two parents, four grandparents, eight great-grandparents, by four hundred A.D. I would probably have about a billion and a half ancestors, and I know the names of three of them, of the billion and a half, most of you don't know the names of any of them, of your ancestors that far back. It just shows how little we know about the background even of our immediate family. And the Bible could have given us lists of full details, of dates, of all these people. But that wasn't God's purpose. Did you have a question?

Well, now, Chronology then is an interesting thing, it is important for a skeleton, it is very, very helpful for that purpose. It is useful, it is vital that we know that Abraham was before David. And it is good for us to know about how long before David he was. And it's good to know the relationship of David and Solomon and which came first. It's good to know how long they reigned. We have relative dates of that period on which we can stand fairly definitely, the chances of their being revised later still exists but not greatly. Dates are a skeleton, a series of pegs to hang things on, but when you get back of Abraham, when you get back of David even, you have nothing very definite. There is about Abraham's date, guesses differ within two or three hundred years today, and we may one of these days get the date when we know Abraham's exact date, today we do not know it. Archbishop Ussher, a very Godly man took the Scriptural dates and such dates as were available to him from practical sources and on the strength of it made up a system, guessing where he did not have evidence and he made a very good system in the light of the evidence he had available. We now have more evidence available, enough to tremendously improve his dating on many points, and enough to know certainly that before the time of David he had insufficient evidence to make a decision at all. Yes? (student. 6 1/2)

Yes, now that is a question which is getting a little ahead. We want to deal with that.

The point is this, where did Moses get the information that he put in the book of Genesis? We should discuss that within the next two or three days but I think I'll keep it for a place on the (7) outline — . So I won't anticipate that discussion. I'm glad you raised it because it might be we weren't intended to discuss it and then (7) I would take a few minutes out of class. But I am intending to ~~take~~ it in the (7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) outline form in just a day or two, so we'll leave that for now.

Now the, I today want to give still in our introduction, E, just a very brief mention, E I call What is History? And some years in this course, I've taken an hour or two on this subject, but I don't think we'd better, with the whole Old Testament to cover, take more than a very few minutes right now. But I do want just to stress one or two vital elementary concepts. People have the idea that history is a list of kings. Well, that's not history, that's annals, that's material from which to make history, but that's not history. Other people have the idea that history is everything that occurs. Well, that again would suggest annals. Nobody could ever write a history of everything that occurred in one single day. It would just absolutely impossible, it would take you a thousand years to write down everything that happened today in Philadelphia. You couldn't get at them, (8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) but if you could, if you had an army of reporters, to get it for you, it would take you a thousand years to write it. Now everything that happened today, well, somebody says history is what happens that's important. Well, that's a partial definition but not complete. But on that, let me say this, who knows what is important. There was a young boy born back in Kentucky, I believe, wasn't it? Born in Kentucky about 18 was it 10 or 20, sometime along there, and he was born in a very poor family, and as a young fellow he learned to read and he sat in <sup>front of</sup> the fire and studied and there were many, many other people doing similar things. And he met a young woman, he became tremendously interested in her, she died rather suddenly, and there are things like that that happened in his life that happen in hundreds of other people. What importance was there, he was one of numbers of people having similar experience. But that man came to be one of the two or three outstanding characters in American History and today historians spend countless hours, trying to reconstruct those events about him, and discussing his love affair and what an

effect it had on his life and some even deny that the thing ever happened, well while others feel they can show where the burying place is of this young woman in his early life who made such a tremendous effect on his whole life, his relationships with her. In American history, this Abraham Lincoln had such tremendous importance that anything that entered into his life becomes tremendously important to us, but no one at the time knew it was of any importance at all, and consequently nobody bothered to write it down or paid any attention to it. And people at that time were writing down <sup>with</sup> as much interest some of the things that some of the presidents of the United States were doing in those days, men who are completely forgotten, and people today are a thousand times more interested in every little detail of Abraham Lincoln's early life than they are in the great events in the life of Franklin Pierce or James Buchanan or some of the other presidents of the United States at that time. What I mean to say is, at the time when events occur it is very difficult to know what is important and what is not. History is not just an account of what's happened, you might say it's an account of the important things that happened, but nobody at the time knows what the important things are, except for certain ones. Because history is not just a list of things that happened or even a list of important things that happened. History is a consideration of vital movements and their significance. History is an understanding of how great changes have taken place. History is a study of how civilization developed to what it is today. And therefore individuals are of interest to us because what they did had important results. They say that there was a, one of the emperors of Russia, one of the Czars of Russia, began to take quite an interest in the, this was maybe a hundred years ago, began to take quite an interest in the arrangement of the guards around the palace, and he noticed that the guards were very well arranged and planned to protect the palace. It was good system used, except there was one thing he couldn't figure out. There was a certain place out on the front lawn of the palace where the guard stood, he stood at attention with his gun beside him at that point on the lawn, and he stood there for eight hours and then another guard came and relieved him and stood there another eight hours and all the twenty-four hours, always a guard stood at that exact spot. And so he asked the captain of ~~the~~ guards, why do you

station a guard here? And he said, well that's part of our orders. Well, he said, where do those orders come from. Well, I was given those when I became captain of the guards. So he went to the higher-ups and asked, Well, that's part of the orders for the guards around the palace, the guards are to be stationed here through the day to protect the Czar and his family, and this one always stands at this point and whether the emperor is here or a thousand miles away, there is always a guard at this point. But why? Couldn't find any reason. And this man was interested why it was, and so he began going back and reading detailed accounts, and studying and eventually he discovered that one hundred and fifty years earlier the Czarina of Russia, a German princess who had married the Czar of Russia and who managed, after he died, to hold the power and continue as one of the great empresses of Russia, that this empress got a very rare shrub which was imported from a distant land and she placed it at this point on the lawn, and she wanted to be sure that this shrub would have a chance to grow and that no one would accidentally injure it, and so she gave very strict orders day and night a soldier must always stand at this spot on the lawn, stand there with his gun, and no one could get near who might accidentally injure the shrub. And within a few years the shrub proved not satisfactory for Russian conditions, the climate didn't suit, it died out, but the empress was busy with her great plans elsewhere and never thought to give a counter-order and so a hundred and fifty years later they continued always having a soldier at that point. Well, now, that seems silly to us. It seems silly to us but there is much in our lives that has just as silly a start as that. ~~There~~

There was a member of Andrew Jackson's cabinet whose wife was accused of certain things and many of the members of the cabinet refused to be friendly to this woman and Andrew Jackson, having a very soft spot in his heart for the fact that his wife had died just before he became president, took her part very violently and the man who was strongest against her was the one to be the next president of the United States. So Andrew Jackson who had absolute power in the democratic party as long as he was president, introduced the rule that no one could be a nominee of the democratic party unless he had a two-thirds vote <sup>in</sup> of the convention, because he knew that Calhoun could not get a

two-thirds vote, though he could have easily have (15 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) had a majority. and that law was put in in order to carry out Jackson's idea of keeping Calhoun from getting the office ~~by~~/~~Q~~ because Calhoun wasn't <sup>in</sup> pretty to this lady whom Jackson felt was wronged. And that rule continued in the democratic party for one hundred and twenty years. ~~was it~~ <sup>It was</sup> finally Franklin D. Roosevelt who changed it. Woodrow Wilson would never have been president of the United States if it had not been for that rule because there were other men who received a majority in the convention ~~and~~ <sup>but</sup> couldn't get two-thirds...

O.T.History 12. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...the whole world for Woodrow Wilson's being president  
~~was~~ affected the whole world (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

A little incidental thing can affect far more than what anybody every imagine. And history is an attempt to understand how things have come about and what are the events that changed them. And so history is an account of what is important but it's an account of what is important because it had effect on great numbers of people or on changing conditions. Now then a political history tries to show that which has caused political changes in the world. A history of art tries to show not just the names of ~~the~~ great painters but the account of the forces that have changed and the ideas and the men who have been important, not merely for what they did but for the importance they had on others. The Bible is a history of God's dealings with humanity. It is not a history of Israel. It is a history of the coming of God's revelation, not a history of the political events <sup>in the near east</sup> and the results. But it gives those things which God considers important in the development of the things which are more vital for our lives than the political events could possibly be, but political events are important in the background and in connection with these. And consequently we don't have a complete history of Israel in the Bible, we don't have a complete list of events anywhere during these periods. There are many areas which are left <sup>almost</sup> completely blank in our account. The Bible is written for one definite purpose but we understand that perfectly. (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Now I think to make this absolutely clear we should take an hour and go into various other aspects, <sup>There are</sup> other things that are much more important so I will be content with this for now, for this much of an understanding of what history is will be helpful as we go through (2  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

. Mr. Soong? (student)

Well, I just gave that offhand. I just wanted to get the idea across, I did not have the . I had not worked out a specific definition, let's see how I would say it. History is the account of events which are important in the development of some particular area of human life or activity, and the attempt to understand the relationship to one another in these instances. That's an offhand definition which is like a summary of an idea (3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) .

Now was that too fast for anybody to get, did everybody get it? What did you get?

(student. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) Yes, history is the account of the events which are important in the development of some particular area of human life or activity, and the attempt to understand the interrelation of these events and their ~~import~~ <sup>influence upon</sup> one another. Now was that, it's much easier for me to talk about something when I have it written out (4 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Did you get that? Well, let's see what you have now.

(student. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

yes...the interrelation of these events upon one another. I think that's a fairly good summary of what I said. And it would be helpful to have that in mind as we look on at this history because we're not going to try and get a list of events. You can easily get that any time and learn it before you come to class (5), but is the understanding of events and of their importance and relationship one to the other. Now that's all the time we'll take now for this point, what is history? . I'm anxious you get the concept because it will help as we go on.

Roman numeral II. Now, I was introductory, and number II we will call, the world before Abraham. I hesitate between, the world before Abraham, and , the primeval history. I think I'll call it the world before Abraham.

This is a section of the Bible which deals with events prior to recorded history, let's say that. Abraham, we have nothing in recorded history outside of the Bible about Abraham. But Abraham is at a time at which we have history from other sources. We know

a great deal about the general period of Abraham and we know of events for many centuries before him, from archeological sources. And so we are getting into a different area, once we come to Abraham. Before that we have nothing, except the Bible, to tell us about events. Another reason why Abraham is an important person is that the Bible is dealing with the whole world before we get to Abraham, but from Abraham on it concentrates very, very largely on one family, the descendants of Abraham, and we trace that family and the nation which came from it, through the Old Testament. And then we trace the outworking of the blessing of Abraham upon his seed in the New Testament. So that Abraham is a very vital turning point in the Bible and we will take everything before him under a separate head. Yes? (student. 6 3/4)

No, I said that there was nothing in the Bible before Abraham which is connected with the period concerning which we have recorded history from many other sources. We have, now that's a little confusing, but what I mean is this: our material from archeological sources throws a great deal of light on the time of Abraham and also on events going back many centuries before Abraham. Before Abraham in the Bible, we have a list of names, till you get back to the tower of Babel. That's the last event, not just name but event, in the part of Genesis till we get to Abraham. Now the tower of Babel is before any archeological evidence, that is, there is no archeological evidence bearing on it in any way, shape or form. And before that, everything you have in the Bible is from a period before any archeological evidence is in the Bible. See what I mean? Now if you say there's no archeological evidence before Abraham, it's not right, because we have much archeology before Abraham but there's no archeological evidence regarding anything in the Bible before Abraham. That's what I mean. (8 1/2) Yes? (student. 8 1/2)

Yes, well that's just a guess, it's a very unlikely guess. Yes? (student. 8 1/2)

Yes. We'll take that up. I've just now given a reason (8 3/4)

Now it is an important dividing point also, because from Abraham on, we have what for us is of tremendous importance, God's relation to Abraham and his descendants with (8 3/4) his promise of the seed through which the world would be blessed. That's of tremendous



importance to us from our religious viewpoint. But before that we have the account of the establishment of the world, the beginning of civilization, and all this which vitally clashes with current secular ideas in this field. I spoke at a Christian college about two years ago and I had to speak in this college in chapel in the morning. It was arranged some weeks ahead and about a week ahead I got a phone call, and they said could you come up a day earlier and have a public meeting the night before, and speak to us about the dependability of the Old Testament? Well, I said I'll be glad to do that, but I was interested in why they arranged the meeting on such short notice. I found that the reason was that they had had a speaker there at a public meeting (9 3/4) the <sup>week</sup> before, a man, a young man who had received a reputation as a scientist who was a very ardent Christian. He was a very fine Christian fellow, very much interested in Christ and a good personal worker, and he gave them a talk in the evening at a public meeting which they advertised rather widely, all their students were out to it, and when he got there, he started in to the Bible in the beginning of Genesis and he says, I believe what is in the Bible, the account of Christ is very important in the preparation for life (10 1/4) but he said when you get the first chapters of Genesis, that's just myths and legends, and he went on and spent half an hour giving the reasons why he considered this was unscientific, it was just myths and legends. We did not take it for any historical or scientific truth.

Well, if this man's (10 1/4) mind seems to be able to have a division over here from Abraham on, this is true. He believed it. But this part before Abraham, that's just myths and legends; but very few people can keep their minds divided that way, and the effect on most people who are logical is, well if that's myths and legends this probably is too. And it is a position which cannot last, you must go one way or the other.

The first chapters of Genesis give us the foundation of the Biblical view of the universe, of civilization, of human society, of the problems which face us, Christ gives us the answer to these problems. He gives us their solution. But the first chapters of Genesis give us the problem. And if we don't have the problem, how can we properly apply the solution? (11 1/2) Now, people can do it. But to a great extent. It is not necessary that we go to everybody out in the world and

try to convince them of the correct understanding of these early chapters. No, we present Christ to them. But in our larger area of the progress of Christ's Church and of the future of the people of God, there will not continue a situation in which people believe in Christ and do not believe in that which Christ considered to be the word of God. Not only that, but the whole of Christ's teaching interpreted itself to some extent in relation to the world in which we live and that world is either the world the secularist considers it to be or it is the world that the Bible teaches. And therefore these first few chapters of Genesis are the vital foundation in our whole attitude. Now we could take a whole year on this with great interest and of great profit, it's very, very much worth while, but we have only three years in the seminary course and in this course we have one year to cover Old Testament History and consequently it is necessary for us to run through these first chapters rather rapidly, but I want to call your attention to some of the main problems, to give you the solutions to some of them, to give you some of its main aspects because that is extremely vital and absolutely necessary. And then maybe the other parts of it we can get later on in some other way. But as far as this course is concerned, this is an extremely important portion of the course, this portion of these first chapters of Genesis, but one in which we will have to leave many things unstated, undone.

Now, so much then for introduction to this section, number II, the world before Abraham. Under that, A, we'll call, the creation of the universe.

Where do you read about the creation of the universe? Where do you find that in the Bible? Mr. Kane, where would you say we find that? (student. 13½. Creation of the universe? First two chapters of Genesis. First chapter of Genesis.) Yes, I think that is better. The second chapter of Genesis is mostly talking about this world. It is talking about man on this world. Some people say we have two stories of creation in the Bible. Which do you believe, the first or the second. One's in Genesis 1, one's in Genesis 2. Well, what do you mean, two stories of creation? You might say we have a dozen stories of creation, because you have the story of the creation of man, the story of the creation of heaven, the story of the creation of animals, the story of the creation

of birds, and so on. But if you're going to take it as the matter of the creation of the universe you have one account of that, that is Genesis 1. You have one account of the creation of the universe, the account in chapter 2 is dealing with man upon this earth

O.T. History 13. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

The story of the creation of the universe is the first chapter of Genesis. In other words it runs from Genesis 1:1 to 2:4a. Genesis 1:1 to 2:4a. Well, let's not worry at the moment about whether it should be 2:3 or 2:4a or 2:4, let's not worry about that. But lest we should worry about <sup>the</sup> second, I do not say that the first chapter of Genesis is Genesis 1 complete and that's it. It includes at least the first three verses of chapter 2. Now is that tampering with the word of God? I think Genesis 1 runs from 1:1 to 2:3 but you open your Bible and Genesis 1 ends with verse 31 and chapter 2 starts with what follows. Well, one of our vital concepts we want to get across in this class is that the Bible as it came from the hands of the writer is free from error. It is true, it is dependable. But we do not today have the Bible as it came from the hands of the writer, <sup>what</sup> ~~but~~ we have has been passed down to us over a long period and it has been translated into English and along the way some valuable helps have been introduced, and these helps are very good to have but they are not inspired and one of those is the chapter divisions and the verse divisions in the Bible. They are a tremendous aid to us because we can find the place quickly and <sup>when</sup> we want to discuss something we can immediately turn to it, that is very, very helpful to have that, and I wouldn't change it for anything, but we must remember they are uninspired and they are very faulty. They are not a part of the original Bible. That clock is moving a little faster than I wish it would so I won't take time now to give you evidence that some of the verse divisions are perfectly terrible. But I will speak about chapter divisions at this point.

The chapter divisions, we don't know when they were put in for sure but it seems highly probable they were put in by an English Archbishop, Archbishop Langton, in the 13th century, A.D. It is said that the Archbishop put them in in his Latin Bible as he was

riding on horseback on his pastoral calls, and the roads were very rough, and some people say that when the roads got rough his mind got confused. Well, whether that's true or not I don't know, but I know that for some reason they were later taken from the Latin Bible, out into Greek and into Hebrew. But they didn't stop what had been started in the Latin Bible. Now whether it was the roughness of the road or something else that confused the good Bishop, I don't know, but it is certain that at the end of chapter 1 he was quite confused. I asked you to make me an outline of chapters 1 <sup>to</sup> through 11 and I mainly (3<sup>+</sup>) was interested as a test of your intelligence in seeing how many of you made the first division of your outline including the first three verses of the second chapter and how many made <sup>it</sup> a chapter 1. Because if you read chapter 1, you will find that chapter 1 tells what happened the first day, second day, third day, fourth day, fifth day, sixth day, and stops there. And chapter 2 tells what happened the seventh day. Well here you have an account of seven days, don't they belong together. Then you go on to another day. So that the first division should surely include all seven days, and so our account of the creation of the universe runs into the first three verses of chapter 2. Now that's not very important for the understanding of the creation because on the seventh day all he did was rest, so you don't understand the universe a great deal better by including the seventh day. But it is part of the account. And that is a vital thing in studying the Bible, is seeing what the contents are and <sup>where</sup> ~~whether~~ the divisions naturally come. Don't be misled by the chapter head divisions. Chapter divisions are merely an aid to finding places and nothing else. I think it's a good rule when you read the Bible, whenever you start with a chapter other than the beginning of a book, glance at the verses before it, and whenever you finish a chapter, glance at the verses just following it. Otherwise you may make some vast error through not knowing a very close relationship. And then again there are places where the most important divisions in some of the books happen in the middle of the chapter. But that's not the right way to say it is, that the Archbishop didn't notice these important divisions and left it right in the middle of the chapter, which is confusing but once you understand that, it's no longer a source of confusion, but merely something about which to be careful.

Now, the account of the creation of the universe, then, we should consider as a whole, running through the first chapter and at least three verses of the next, most interpreters think it includes the first part of the fourth verse, because that says, these are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, and that seems to be a summary of the whole of chapter 1 while chapter 2 says nothing about the creation of the heavens and therefore it seems that chapter 2 starts in the last part of that verse instead of the first part. Well, that we don't have to worry about now but we do need to realize that at least the first three verses belong in the previous chapter.

Now in this chapter I have outlined here to take number 1, the general teaching of this section about God, number 2, the general teaching of this section about the material universe, number 3, its general teaching about mankind, and number 4, a consideration of Genesis 1:1. But I thought I'd get to this point before this time. I wanted to cover those three and give you four because our assignment for next time deals with four. So I think that I will just give you a brief mention of point four first. A point-four program is a good place to start in. But we will mention on number four just briefly what it is so that you will have it to prepare for your assignment. We won't go into it, we'll do that probably later. But ~~I'll~~ our fourth point is a consideration of Genesis 1:1, and I want to say that there are five ways, that I know of, in which Genesis 1:1 is interpreted. Five ways.

These five ways divide into two, (7) <sup>made</sup> two divisions according to whether you think of it as an independent sentence or as a subordinate clause introducing what follows. The first three deal with it as an independent sentence. The other two as a subordinate clause. Now we'll deal with the subordinate clause later because that doesn't relate to our present assignment. You will probably, most of you have never heard of a subordinate clause, you don't need to worry about that now. I think that's the wrong interpretation anyway but we will discuss it later. But if it is an independent sentence, which I think it is, and which is the way it is translated in all ancient translations, then what does it mean? In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. What does it mean? Well, the three <sup>of the</sup> other ways of translating it, of the purpose rather, are the three ways, if it is independent sentence. If it is an independent

sentence, if it is an independent sentence, then what is this sentence? Is this sentence, number 1, a summary of the full account of creation? A newspaper article, will often state, will often say, start, something like this: General Brown died at 6 o'clock last night in the Memorial Hospital. Then it will go on to say about two months General Brown was taken ill, they found it was such-and-such a thing, he went to the hospital, he's been there so long, and so on. They'll go on and tell you about him in more detail. Then they go back and tell you about his early life. But they often have a first sentence that summarizes all the following. As a newspaper man once said, the Bible has the greatest newspaper lead in history, because it has the first verse which summarizes the whole chapter. In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. I could give you later, well I'll just mention it now, Genesis 18:1a, Exodus 40:17, and 1 Kings 18:30. On examination, Exodus, Genesis 18:1a, now look at these later, I just mention them now, Genesis 18:1a, Exodus 40:17, and 1 Kings 18:30, are examples of a general statement in which a thing is told and then it goes back and tells it in more detail. It occurs in the Bible. Is that what we meant here? Is Genesis 1:1 a summary statement telling the whole story and then you go on and give it in more detail? Now that's the first interpretation. ~~The~~

The second interpretation is this: Genesis 1:1 is a complete story of creation. A complete universe with everything in orderly fashion in Genesis 1:1. And then everything later follows this creation, so that what follows is not an account of creation but a reconstruction, an account of events that came after the creation, and the whole creation is told in Genesis 1:1. That is a second suggested interpretation.

Now a third suggested interpretation is this: Genesis 1:1 describes the creation of matter (10<sup>1</sup>), heaven and earth being used to mean all of the elements of the universe, of heaven and earth, this is formed in Genesis 1:1. You read on a little further that he made a firmament and he called the firmament heaven. So that sounds as if heaven was made later, that would fit with this suggestion, that ~~the~~ heaven and earth here means that universe simply as matter. The universe in inchoate state. The original creation of the elements out of which everything was made. That that is what Genesis 1:1 says and that what follows is still a part of the account of creation but goes on and tells us

this which he created in this inchoate state simply as matter and elements and so on, and then how he took and rearranged it and fashioned it and established life upon it. Now that was the third interpretation of Genesis 1:1.

Now I hope everyone understands what these three are. Because our assignment for next time which, however, will not be due at our next meeting on Monday (when do we meet, first thing in the afternoon?) well this assignment will not be due until our Tuesday morning class. But please have it ready at our Tuesday morning meeting. This assignment is to list each of the three interpretations and try to give reasons in favor of each of the three. For and against. I'm not asking you to decide between them now. I hope you do not already have such a strong prejudice for or against one of the three that you're absolutely convinced that it must be that way, that you can't look reasonably at arguments in favor of one of the others. But I would like you to try to look at each one of them and think of reasons for or against them. For instance, on the third one, a good reason for it is that heaven is actually formed later, therefore that this would not be heaven in its completely formed way, but the elements out of which heaven was later formed. That would be one reason. Now think of reasons which you find in this chapter or that you know of anywhere else in the Bible, in favor of for or against any one of the three. You may already have done a lot of thinking on it. You can sit down and write out clearly the results of your thinking. You may know nothing about it, but after reading the chapter a little, you might look at some commentaries if you feel like it. I'm not assigning commentaries for this but my assignment is to put in a couple of hours and mull over the thing, look up what you can, and try to make a good argument for and against each of the three. And bring that in written out, Tuesday. We meet Monday at the regular time. Oh, excuse me, <sup>Monday,</sup> yes, we meet at the regular time. Now Monday morning, Apologetics A, we don't have a Senior section, Monday morning, but we have a regular lecture Monday afternoon. But this paper isn't due till our lecture time Tuesday morning. Is that what you raised your hand, to make that clear? Yes? (student)(14)

No, I think you, anywhere you want to get, I think you will find evidence in Scripture. But any other source you think will be helpful, as long as it doesn't waste a lot of time,

looking through a lot of stuff, it will be satisfactory. Well, we'll continue there then Monday afternoon at the regular time.

O.T.History 14. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Would you please take a piece of paper and write your name on the top of it. And open your Hebrew Bibles to Genesis 1:20. Close your English Bibles but open your Hebrew Bibles to Genesis 1:20 and write a translation of it. We assigned for ~~that~~ <sup>last</sup> Friday the second ten verses of Genesis 1. For every one of you<sup>f</sup> that has had Hebrew. Any of you who are just beginning Hebrew now, instead of doing that, state and write the names of the third and eleventh books of the Bible. Third and eleventh books of the Bible. But if you've already had Hebrew open your Hebrew Bibles and translate verse 20. Third and eleventh in the Old Testament. The third book of the Bible and the eleventh book of the entire Bible.

Open your English Bible or Greek Testament to ~~book~~ <sup>Luke</sup> three. Has everybody got the book now? ~~Book~~ <sup>Luke</sup> three. Because I want to give a test to everybody now. On the basis of Luke 3:36, I want you to write the answer to this question: Lamech was the father of \_\_\_\_\_. End that statement. Everybody write the sentence: Lamech was the father of \_\_\_\_\_, and then state who.

Right underneath the word Lamech write the name of his son, you might use the Old Testament (~~36~~) form rather than the Greek form. \_\_\_\_\_. His son was the father of, and then state who. Yes, ~~the-see~~ <sup>in Luke</sup> 3:36, it ends with the words "the son of Lamech," I want you to turn it around, and say Lamech was the father, and give the man's name but give it in the Old Testament form if you know it, rather than the Greek form. Yes?  
(student. 3 3/4)

One question so far, there'll be three more. Everybody has down, Lamech was the father of so and so. Right underneath the name of Lamech put the name of his son, then you can ditto, was the father of, and put his name. (student. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ )



You have an English Bible open before you, if the English Bible says James was the son of Henry, would it be difficult to write down Henry was the father of James, would it? Lamech was the father of who? Put the name down. And then the name that you have at the end of that line, put it right under Lamech, on the next line. Say this man was the father of, and then give the name of his son. Then underneath him put the name of his son, he was the father of--just read this verse. Lamech was the father of the next man, that man named was the father of another one, this other one was the father of the next one. This one was the father of the next one. If you use ditto all you have to do is write each name twice but go down for six lines. How many are down six lines? How many are finished now? All right, Mr. Aschenbach, would you stand up please, and will you read please, and anyone who does not have this right, please cross out anything you have wrong in the question and if there's something you haven't put in, why write it in but underline it to indicate that it's added, you didn't have it written. Would you read what you have, Mr. Aschenbach? (Student: I have number 1, Lamech was the father of Noah.) How many have that, most everyone, good. Read the next line. (Student: Noah was the father of Shem.) How many have that, good. What's the next line? (Student: Shem was the father of Arphaxad.) How many have that, all right, the next one. (Student: Arphaxad was the father of Cainan.) All right, and the next one. (Student: Cainan was the father of Sala.) Yes, is that your last one? (Student: No, I have one more: Sala was the father of Heber.) Yes, how many had the last one? Most of you, good. Do you have a question? (Student: yes. (8))

In the (8½) Hebrew

In the English then (8½)

so you could say that each one was (8½) just a part of all that follows. But I was wanting to have the list placed down as it is here because I wanted you all to compare it with something else. Now underneath that though leave one line space, leave one line space, and then write this: Noah begat Shem, when Noah was \_\_\_\_\_ years old. Then on the line below that, write Shem begat Arphaxad when Shem was \_\_\_\_\_ years old, and do the six of them right down, the ones you have on your list. You can make ditto marks for everything except just the names. Get your names from the list

above. Now how many have that written? Yes, start with Noah.

Now, look at Genesis 5:32, or you can look at 5:28 or 32, and fill in from that any figures you can. If 25, 28, or 32 gives you a figure for an answer to one of those questions, put it in. Then turn to Genesis 11:10 and from there on fill in any of these figures you can. Genesis 11:10 and following. Did you start with Lamech or with Noah. Did anybody start with Lamech and say, Lamech begat Noah when Lamech was 182 years old.? Well, then, Mr. Clark, you started with Noah, didn't you? So what did you say about Noah? Who's got something for Noah? Would you read, Mr. ? (student: 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) Noah begat Shem when Noah was five hundred years old.) Well, I think it would be safer to say at least five hundred years old. Because when he was five hundred he begat Shem and Japheth. Maybe they were twins, maybe Shem was the first to be born, maybe not. But at least he wasn't less than 500 years old. Do you have the next one, Mr. Clark? What do you have for that? (student. 4 3/4)

How many have that?

O.T.History 15. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

(student)

How many have that? All right, what do you have for the next one? (student) Who has any thing for the next one? What do you have? (student. 3/4)

You mean that Arphaxad was five years old when he begat Cainan? (1)

You had a question? (student)

It's a name, it's a common name, but evidently this one here was Cainan the son of Arphaxad. There are other Cainans. But you notice that Genesis says Arphaxad lived 35 years and begat Salah, but Luke says Salah was the son of Cainan and Cainan was the son of Arphaxad. So according to Luke Salah was not the son of Arphaxad but the grandson, according to Luke, which simply is an evidence that in this case Genesis leaves a gap which the Holy Spirit permitted Luke to fill in, that there's another generation came between, and so the statement in Genesis was true, that Arphaxad was 35 years old when he begat Salah. The statement Mr. Clark made would be true that Arphaxad was 35 years old when he begat

Cainan. We don't know how old Cainan was when he begat Salah. If he was sixty years old then it was 95 years after Arphaxad was born that Salah was born. But still the statement in Genesis would be true, Arphaxad was thirty-five years old when he begat Salah. As that was the time that he had the child who was either Salah or the ancestor of Salah.

Well, we continue now with the lecture. Let's hand these papers in to the far side. How would it be to put them here, it'll be a short row this year from that side. So pass them all over here and put them here please. Who's in the back corner, I can't see, would you bring them up please? Bring them all up here please. Thank you!

Now, we were speaking last time about the world before Abraham, and under that, A, was the creation of the universe. ~~W~~ Under A, number 1, is the general teaching of this section about God. I think it might be good to have your Bibles open before you now, and we are talking now about the account of the creation of the universe, the first section of the book of Genesis, which runs from Genesis 1:1 to 2:3 or 2:4. It's right about there, we don't need to be too sure of the exact words of the transition from it, but at least the first three verses are included. In this section, number 1, I'm putting under A, the general teaching of this section about God. And under that, small a, is God's existence is assumed. In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth and God said let there be light. It does not tell us where God came from; it does not tell us anything of the beginning of God. It assumes God's existence. Now that's quite different from the Babylonian story of creation. There is what is generally called the Babylonian story of creation, a poem which in Babylon was recited on seven successive days of a festival. On each day they had a section of the poem which they read, and the poem is often called Enuma Elish, that's the title, Enuma Elish. The title is taken from the first two words in Babylonian, Enuma Elish. It means (5) when from above. But the poem goes on something like this, When from above there were no gods, when no earth had been created, when nothing existed except just the primeval darkness and chaos, then gods become into existence. It goes on and tells how the gods were formed, how they came into existence and how the earth was formed, how man was formed, and so on, tells of a great fight between the Babylonian gods. But the Babylonian story tells how their

gods came into existence, The Greek mythology tells you Jupiter is the <sup>great</sup> ~~main~~ leader of the Greek Pantheon. You read who his father was, who his father was, who his father was. He just had an origin, but there is no such here suggested about God. It is different from these mythologies. God's existence is assumed, <sup>it's</sup> ~~we~~ just taken ~~for~~ granted. No attempt is made to tell you where he came from. His existence is assumed in the beginning of Genesis. The book, the word ~~Genesis~~ means beginning. We read of the beginning of all the different forces in the creation, in this book, but we do not read of the beginning of God. We simply assume that God was there when everything began. So that's number 1 <sup>and</sup>

as to the general teaching of this section about God. God's existence is assumed.

And 1, Monotheism is taught. Monotheism is taught. In mythologies of different lands you have accounts of gods squabbling among one another and arguing about what they're going to do. In the so-called Babylonian story of creation you have a great fight between two groups of gods. And one group overcomes the other group and they take the leader of the other group and they cut him in two and they stretch his body to ~~make~~ the stars. And then they take his blood and they ~~make~~ <sup>mix</sup> it with earth and they make human beings. And thus it is a result of a squabble among gods. They are fighting, they are arguing, they are discussing, but Genesis is altogether different. It starts with God, tells you what God does, the word for God is a plural word, elohim, but it is used with a singular verb. God did this, God did that. There is a definite plan and system whereby this one God proceeded to establish the creation of the universe. So monotheism is taught very clearly, right here in the first chapter of Genesis. Not only is no other god mentioned, no other god is possible because His activities are such that they could not occur if there were another god (8)

. In the Babylonian story of the flood, the leading god of the Babylonian pantheon becomes angry at mankind and decides to destroy it. A secondary god has pity on mankind and he speaks to a wall (8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) of a reed hut and says to the wall, when this man comes you tell him this. So then when Enmil (8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ), the god of the Babylon pantheon, says has anybody told any man that I'm going to cause a flood, they all said no, none of them had. He'd just told the wall of the hut to tell the man, he didn't tell the man. So then this hut told the man to prepare a boat. The man prepared a boat and he and his family got into it, Enmil sent the great flood, all

the rest of humanity was destroyed and after the flood was over, to the surprise of the greatest god in the universe, these men came walking out of the boat. He was surprised, amazed, and astonished. But then the other god interceded for them, said well, they've escaped your flood, let them live. So he let them live. Utterly different from the whole spirit of Genesis 1 which has monotheism, one God making his plan, doing his deeds in a way that would be impossible if other gods were even thought of. So monotheism is taught, c, small c (9 1/2), God is omnipotent, He only speaks and it is done. This is definitely taught in what God does in Genesis 1 here. He says let there be light and light comes into existence. He says let the waters be gathered together, let the dry land appear: and it is so. He has only to speak and what He desires is done. He is omnipotent.

d, God works in orderly fashion. You do not have pictured here an arbitrary, whimsical sort of a being, who lashes out wildly in this direction and the other, but you have an orderly method of procedure. He does one stage, he does the next stage, and the next stage. It is all fitted together in an orderly procedure, divided into various sections which are here called days. He works in orderly fashion.

e, small e, God is separate from His creation. There is no suggestion in Genesis 1 that God and the creation are identical. There is no hint of pantheism. There is no hint of the attitude that some take today that God is the spirit of the universe, just as our soul is in our body, that God is in the universe. Anything like that is absolutely excluded in the teaching of this chapter which teaches God who creates the universe is distinct from the universe. It does not say he takes any part of himself and makes the universe out of it, it simply says that He commands that the universe come into existence. ~~That~~

Then, f, the uniqueness of these ideas as compared with other religions and philosophies. This chapter of Genesis has a picture of God, an idea of God. He is utterly different from anything that you have in any other religion I know of. There are atheistic religions like Buddhism in which there is just a world course that accomplished things, just a system that goes on. There are pantheistic religions, there are polytheistic religions, there is the dualism of the Persians, with the fight between the good god and the evil god, of the Persian (12 1/4) but here we have pure monotheism, a teaching

which is the teaching of the Bible, Old and New Testaments, but which we do not find in any other religion I have ever heard of anywhere. It is a very definite attitude toward God which we find already right in this first chapter. One could spend a long time elaborating these points but that is not necessary in Old Testament History, but it is very vital to know the uniqueness of the views of God presented right here in this very first chapter.

Number 2, the general teaching of the section about the material universe. a, it is not self-existent or divine. The Babylonian story has the universe the great deep existent, and out of that great deep there come, gradually gods come into existence, and gods take various parts of it (13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) and fashion this earth. But here in the Bible the universe was created by God. He brought it into existence, he established it, it is not divine, it is the product of the activity of a divine being, but it itself is neither divine, nor personal, nor self-existent.

Then, b, it is not inherently evil nor antagonistic to God or to man. There have been many philosophies which so tell us (14) and there are certain Christian groups which have twisted their thinking (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) to the point where they hold this, and there are certain sects which are nominally Christian who hold this, that matter is evil and the thing to do is get away from matter, to get rid of matter, that the universe is bad. There are philosophies/<sup>today</sup> who hold an attitude toward the universe, toward matter, that to get rid of its shackles, ~~that~~ is the great good, that is the view of Buddhism, that the goal is to sink into a nirvana of non-existence, to get rid of matter, to get rid of all desire for anything material. But that is not the teaching of Genesis 1. Genesis 1 has no suggestion anywhere...

O.T.History 16. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...that the universe in itself is evil, or that it is antagonistic to God or to man. We have this, not only the absence of any suggestion of such a thing but we have frequently such statements as it was good. God saw what he had made and it was good. It was a good universe which God created.

c, it came into being at the will of a divine creator. The average scientist today, the average philosopher today leaves out of his thinking completely any idea of a divine creation of the universe. But Genesis 1 teaches us that everything which is the work of God is simply that which God has made. It came into being at the will of a divine being.

Then, d, its formation followed orderly stages. God could have said, let the universe be in existence <sup>in</sup> ~~and~~ the year 1958. And all of a sudden there would come into existence a world with oceans and cotton and mountains and rivers and people walking around and talking about what they had done thirty years ago. He could have done that in one instant if He chose. But there is not the slightest evidence that that is what God chose to do. There was a big argument in one of our magazines a few years ago between two men, one of whom is now the President of a great theological seminary, and these two men argued over this: did God create trees with tree rings in them. And the man <sup>to</sup> ~~of~~ whom I just ~~made~~ reference insisted in the article that God must have created trees with tree rings in them. Well, certainly God could create trees with tree-rings in them if he chose. God could have said, let the world be covered with trees, some of them two hundred years old, some of them a hundred, and so on. That is like they would be ~~if~~ they were that age, he could have said that. But don't the Scriptures say that he didn't. Instead ~~of~~ this argument, like too many arguments, they rest on human speculation, human philosophizing, instead of going to the Bible to see what it says. This we find clearly taught in Genesis 1, that the creation of the universe was done in orderly stages, with one event following another. Now of course the fact that <sup>it</sup> ~~they~~ mentions one, then mention another, does not necessarily show that they follow. You can say that someone built this house and that house and the other house and the other house and the other house, and yet he might have hired two hundred people to build all those houses simultaneously, but when you say he did this and it was evening and it was morning one day; he did this and it was evening and morning the second day, you've made absolutely clear that these events come in a certain sequence, in a certain series <sup>with</sup> ~~which~~ a space between them. And so the orderly progress of the activities of the making of the universe are clearly taught in Scripture. Now, there have been people who assume that all the universe just came into existence like that, just one flash,

God waves his hand and everything is just there like that, and that to assume any progression, any progress, any change, is contrary to the Bible. It may be contrary to their philosophy but the Bible clearly teaches that there were stages in the creation of the universe. So much then for d.

Now e, its essential character is pleasing and good. And so many, many different religions or philosophies, hold the idea that its essential character is evil. It's amazing how if you talk with the average worldly person today, you don't talk to them very long before you're apt to find that their attitude is that everything is bad, everything is harmful, everything is evil, everything is disappointing. Even the people who seem to be just giving themselves to hilarity and to lightness of thought and activity as if there was nothing that mattered but eat, drink and be merry and enjoy yourself, it's amazing how often you'll find that they're trying to forget (5 1/4) by what they're doing, and that they're feeling that everything is sad and gloomy and doleful. I was once interested in going to climb in the Sierra Nevada mountains. I took the train out to Mojave, California, and there I got a bus, and the bus would take me north about two hundred miles to where I would get to the eastern side of the Sierra Nevadas and climb the highest mountain in the United States, <sup>Mount Whitney.</sup> ~~en-feet,~~ that was about one hundred miles north, a hundred and fifty to get to Whitney (5 3/4). And I climbed other mountains up through that area. But the bus which I caught at Mojave to go up into the Sierras was a bus which left Los Angeles two or three hours before it reached Mojave, and which after I got off would go on another five or six hours and reach Reno, Nevada. And the bus was fairly well-filled with people, so I had a seat toward the back in the center where they raised these little seats and just behind me there were two young women sitting, and these two women had ridden from Los Angeles and they were getting rather tired of riding and they were talking a good bit and then they began singing. And they were on their way to Reno to get, to seek a divorce, each of them, and they were talking about each other, one of them said to the other, for instance, my, she said, I remember when I first saw you, so-and-so, my I felt how did he rate like that. That was before I knew you. And that was their general attitude, but after they had sung these dolorous <sup>one after the other</sup> songs, one turned to the other and she said, isn't there



any happy song? Aren't there any happy songs? And I was impressed with the questions they asked, that coming out of a light and frivolous background of just what people would call gaiety, the greater part of the songs they sang and the things with which they dealt were what they would consider gloomy, sad--aren't there any happy songs? Well that is not the teaching of Genesis one. Genesis one teaches that the universe, in its essential character, is pleasing and good, and almost every one of these days, it says that God saw what he had made, that it was good. God looked upon his creation and saw that he had made a good world. In fact, at the end of the six<sup>th</sup> days it said, he saw what he had made, and behold it was very good. Here, then, is a whole philosophy of the nature of the material universe, taught in this first chapter of Genesis, which is different from the philosophy of other groups ~~that~~ <sup>than those who</sup> ~~mostly~~ hold to the teaching of the Bible. It is a philosophy which has become into our civilization from the Bible through those who know it: it does not strike us as strange <sup>as it might</sup> / because we're accustomed to hearing reference to it and seeing it sort of assumed. But it is a sharp contrast to other viewpoints. But we don't have to go very far in the Bible to find it, it's right here in the first chapter of Genesis.

Now, number 3. Yes? (student. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...general teaching. But thank you for mentioning that because I'll make sure (8 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Now, the third, the general teaching of this section about mankind. a, man is not self-existent or divine. Man is not self-existent or divine. Non-Christian thinkers seem to oscillate between two extremes, one thinking the world is bad and gloomy, everything is miserable, the other ~~that~~ man is practically deity himself and that there's no end to what he may accomplish. The deification of humanity is an attitude which taken of either individual men or mankind as a class, what man thinks he may be able to accomplish in changing this world, changing this universe, it's an interesting thing, if you would think of all space as this blackboard here, I am sure that our earth would not be anything bigger than this, and if this was all space, our earth would be such a fine pinpoint you could hardly see it and the furthest planet from it would be another pinpoint so near that you could hardly see the difference between them.

And now that we are talking of this, perhaps we might be able to find the (10)  
 furthest? Mars planet not so different from <sup>one of</sup> the nearest planets

some time in the next fifty years, and the way they talk why you figure that all the  $(10\frac{1}{4})$  universe was about to be conquered and man would come to hold everything in the hollow of his hand. And if we got from here to the sun we certainly wouldn't have covered but a tiny bit of the universe and, great as the difficulties might be in getting from here to the sun, they probably would be thousands greater to get to any others or to any other system within our <sup>galaxy</sup> day, to say nothing of the billions perhaps of other galaxies. But the attitude that man is, there's nothing man cannot do, man is practically divine, is certainly not taught in this chapter. It teaches that man is not self-existent or divine. It teaches that man owes his existence to a divine plan. Man owes his existence to a divine plan.

c, man comes at the end of the creation. There's a definite order here and in that order, in the sixth day, in the latter part of the sixth day, you ~~wild~~ see, man is created at the end of the creation. And it is very interesting that the geologist, finding fossils with man, with human bones or human skulls in them, arranging their philosophy--I heard a geologist say that if all that they can reconstruct of the history of this world were a series of about twenty very large volumes  $(11 \frac{3}{4})$  some place up here, of what they think from the very earliest times to the latest, all they'd find of any evidence of man on the earth would just be the top  $(11 \frac{3}{4})$  page of the top  $(12)$  of the whole, which of course exactly fits with what Genesis 1 teaches, that it was the latter part of the sixth day that God created man. Yes? (student.  $12\frac{1}{4}$ )  
No, what I said was that if you just said you did this, you did that, or you did the other you could conceivably done them in any order or all at the same time, but when he says this is one day, this is second, this is third, it shows that there is a progress, there is a definite order of progress. Then, c, man comes at the end of creation.

Then comes d, dominion, man has divine authority for dominion over the animals of creation. That is clearly taught in this chapter. Some thought is that man is just another animal, a little bit better, a little bit stronger than some of the other animals perhaps. But here we find that God creates man and God says that man is to have dominion over the animals created. He says be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it and have dominion over fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air, over every

living thing that moves upon the earth. He has divine authority for dominion over the animals of the earth. Man is separate from all the rest of God's creation. In this account here, man is sharply separate from the rest of creation. We are told <sup>of</sup> ~~that~~ the creation of the vegetation, we are told of the creation of sea animals, told of the creation of land animals, and then we are told of the creation of man.

e-7  
O.T.History 17. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

And so God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him. This word create, I believe, is used four times in the chapter and two of them relate to man. And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him. He <sup>is</sup> ~~was~~ separate from the rest of God's creation.

f, man was made in the image and likeness of God. God said let us make man in our image, after our likeness. Next word, God created in his image, in the image of God created he him. Three times we are told, it is stressed, that man in contrast to the rest of creation is made in the image and likeness of God. Of course, that does not mean a physical ~~image likeness~~ <sup>image</sup> or physical likeness but it means that there are personal qualities, it means that there is a spiritual existence, it ~~means~~ <sup>means</sup> that there is a capacity for morality, for spirituality, which is similar to the nature of God. Man is created in the image and likeness of God. So much then for these three points.

Now the fourth, number 4, the interpretation of Genesis 1:1. Your paper on this is not due until tomorrow morning. Please have it in before the first hour. But the paper discusses the first three of the five suggested views. These views have been suggested by different writers. They go under two heads, the first three deal with it as an independent sentence, the last two as a subordinate clause. The independent sentence, the view of the first three, is the view which ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> contained in all the ancient translations, every one of them, every translation of the Bible made in ancient times, whether ~~from~~ <sup>into</sup> Aramaic, into Greek, into Latin, into any other language, translates this verse, In the beginning God created heaven and earth, as an independent sentence. Today most critical scholars say

that this sentence must be a subordinate sentence, when God began to create ~~that~~ heaven and the earth. Most take it that way today, of the critical scholars, but it is very strange if that's the way it should be taken that no ancient translator translated it that way.

You would think that they would nearer (3 1/2)

As a matter of fact, the translation of it as a subordinate clause is not impossible (3 1/4), the particular construction taking this as a (3 1/2) , in the beginning of, there's no article with beginning in the Hebrew, in the pointing as we have it, beginning of, and then having a sentence after, a clause after it instead of a word, does occur maybe fifteen or twenty times in the Hebrew Bible, it's not a common construction but it is a construction that occurs. The difficulty with it is it makes a very long complex sentence such as is quite uncommon in Hebrew, and Belhausen, the great founder of the ~~historical~~ <sup>higher critical</sup> (3 3/4) of today, said that it was a terribly confusing interpretation. But

today, practically all the critical scholars take this interpretation, that it must be a subordinate clause. I believe they are wrong in it, I believe we are justified in taking it as an independent sentence, especially since that it is the way it was done <sup>in</sup> all the ages ancient translations. But if you take it as an independent sentence, as we've noticed, we still are not sure what it means. Does it mean ~~that~~ <sup>in</sup> the beginning God created heaven and earth, this is the whole and complete creation, everything done, and then we go ahead to repeat the story and tell the details of it. That is a method which I gave you a few references to, it occurs in the Bible, does it occur here? That's one interpretation.

A second interpretation is that this a complete creation of a complete organized universe but then that everything else in the chapter comes afterward, in the reconstruction of the universe, with complete creation described in the first verse.

And the third interpretation of it is that heaven and earth in the first verse is a phrase to mean the material which make up heaven and earth, rather than heaven and earth in a completely organized state. And therefore that this indicates the creation of matter. I've read the statement that some scientists ~~of~~ today have said that from an original bit of matter, all of the elements which we have could have been made in half an hour, by a process which they would have been made out of the one and then everything since would

have been a recombining of those elements. And that that could have come within half an hour, whether that's a pure conjecture or a pure theory, certainly if it did ever happen that way, nobody ever saw it happen. But at least that would fit with this interpretation of this verse, that it is the creation of matter, the creation of the elements, the creation of that out of which the universe is built, and then he proceeds to describe the steps. I asked you for tomorrow morning to turn in, before class time tomorrow morning, to please turn in reasons for and against each view, preferably Biblical reasons, for and against each <sup>of the three</sup> view, see which has most to be said in its favor, particularly in this chapter. And we'll continue there then tomorrow morning at eight.

...was not to be collected until this morning, the writing out of this paper. And the office is full at this time of the morning so I expect most of you brought it with you to class, if you didn't happen to have it ready yesterday and turned it in then. Let's keep those papers and make them for the class (7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) if you have them here and they might enter discussion today, and then we'll collect them at the end of the hour. I wonder if there's somebody there in the back, Mr. Shellabarger, you're near the door, would you mind collecting them for me at the end of the hour. As you go out, please give the papers to Mr. Shellabarger.

The next assignment for today will not be due until Friday, and that for the Middlers and Seniors will consist of the preparation of the few remaining verses of the first chapter of Genesis, <sup>have</sup> and them in good shape. The Juniors who are burdened down with beginning two heavy languages, it will be a review, be sure you have everything thoroughly in mind we have covered thus far. "

Now we are discussing the matter of Genesis 1 and we are at point 4, the interpretation of Genesis 1:1. And we notice there there are five suggested views. Now right here perhaps just a word on what I consider to be one of the very most important matters there is, as far as Bible interpretation is concerned. Let us see what the Bible teaches so clearly that there is no question whatever that it is talking about, and then let us stand upon that, let us absolutely stand without wavering, on that, even though all the

1.  
 preachers, all the observers, all the people in the world, say something else, if the Bible absolutely, clearly teaches something, I believe it is true, and I believe that when all the evidence is in we will find that there is no evidence against but it is all for ~~what~~ the Bible teaches. Let's take that stand on ~~whatever~~ the Bible absolutely, clearly teaches. Now let us try to go beyond that and let's understand ~~all~~ we can of what the Bible teaches but not have the same dogmatism on that on which there is some question of interpretation. And let us remember that in (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) of the Bible it's going to have many, many things on which it touches, on which we are not sure exactly what the answer is, and because we have not gone far enough into it to give us an answer or because we have not yet studied as far to have a clear knowledge of what the answer is. And on these, let us not be dogmatic but let us be charitable to those who take another view <sup>of them.</sup> In my opinion, one of the greatest injuries that has come to the Christian church through the ages is that people have taken a superficial interpretation of the Bible and said this is it, this is what it says, and they've presented this when the Bible did not clearly state it and then when people have brought evidences that it was wrong, they said oh you're attacking the Bible and then if that view was proven to be wrong, many people have had their faith wrecked because they have thought that the Bible has been proven untrue. When it was not the Bible at all but people's interpretation of the Bible that had been proven wrong. I do not say that you should preach in a manner that says well I don't know whether it means this, or this, or this, or this, that is not the purpose of preaching. The purpose of preaching is to take what you know, what the Bible teaches, and present it, and you may incidentally help people to understand the Bible better. But take what is clear in preaching and present it strongly, but do not present strongly that which the Bible does not definitely teach. In fact, I find some theologians stand (11)

will take that which everybody knows to be true, or everybody who has studied it knows to be true, though others don't of course, and will present it in a very mild fashion so that the outsider immediately things well I guess there's some evidence for this, but then they'll come to some point on which they stand all alone against everybody else and they will just hammer away at it and try to

drive it home until (11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

this is the one thing we can be sure of. This is what we really ought to know. So it is not my purpose to tell you here are five views of Genesis 1:1. This is the right one, we stand on this. That is not my purpose. My purpose <sup>is</sup> to ~~state~~ <sup>say</sup> there are certain view here, perhaps there's one which is (11 3/4)

Here, perhaps, we can say is one which we prove is right, but here are two or three on which the evidence is more or less balanced. One of these three is correct but they have certain things in common. Now take, like the illustration I gave you ~~about~~ my coming here from Chicago. I came here from Chicago, if I say that you know it's absolutely true, if you ~~you-can~~ believe that I am a man of my word, <sup>and depend on it,</sup> ~~you-can~~, but how I came, when I came, whether it was a continuous journey, I have not stated this and therefore you should not be dogmatic. In the beginning God created heaven and earth, the first three say, the last two say, when God began to create heaven and earth then, well, any one of the five teach that heaven and earth are not eternal, that they were created and they had a beginning. Any one of the five teaches that God created heaven and earth, any one of the five teaches heaven and earth are distinct from God. They are not part of himself but something he created, something distinct from Him. He was before them but He brought them into existence, now that's a tremendous lot. That is a great deal that's very important; if true, it is the gital foundation of every science and most everything we think in life. And that is so, whichever of the five views I mentioned you take of the verse. So we have a great deal in this verse that we can stand upon and be absolutely sure of, regardless of which of these five views we take, and, in my opinion, that is one of the most important Bible interoretations, if you get that habit of seeing what's absolutely clear and standing on it and not being dogmatic about that which isn't clear.

Now, let's look at the five views. The five views we notice divide into two groups, according to whether the verse is an independent clause or whether it is a subordinate clause. I hesitate a little whether to discuss the difference between the two groups right away at the beginning <sup>or</sup> to take up the difference as we take the last two. I think I'll do the latter. I'll merely state at this point that I personally think it's an independent sentence. I believe the evidence is better for that but I don't think it's

absolutely overwhelming.

## O.T.History 18.

...consider the other as impossible. There are good grounds which may be advanced for the other. We'll look at that later. But now, with that much introduction, we will now look at the first three and compare them one with the other.

Now the <sup>Q.</sup> first was that this is a summary of the whole section. Now that, I gave you some references where it happens in other passages. It is something which is not the common attitude of the Scripture, but which does occur, to give a summary, a survey, and then go back and repeat. Well, now, if this is a summary, a survey, followed by a repetition, there's nothing wrong with that, it has parallels elsewhere, it is a possibility. Against it, I would raise one serious obstacle, which I hope all of you mentioned in your papers. If that is it, then verse 2 following, tells the whole story all over again, and verse 2 does not say God made a universe which was without form and void. It says the earth became or was, whichever way you want to take it, it means activity, it means change. It does not mean a static (1 3/4) state, without form and void. Now, God created heaven and earth, and then your next step you find heaven and earth without form and void. That sounds as if before he created it, it was without form and void. Now it may be that you can interpret the second verse to say God created heaven and earth, how did this happen, well, the first step of it was that there came into existence an earth without form and void, that's the first step and we'll go on and give the others. That may be possible but I think (2 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

So to my mind that is a serious objection against taking this as a summary statement. To my mind, that, if this were a summary statement, I would expect it to go <sup>on then</sup> and say God created matter and He proceeded to make some changes in it, rather than and the earth was without form and void. So that, I feel, is a very serious objection to this first viewpoint (2 3/4)

Yes? (student. 2 3/4)

Yes, that the first verse states the whole thing and then the second verse starts all over again to tell the story. Well, you could say the first two if you wanted to take the whole

thing in them (3 $\frac{1}{4}$ ). You could make your summary statement, you'd have to decide how long



it would be, but at any rate, however you decided, it is pretty hard, to my mind, to draw a sharp line between the summary statement and the starting right from the beginning, though for me, that is a very serious obstacle to its being taken as a summary statement. Yes?

Mr. . (student. 3½)

No. Simply that the second verse does not have ~~the~~<sup>a</sup> dynamic verb. He may have earth without form and void. It says and the earth was or became without form and void, and it sounds as if, if you're starting your account of creation there it's not telling of the creation of it, but telling how it was. That is my objection, that it does not seem to me that that is a proper start for telling the whole story, the way it is stated. The use of the perfect verb. Yes? (student. 4½)

You mean, the fact, that you would feel that if it gave a summary and started over again there wouldn't be an and. Yes. I would feel that that also militates against this being a summary statement but extremely strongly, because the Hebrew sort of throws ands quite freely.

They will very often start a sentence with and, and so it could mean here's a summary of it, and now we go on to tell the details. It would seem to our feelings better to start without an and, but we find other instances in Scripture where the and just introduces two different sections rather than a continuous narrative story. I don't think, in view of the use of and in Hebrew, that is a (5½) argument. But that is, to my mind,

the one serious objection to this. I don't think it's a serious enough objection to rule it out because I do believe it might be possible to interpret it, God created the heaven and earth. Now what happened? When he created heaven and earth? Well, it started and came into existence, an earth without form and void, and then he proceeded to do different things about it. But it does seem to be much more natural a summary to say, and God brought into existence a world without form and void, and then he said let there be light, <sup>and so on</sup> rather than and there came into existence that which (6) Now that, it's not conclusive

at all, but to me it's a rather serious objection to take a general survey. Yes, Mr. ?  
(student. 6)

Yes, that is to say if this is the survey, it might be more natural to say, God created heaven and earth as a place for man and he created man and put him in it. Then start in to tell how he did it. That would seem a bit strange, to have your survey quite as brief

and would ~~throw~~ <sup>show</sup> comparatively little conclusive evidence, as Mr. Shellabarger pointed out. And I don't think that's conclusive against it but I do feel that it's a definite point against it. Mr. ? (student. 7)

Yes, from the viewpoint of a summary, as Mr. Deshpande points out, the things related to heaven seem to come later rather than earlier so that it isn't quite a precise summary, that again I don't think it conclusive because it wouldn't necessarily follow the order but it would seem perhaps more natural for it to be. So I think perhaps that is a further reason for hesitating about this view, I don't think we can disprove it, but I do incline against it, on these grounds. Yes? (student. 8)

Yes, at the very end, these are the generations of heavens and earth <sup>in</sup> and the day when they were created. Most scholars think you stop there and start the new section in the last half of verse 4. At any rate, whether it was first or whether it was stopped there, there is sort of a conclusion which gives something of a summary. But it's a very brief summary, it doesn't half tell the whole story. Well, that's the first view. I don't think we can disprove it but I incline against it for the reasons mentioned by different ones but most particularly because it doesn't seem to me that it starts quite right for a summary, that it seems to assume an earth already without form and void, rather than to say he created an earth which was without form and void. Yes? (student. 8 3/4)

I simply am trying to see how to take this first verse, and... (student)

It's more like headline than a summary. Perhaps the word summary, to our sense, is just a concluding summary. It's not usual to us to give a summary at the beginning, but if we ever read newspapers we are accustomed to having a lead at the beginning, <sup>which tells</sup> ~~Yes,~~ the story, and newspaper men often say the greatest lead in history is that first verse of Genesis because that tells the most tremendous thing ever told in one verse and then it goes on and tells it more fully. That is, it's often said, or often taken for it, but personally I think there's a little bit of hesitancy about taking it. Yes? (student. 9 1/2)

Not necessarily. You can have an introduction giving a summary, and a conclusion. People often do that in lectures. They say, now I'm going to show you how this happened and this

happened and this happened. Then they start in to tell you the whole story and at the end they say now I have told you how this happened, and this happened and this happened. It certainly would be good pedagogy to summarize at the end and also to give people an idea at the beginning of where you were heading for. Somebody told me that's a mistake I made yesterday. I gave you a little quiz to see how well you could do, then I proceeded to have you write some stuff which was in order to bring<sup>to</sup> your attention some things (10 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) but I did not state the transition and say that I was doing something different and therefore there was a feeling well now this is supposed to prove what we know and yet how does it prove it? That probably contributed to uncertainty of what I was trying to have you do. I did not make clear in advance. Well, now, it is always good to have some idea in advance what you're doing and some idea at the end. So there could be an introduction and a conclusion both. But personally, I hesitate about ~~this~~<sup>taking</sup> this as a general survey. I ~~do~~ incline to think that one or the other might be better. ¶

Now the <sup>b</sup> second suggested interpretation which I am, simply from the viewpoint of outline, following, <sup>b</sup> here is the view that it is the complete preceding creation. And for this view, the objection that Mr. Shellabarger gave, is probably in point against this one also. That if this is a complete story of a creation of a world with intelligent beings walking about on it, and so on, it is very, very abbreviated. In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. If this is the whole creation of what follows in later events, it's pretty much condensed for that. Now I don't think that disproves it, but I do think that it's a point against it, definitely. But it could be taken that way. This is a complete creation. God created heaven and earth, with everything complete in them. There were the sun, moon and stars, there were clouds, there were lakes, there were intelligent beings on it, there was a complete creation. And then <sup>that</sup> ~~the~~ verse two tells us of something that happened long after the completion ~~of the~~ creation, that the earth became without form and void. Now according to that interpretation then you have a complete creation verse 1, then in verse 2 you continue with <sup>an</sup> events that happened later. There was a great catastrophe, this earth became without form and void, and then the succeeding verses are not an account of creation, according to this view, but an account of a reconstruction of an earth which had fallen into tremendous difficulties. Now in a way <sup>the discussion of this</sup> ~~this~~ should wait for the discussion

of verse 2, but perhaps we'd better discuss verse 2 here <sup>instead</sup> because it comes right under this to know what verse 1 means. If that is the interpretation, one objection raised against it is that it goes on to say, and the earth was, not the earth became, you will find in many books that given as an objection to this view but it is in my opinion an objection which is without foundation. I saw a book in which the--it was the American Scientific Affiliation book--discussing various sciences and I was sent the chapter on theology to look over and the man who wrote the chapter on theology spent a good part of his space attacking this reconstruction theory and in his attack he said the second verse cannot mean that the earth became without form and void because there's another Hebrew word that means became. This word means was. Well, he was a geologist, not a Hebrew. He'd picked up a little Hebrew and on that point he'd picked it up wrong. Because the word which is there is not a word which means ~~it was~~ it was. It is a word which shows movement rather than a static situation. He--it was pointed out to him that that is a word that means become and he changed his statement to say there is another (14 1/2) instead of another word. Because the fact is that this word (14 1/2) \* when it means become usually has a preposition \* He became to something. He was to this, is the technical phrase for he became and there's no (14 1/2) \* in this sentence. But, in my opinion, that is like when you say he came in the room and he came into the room. Technically you would say he came into the room <sup>you wouldn't</sup> but ~~you say~~ he came in the room. Yes; <sup>you said</sup> if he was outdoors and he came in the room everybody would know what you meant, it would be slightly abbreviated, but it would serve the purpose (14 3/4), and \* if you look it up in ...

## O.T.History 19. (1/4)

... Brown, Driver and Briggs Hebrew dictionary you will find the verb \* in Hebrew means to happen or to become. It does not mean in Hebrew to be, it may have developed at a later time to mean to be, but in Hebrew ordinarily the idea of (3/4) \* is expressed by putting the two nouns together with no verb at all. Mr.

Soong, do you have a question? (student. 3/4)

Yes, in the second verse the heaven ~~is not specific~~ <sup>is not specific</sup> And, yes? (student)

No, Brown, Driver and Briggs is the late edition of Gesenius (1). Gesenius wrote a dictionary about a hundred and ~~fifty~~ <sup>thirty</sup> years ago and it was a very excellent dictionary, but nobody would use it today because there's been a tremendous amount learned since, but Gesenius put his dictionary through several editions and then other scholars since have revised and improved it and they still call it Gesenius, and this is sometimes called Gesenius and sometimes called Brown, Driver and Briggs, because they are the editors who fifty years ago spent all their spare time for maybe twenty years revising the latest Gesenius and it is our best dictionary, it is a matter of which there can be <sup>no</sup> question that the verb (1 3/4) \* is a dynamic verb, not a static verb. I went through Genesis 1 in the English and I found that in our English Bible there are maybe forty or fifty cases where the verb to be is used in Genesis 1. Like it says, it was evening and it was morning. It says that God saw what he had made and it was good. And there are maybe, I forget the number, but maybe it might be only--it's not less than ~~one~~ <sup>25</sup> My impression is that it's <sup>nearer</sup> ~~either~~ forty or fifty. Anyway I counted all the cases in Genesis 1 of the use of the English verb to be. And then after listing those I looked at each verb, omitting this second which is the one we're discussing, I looked at all the rest of them in order to see whether it was dynamic or passive, that is to say it was evening, that doesn't mean simply that that was the situation, it means it became evening, and it became evening and it became morning. The authorized version puts the two together, it says the evening and the morning were. The American Standard has it more literally, and it was evening and it was morning, one day. That is a dynamic thing, it means it became evening and it became morning. Half of them express a change like that. God said let there be light. That's dynamic. And it was light. It doesn't mean God looked up and everything was light, it doesn't mean that at all. It means <sup>minute</sup> ~~one~~ it was dark and then it was light. It's dynamic. It means it became light even though the English word used it was light. Well, half of them are dynamic, meaning the same thing as our became, he said let it become light and it became light. Half of them are static, he saw what he

had made and it was good. It doesn't mean it became good, it means it was good. When he looked at it that's what he saw, but the other means it was something one minute and he caused that it be something different the next minute. Well, about half of them are one and half are the other. Then I looked at the Hebrew and I found that in every case where it was dynamic, where there was a change, like let it become light and it became light, the ~~word~~ <sup>verb</sup> (4) \* is used. And in every case where it was static, like God saw that it was good, there's no (4½) \* ~~used~~ used. Just he saw that good, in the Hebrew. The (4½) \* is not a copula. It is a word which expresses a change as a rule. Perhaps <sup>in</sup> it ~~is~~ very late Hebrew, in Chronicles it may sometimes be used as a copula, but never in early Hebrew. Well, then, the verb (4½) \* here is well-translated became, but that does not prove this second view in this sentence, because it can be that God created heaven and earth and the earth had come into being without form and void. When he created this, here is what happened, the earth came into being without form and void. It can be that, dynamic, it's perfect so I think had come is a very good translation, had come into being without form and void. Or it can be, he created heaven and earth and then something happened as a result of which the earth had become without form and void. The form of the verb is rather one which shows a transition, then an action. The earth had become rather than <sup>and</sup> the earth became, would be more literal. And I think this fact that it's perfect rather than imperfect fits a little better into the idea that this is a situation produced by the first verse than that it is something which came after the activity of the first verse. However, it is entirely possible to interpret verse 2 as a result of a great cataclysm which came to pass upon the earth.

Now there are a couple of verses in the Prophets which are advanced by those who believe in the great cataclysm to show that such a cataclysm occurred. I do not believe that these verses prove it. It seems to me, in one or two cases the context shows that it had nothing to do with that but they deal with a different situation, in other places they're not clear. I do not believe there is any where in Scripture any greater statement that can be interpreted to mean there was a great catastrophe between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2. If that is to be believed, it must rest on just taking Genesis 1 and

interpreting it that way. Well, to me, it's a pretty tremendous thing to assume without further evidence and yet that <sup>doesn't</sup> /proves/ it isn't true because God's purpose isn't to give us the history of the universe, it is to tell us of his dealings with our race, not with the previous race if there was any. And so my personal feeling on the reconstruction theory is that it is entirely possible that Genesis 1: 1 and 2 ought to be interpreted this way. It is entirely possible but that there is not evidence enough on which to have any certainty, that it is equally possible that it is not true. That is my feeling on it. To me the greatest argument in its favor is that in the garden of Eden we find Satan there, already fallen, so Satan must have fallen sometime before the garden of Eden. It would seem that Satan, we are not told of the creation of Satan or the creation of angels, but they certainly are created beings. It would seem to me that either Satan fell before the creation of the world or he fell after the creation of the world and before the garden of Eden and we are not told in Scripture when it happened, so that, to me, is an argument in favor of the reconstruction theory but not a conclusive argument. And my own inclination is <sup>in</sup> there's the lack of any definite evidence that such a catastrophe occurred to this earth at that time to consider it as a possibility but by no means a certainty and, in fact, I would think that the balance of the evidence is slightly against it rather than,--I certainly could not prove it not true, but I don't think we have enough to prove it true. Well, that's the second argument then. Maybe some of you in your paper gave these verses in the (8½)

. Some of you may have been particularly familiar with this view and gave them in connection with that. I don't know that we should take time to look into the details. If somebody has one of them that seems to you to be quite conclusive on it, then let's bring that up in one of the sections and we'll discuss it there at some length rather than in the whole group. Yes? (student. 8½)

Which word is this? (student) 8 3/4)

No, I would say that the word ~~(9½)~~ may be (9½)

That is to say that, if you say that, if I say that there are a hundred people in a certain room, I do not prove thereby whether they are men or women, boys or girls, if I say there are a hundred people. Now if I say there are a hundred boys in a room, I prove they are

not men and they are not women and they are not girls. The word boys is a smaller word than the word people, it includes less, but in another sense, but the word people is a larger word. I could say with equal truth, there are fifty boys in the room or there are fifty people <sup>in the room</sup> but you could infer more when I said boys than people. Now I ~~might~~ <sup>would</sup> say that made and created are exactly that situation. That created is a way of making and consequently if you say that ~~you~~ <sup>he</sup> made it you don't say how ~~you~~ <sup>he</sup> made it, whether he created it or whether he transformed something already there into it, either one could be made. God creates the world, I make a desk, they're altogether different but they're both made. God made the world, I made the desk. But God created the world, I simply put matter he's already created and ~~make~~ <sup>made</sup> the desk. So, to me, if you use made it doesn't prove that he didn't create or that he did, it just leaves both possibilities. You certainly, I don't think could take make to mean in this passage, this does not refer to a creation, (11) I'm quite sure that creation was to come out of this. Yes? (student. 11)

Those who hold the reconstruction theory hold that the catastrophe was the result of the fallen <sup>of Satan</sup> angels and I would think that there is no doubt that the fallen <sup>of</sup> Satan took place prior to the garden of Eden, but whether it took place before the creation of the world, after the creation of the world and before the first day or sometime during the first days, I don't think we're told in Scripture. And whether it had a great catastrophe to the world or not, <sup>with it,</sup> we are not told, it may have had, but we are not told <sup>anywhere</sup> so I don't think we can be dogmatic. Yes? (11 3/4) student)

Yes, it was certainly suggested but it wouldn't prove it because he wouldn't necessarily have been cast out (12)

but it certainly would suggest it. Yes? (student. 12 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

With which? Yes, but I mean how (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) does it reconcile ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> what? To the reconstruction theory or to the (12 $\frac{3}{4}$ ) to others? (student)

Yes, Isaiah 45:18 is one of the verses which are often taken as proving a catastrophe before the foundation of the world but it does not seem to me that this verse proves that particular thing. This verse says thus saith the Lord who created the heavens by himself and formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he did not create it in vain and he did not



create it to be without form and void. He formed it for these inhabitants, that is that God created the world as a place in which righteousness ~~was made~~ <sup>would reign</sup> and we look at the world today and we find it doesn't, we find today all sorts of chaos and confusion and defiance of God, God does not mean the world to be like this, we'll find what he did create <sup>to be</sup> it/like when (13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) and when we have righteousness. That is, I don't think that that's a statement of how he did create it but what he created out of ~~an~~ (13  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) (student)

Yes, but you see it's followed by the to be inhabited. I don't think that the word used (14) means necessarily that he created it in this but he did not, this word inconstant is telling (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

but don't think that God intends this to last for ever, God did not create the world to be a world in which the wicked ~~oppressors~~ will hold you and the people of God will be subject to the oppression of those who are wicked, God did not ~~mean~~ <sup>create</sup> the world to continue that way forever, he created it to be a place for righteousness. In this particular concept I don't, I think that an early situation is (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) in to ~~this~~ particular time. I don't think that that verse throws light on this particular problem. But we'd better look at verses like that in the sections rather than all together, because it's rather hard to hold extensive discussion in this large a group. We'll do that in the sections, but I feel that way about all the verses advanced to prove a catastrophe, I don't feel they prove it. But I don't think that means there wasn't one. There may have been one. I just don't think we can be dogmatic...

O.T.History 20. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

... Now the next view, the third view, is the view that this means merely creation of matter, including the elements, and personally I incline rather strongly toward this view, the third view. I think the first and second are not impossible, but I feel that there is a certain preponderance in favor of the third, that when it says God created heaven and earth, that is not a summary of creation, either a summary of what follows or a story of a

complete creation which then was followed by a catastrophe that's not mentioned, but that that is the first step in God's creation, that he created the elements. He create the inchoate matter which he formed into an established world. That, I incline to think, is the more probable interpretation of it. We have frequent references of the creation later in Scripture which refer to events of the later part of the chapter, which seems to me to fit with the idea of creation rather than a reconstruction. And there must be sometime, somewhere, a construction of these elements. That, to me, is the objection to the first one, the very first, that there's no statement in the complete account of the creation, of the original elements. Yes? (student. 2)

No, I would think that heaven and earth is just a statement for the totality of the elements. (student. 2 1/4) Yes.

Though how pure (2 1/2)

They were not developed. (student)

Well, I would think, whether elements or compounds, or what, there was not a completed world. You see, the oceans were not separated from the dry land, the firmament was not made, the sun, moon, and stars were not visible. It would seem to me that it was probably just the first day, just... (student. 2 3/4)

Yes, to my mind that is what this first verse probably is. That the first step in God's creation was to bring the building blocks into existence. Now God could have snapped his finger and said, let the world be standing here with Faith Seminary standing here already and students sitting (3 1/4)

That would be just like that, he could have done it. He could have said, let the world be here with all its trees, a thousand different types of trees, all standing here. He could have done it, if he chose. But does Genesis 1 present him as building the world by stages in an orderly process with one thing after another? Now, if he did it by orderly stages, instead of just suddenly giving the word and it's all complete, then the first step should have been the creation of the blocks out of which the other things were made, the creation of the elements. Now, how far he went in the creation of the elements, assumed from this statement, we're just not told, but the fact is essentially what the verse says, is a, is one possible interpretation, and I do not think the other (4 1/2) is sufficient to rule out either of the

other two. But, to my mind, the preponderance of evidence is slightly greater in this direction than the other. Yes? (student. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

How complete the form was, we don't know. But at least all of this (4  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

in the six days, I would say, was not (4  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) . But I wouldn't say that this is just to make the elements and then just the making of light. Maybe it happened, but on the other hand, maybe a lot was done with the elements under this head. Yes? (student. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, now there is the interpretation. What does heaven and earth mean? As we see heaven, it includes sun, moon and stars. Well, now they're not made till the fourth day. The second day, he said, that he separated the waters below <sup>from</sup> and the waters above the firmament, and those above he called heaven and those below he called earth. That would suggest that heaven and earth were not separated. (5 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

So to create heaven and earth may mean he created them with separate endings but it could mean that since he did separate them in the second verse (5  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) that at this point they were not separated at all but it was just a mass of material. And one point there that is worth calling attention to is the habit in ~~many~~ languages but particularly in the Hebrew and Greek of using two words together to express one (6)

That is something which occurs quite a bit in the Bible. They put the two words together. Now was the crucifixion on Wednesday or on Friday? There are some people who feel quite strongly convinced it was on Wednesday. Most people feel it was on Friday. There was a tradition which goes back very, very far that it was Friday. Now maybe the tradition was wrong. But if the tradition is right, that the crucifixion was on Friday, then the body of Jesus was in the tomb Friday night, Saturday and Saturday night, wouldn't that be right? But it says he was three days in the tomb, and the great majority (7)

that the term three days means a day and night means one day, that is one day in the larger sense. A day is made of a day and a night. And the three days and nights means part of three days, even though actually there would be only part of two nights and one full day and a part of two others. There are many, many statements, I would say there are many, many people, but there's a very substantial number of cases

where two words together make one concept and where you get into nonsense if you don't

(7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) There are quite a large number, it's a well represented matter

. So that heaven and earth, since they are separated in the <sup>second</sup> sense day may have been unseparated at this time. One concept meaning that of which they are composed. Mr. Myers? (student. 7  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

Well, are you giving that as an opposite to our view that everything that happened in the six days was a creation out of nothing? (student. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

Well, this is not denying that at all. This is merely saying that the elements out of which the, the second day does not say God created water. The water was already there...

When did he (8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) . He said, let the waters that are above the firmament and the waters under the firmament be gathered together. Where did those waters come from? If they're not created in verse 1, when are they created? They are not created the second day, they are merely separated. (student. 8  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

I don't quite get the problem. I don't quite understand what the problem is. (student. 9)

Yes, create doesn't necessarily mean there was absolutely nothing there and just out of absolutely nothing something came into being. Create means that there was an act such as only God could perform which made tremendous change (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

which was not there before, but God says later on I create peace. He uses the word create on something that was so utterly different to what was before that only God could produce it. But it doesn't necessarily mean, as you say, it says in Genesis 1 God created man, in Genesis 2, it says he took the dust of the earth and made him. So creation does not mean there cannot be a pre-existent element involved to some extent. Yes? (student. 10)

Yes, they were considered as having been in existence before other things were made out of them. Of course, that doesn't prove anything, that's just human ideas. But it may well be a true idea. Yes, it may very well be. (student. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

(student: Well, I don't know about the Hebrew)  
The word earth in Hebrew. Now the word earth in English has two meanings. The earth goes round the sun. That's a true statement in English. The earth goes around the sun.

Another true statement in English is, "I went out into the back yard and I filled a pail with earth." And then I came in here and I poured out the earth on the platform." So I can pour out the earth on the platform but yet the earth moves round the sun.

(student. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Well, in English earth has two meanings. One is this globe, the other is a bit of soil. Now in Hebrew earth never means a bit of soil, there is another word to mean a bit of soil, but in Hebrew earth has two meanings, one of them is this whole globe, the other one is a particular land, like the land of Egypt, the land of Italy, the land of Israel, that is

(11 3/4)

So, in Hebrew the word (11 3/4) \* which we translate earth may also mean a substantial portion of <sup>this</sup> the earth. I would think it quite likely, as Miss Hyland has suggested, that wherever this Hebrew word (12) \* is used it does not simply mean the dirt involved, but means the dirt and the water and the air above it, it means that section of the globe, or else the globe itself. I would think that quite likely, but I doubt if it could be proved absolutely. I think it's very likely. Mr. Shellabarger? (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, thus it can be used as a figure of speech for the inhabitants of (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

I don't think the word earth includes the inhabitants but I think it can be used as a figure of speech for the inhabitants. And that, of course, brings us to this point, some people say to take the whole Bible literally, and anybody that says that has never read the Bible without being (12 3/4) free while they were reading a large slice because you cannot take any point entirely literally that ever was written, it wouldn't make sense. But I would say this, we should take most of the Bible literally. We should interpret something that's figurative only where it's clear from context it should be taken literally. People take it figuratively, often they mean, they so interpret it as to explain it away and have nothing left. That's a false kind of interpretation, but it will include figures of speech, not all literal by any means.

Well, now, we'd better move along and our sections we can have further discussions but it's rather hard to have lengthy discussions with so many together at once. The main thing I want at this point is for you to have in mind what these three views are,

to see the difference between them, to see arguments for and against <sup>each of</sup> them. I feel personally the third is the correct <sup>one</sup>, but I do not feel that the preponderance of evidence is sufficient to favor it, that I would want to urge it upon any one. I would feel that if any one inclines towards either the first or the second I would not feel it particularly important to try to persuade them that the third was better. I do think that for the purpose of this course you should know why I think the third is better, but your conclusion on this might be different and might be right, only it probably will take a bit longer to study before you have evidence enough to prove conclusively (14 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

but I'd like you to see the evidence for all three, and whichever is proven right, there is much that is in common among <sup>the three of</sup> them and on that we can stand absolutely without (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) fear. Everything was created by the Lord. It is God's power that made us, it comes at the beginning of our (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) what we have on this earth here is God's great creative act which established it. God is separate from it. Those are great vital points (14  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) which of these three is right. I incline to think the third fits better into context, but I certainly wouldn't be dogmatic on it but the fourth one is the (15) is the view that it is subordinate to verse 2 and the fifth is that verse 1 is subordinate to verse 3. And the view that...

O.T.History 21. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...the <sup>↓</sup> fourth one would be when God began to create heaven and earth, then the earth was without form and void and darkness was upon the face of the deep. That's the fourth one.

The <sup>↑</sup> fifth view is when God began to create heaven and earth and the earth was without form and void and darkness was upon the face of the deep, then God said let there be light.

Now I don't think it makes an awful lot of difference in meaning (3/4)

they both of them seem to me to imply an earth without form and void here in existence before God began his creative activity, and I don't think that is true. It is the claim today of

most critical scholars that the Hebrew must be interpreted this way, but you take the best critical scholars of forty years ago and they would say, some of them, they would say, well, we can't be sure which is the way to interpret this. And all the ancient versions take it as an independent clause which does not seem to me to fit. It seems to me that if people knew more about Hebrew back in those days than we do today and <sup>that</sup> at least somebody would have taken it as a subordinate clause if it had to be a subordinate clause. Now the fact they all take it as an independent clause doesn't prove it had to be an independent clause. To me it makes better sense as an independent clause. To me it fits into the context better. If it's a subordinate clause and if it's the fifth view, you have a very long, involved sentence which is quite uncommon in Hebrew, <sup>which usually</sup> Hebrew is made up of short, simple sentences. Personally, I incline quite definitely against the fourth view, but as I say, most critical scholars today are very dogmatic about <sup>that</sup> the fourth is <sup>(?)</sup> unnecessarily true. Well, I guess we'll have to stop for now. We continue tomorrow at 8: o'clock.

(3) ...and as I mentioned earlier today, it is not a (3) Haphil form of the verb. In Hebrew the imperfect expresses action, then this occurs. The perfect expresses a condition, this had occurred. This condition exists because something has happened. And here you have the perfect form, then it had been, or had become, which hardly seems like the conclusion after when he began to, then it was or it had become; not then it became. Consequently, that is pretty well given up. This, as I said, is, in my opinion, a grammatical objection to the second view, <sup>also</sup> though I don't think it's conclusive, I don't think it's a conclusive one for the fourth either, but it's a very (3 3/4. cough) <sup>point</sup> <sup>against it.</sup> <sup>beginning.</sup> And this point is sufficiently strong that just about all, perhaps all the critical scholars, have given up this fourth view, that when the earth was without form and void, <sup>that</sup> when God began to create, then the earth was without form and void, that that (4 1/2) They take it (4 1/2) by the fifth view. Now the fifth view, which is held by practically all critical scholars today is e, that it is subordinate to verse 3. In other words, when God began to create the heaven and earth, then God said let there be light. That is the sentence, but it has a parenthesis <sup>in it</sup> consisting of the second verse. When God began to create heaven and earth, and at that time the earth was without form and void

and darkness was upon the face of the deep, then God said let there be light. And you see that would seem to allow for pre-existent matter. But when he began to create, the earth was then without form and void. And so it does not fit with the view which we find taught in many parts of the Bible that God created everything and there was nothing before he created it, and consequently it is not a satisfactory view from our Scripture viewpoint. But it is the view which most critical scholars hold today. It has this objection to it, grammatically, that it makes a very involved sentence, with this long parenthesis in the middle, something that while not impossible is extremely rare.

So those are the five views which I've called a, b, c, d, e. And still under this heading, number 4, the interpretation of Genesis 1:1, I'm going to make an f, which is not parallel to a, b, c, d, e, it's not another view, but it's another part of this discussion of Genesis 1:1. א, the word create. This word in the Hebrew is (5  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) \* to create. There is a statement (5  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) here by Professor Heidl, Dr. Alexander Heidl, of the University of Chicago, died about five years ago I believe, he was a Missouri Lutheran, very strict in his orthodoxy according to the Lutheran viewpoint, and <sup>a</sup>very definite believer in the absolute dependability of the entire Scripture. But Heidl, in his book on the Babylonian Genesis, ~~from~~ <sup>in</sup> which he's made a very careful study of the Babylonian story of creation, and of many things in connection with the Biblical story, has this statement which he makes. He says (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) \* has about the same meaning as (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) \* (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) with this difference, that \* contains the idea of a new extraordinary or effortless production such as befits the Almighty by word or revelation, but (6  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) \* is used as a general (6  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) \* He says the idea of a creation out of nothing is a connotation which has been read into (7) \* . I don't know whether he's going a little too far in that statement, I think you can say that create, as a general rule, indicates making something out of nothing but certainly it does not always mean that because man was created, God took the dust of the earth and breathed into it, there was something in it, there was a brand new creation, something that had not existed before. But this did involve a certain amount of pre-existent material. So that the idea that create means simply make



completely out of nothing, I question whether that is a fair definition but it is used in the Scripture only of God's activity. Create is used of great acts of God which result<sup>ed</sup> in the production of something that is a tremendous change from what had existed before. And it is the sort of divine power that no human being could ever (7 3/4) <sup>h</sup> evoke, which is involved in the word create. So naturally, in many cases it does amount to making something out of nothing. He causes it to come into existence, when there either was nothing there before, or what there was there before was so different that it really is a new thing altogether. The term is used in common language today. People speak of a dress or a hat which they say is a creation of a certain design. Well, now if that word is at all legitimate to use in that sense, what it means is not simply that the designer has taken and has rearranged things, but that this designer (8<sup>1</sup>) has put into it such a brand new idea that <sup>you have</sup> ~~he has~~ something there that just wouldn't exist if it weren't for his brilliant mind of this designer who has originated this great innovation and created it. I think that that, I'm not sure it's really right to use it in that sense, but if it's used in that sense it is because it approaches (9) which is the real idea. It is that which the ordinary person could never do, which no person can do, but only God can do. It is the effortless, supreme activity of God whereby He brings to pass, <sup>brings</sup> ~~things~~ in existence, something so different <sup>from</sup> ~~than~~ anything that happened before that only God could possibly have done it.

Well, so much then for this word create which, by the way, is not used in every one of the days. As a matter of fact, I don't remember the exact figure on how many times the word create is used in the first chapter of Genesis but it is not a great number. Several of the days do not have the word create in them at all. So I think when the word create is used it stresses the tremendous nature of the particular act of God which was done, but when it doesn't use create it does not mean that there may not have been a similar activity on some of those cases also. The word do is a large word, do or made, which could include (10)

but create is a special kind of making and do or make may be used for create, (10) and not be <sup>definite</sup> ~~special~~ that <sup>it</sup> is create. But we are specifically told that God created the heaven and earth. In verse 21 we are specifically told he created the great creatures of the deep, and we are told in verse 26 and 27 that he created man, and in verse 27 the word is used

twice and that's three times in the one verse to stress the creative activity in connection with man. Stress perhaps more than all other creative activity in the whole chapter. The creative activity of God in the making of man, and that was the case, we notice, for in the next chapter it tells us (10 3/4) of the earth. But God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them. Three times it is stressed in this one verse. The creative activity of God in connection with the coming into existence of man.

So much then for number 4, the interpretation of Genesis 1:1 and number 5 I'm going to take very little time on because we have of necessity had to discuss 5 under 4. 5 is the interpretation of Genesis 1:2, and since I gave you views 1 and 4, each of which dealt very strongly with (11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

the interpretation of Genesis 1:2. It must be admitted it is a rather difficult verse to interpret. As for the earth, it had become or it was as a result of this happening, without form and void, As a result of what happening, as a result of being created that way, or as a result of there having been a great catastrophe which changes that situation from the original, either one is perfectly proper as far as interpretation of the verse is concerned. Of the grammar of the verse is concerned.

The earth was without form and void, it was in this chaotic state, it was not in a final state, the (12 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) one was there, but they were not in the fully usable state as yet. Had they been once and then changed back to them, or is this the way they were made and from that they were going to go on. Well, we can't be sure which it was, but it is dynamic. It is either the result of the catastrophe or the result of the activity of God in bringing the earth into being so that there came into existence an earth without form and void. <sup>But you see</sup> It doesn't fit at all for the beginning of creation, to begin with verse 2, to say verse 1 is the whole (13) and then you go back and start over again because you start when the earth already had come into this situation. To me that's a rather strong (13) general summary.

And the next phrase, darkness was upon the face of the deep, is a rather difficult phrase, what exactly it really means, I don't think anybody knows. Darkness was upon the

face of the deep, the word here translated deep is the Hebrew word (13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) \*

which is not a common word in Hebrew but it's very similar to the Babylonian word (13 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

\* which is used for the great (13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) of salt  
 water in the Babylonians but whether <sup>there's a</sup> the relationship there or not is pretty hard to prove.  
 There's a big argument both ways, and the Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters.  
 This word moved here is one which is not a common word. And sometimes it is translated  
 (14\* and sometimes translated \* Sometimes it is taken like  
 a hen brooding over her nest, the spirit of the Lord brooding over the face of the water.  
 Other times this word (~~is~~) spirit, which is exactly the same as the word for wind, is  
 taken, you will find some critical translations say wind of God, in other words a mighty,  
 a mighty wind was rushing over the face of the water. I don't think that's what it means.  
 But exactly what it does mean is something that we do not have knowledge of. There was  
 certainly, we can say, a divine interest there, a great divine interest, God had not cast  
 off the world and forgot it. The spirit of God was there, the Spirit of God was taking an  
 interest in it, but exactly what the (14 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) relations were, I don't  
 believe we can be sure, with the amount of evidence we have. So much then for Genesis 1 and  
 2.

And that will take us to 6 which leads us into a very interesting problem. The meaning  
of the word <sup>day</sup> they. Well what does the word day mean. All you have to do is to go up to the  
 first man you see on the street, and ask him, what is a day. He'll say twenty-four hours.  
 He knows when the Bible says day it means twenty-four hours, Unfortunately, you cannot  
 determine the meaning of Biblical words that way. That is a step in the finding the meaning  
 of an English word, to ask...

...what it means, but the first name you come to may be completely wrong as to what it  
 generally means, because language is a peculiar thing which passes from mouth to mouth,  
 and from mind to mind, and it's always changing, and the result is that with just about any

word you want to take in any language you will find some people who are still using it in the sense it was used a hundred years ago and some people that have moved on to the sense it will be a hundred years from now. It is in state of flux, and you have to check it with many different people to know what the word really means in that language. In making up a dictionary it is customary to go through a lot of books and from the books examine all the different contexts where a word comes and see what light can be thrown on how it is used at that time in that language. A language is a difficult thing to think up, and in this case we are not interested in what the English word means. If we know that that only tells us what the King James writers think. What we are interested in is what does the original mean. The Hebrew has a word (1 3/4) \* which it so happens is regularly translated day. Now in some cases one Hebrew word is translated various ways in English, but in this case I think you can just about say that just about any time you find the word (1 3/4) \* it's translated day, and just about any time you find day it's translated (1 3/4) \* So that to find out what this Hebrew word means we can check how the word day is used in the Bible, how it's used in English proves nothing. How it's used in the Bible.

Well, now, is there anybody here who will be ready to say that you believe that every time the word day is used in Genesis 1, it means twenty-four hours. Would anybody care to say that, that that is your opinion, that every time the word day is used in Genesis 1, it means twenty-four hours. Mr. Deshpande, I don't think you really believe that. (student. 2 1/2)

Yes, all right, now we notice (2 1/2) that every time the word day is used in this chapter it means twenty-four hours. Now let us look at verse 4, and God saw the light that it was good and God divided the light from the darkness, and God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. Now what does this word day mean in verse 5? God called the light day. Was that twenty-four hours. I think we would all easily agree it was not. We would all agree that the first use then of the word day in the Bible is not twenty-four hours. It is a period of time in which it is light, which is called Day. How long is the day? If you're up <sup>near</sup> at the North Pole it may be six months long. You may have six months of day and six months of night. If you are fairly near the Equator, it may mean twelve hours most of the year, with slight variations. If you are in Northern

Scotland the day will be twenty-three and a half hours long in August, and it will be maybe an hour longer in mid-summer. There'll be a long, long (3 3/4) of some length, but it certainly varies tremendously over the earth, the length of the day. But that is a-ee the common way the word day is used, not for a twenty-four period but for a period in which it is light, that is the Day. And when we say that Christ was in the grave three days and three nights we don't mean he was in the grave three days of twenty-four hours each, plus three nights. We mean three cycles, or a portion of three cycles, each of which cycle, day and night together, is twenty-four hours. So the first usage of day here is a usage which is probably a great deal less than twenty-four hours, unless this chapter is written from the viewpoint of somebody who was within a few miles of either the North or South Pole. In that case it may mean six months. But at least, there's no reason in the world to think that the word Day, in its first usage, is twenty-four hours. All right, then, we have our present passage is a passage which I think we could say runs from Genesis 1:1 to 2:4a. In other words, or 2:4, I should say, in other words, that ~~chapter~~ <sup>verse</sup> 4 would be the end of the passage and so the last time the word day is used in the passage would be in verse 4 of chapter 2. These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens. Well, how long is that day, the day when the Lord made the earth and the heavens. I don't think that anybody would feel that that refers simply to the making of the original elements. I think anybody would interpret that these are the generations of the heavens and the earth, in the day when they were created, in the day when the Lord made the earth and the heavens. Or if you take it as the start of the second chapter, the same thing, in the day when the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, (6) \*(?) as meaning the whole of the creation which is described in the sixth day. And consequently the word day here means the same as the whole six others put together. The day when the Lord made the earth. So that, or if you should take it that it refers to <sup>when</sup> the original elements were made, then that would be the minus-one day because the first day is when he made light, after the original elements were made. But I don't think anybody takes it that way, as the minus-one day. I think everybody takes it as the combination of the whole six. So the first usage of the word day is probably much

less than twenty-four hours and the last usage is at least six times twenty-four hours, so here we have these two varied uses of the word Day, and then in between we have usage of it in relation to the sixth day, which is the problem we're interested in. What does this mean in those instances?

Now the first usage of it in the beginning of verse 5, the light period of the time, is something that is very common in our language. Probably we use the word day in that sense far more than in the sense of twenty-four hours, in the sense of period of light. We read in the New Testament that you should work while it is Day for the Night cometh when no man can work. That doesn't mean a twenty-four hours for many people. It either means a specific day of light or it means a long period of time which is similar to the period of light. In any event, it certainly ~~is~~ that nobody will interpret that phrase as meaning a twenty-four hour day. So we find that the word day may be used for quite a short period of time because bound together by one feature, of being the light period separated by darkness on both sides. Or it may be used for a long period of time. And probably (8) use of the word Day for a long period of time is certainly not the commonest use in the Scripture, yet it is used a good many times. We find in the New Testament, we find a good many instances, where the word Day is used for a period, a long time. I believe John 9:4, if I recall correctly, it ~~is~~ where Jesus said, Abraham saw my day and was glad. Well, which day did he mean? Did he mean a particular twenty-four hour day. I don't think there's any question there, that he meant that he saw the period of Jesus' life, which would be about thirty years. Oh no, this isn't that reference. This is I must work the works of him that sent me while it is day, the night cometh. That's the other one. I forget, then, what that reference is. John 8:56? Thank you. Five verses before the verse I gave you. "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad." How long was the day that Abraham rejoiced in. Certainly much longer than the twenty-four period.

In 2 Peter 3:8 we read that a day is with the Lord as is a thousand years. 2 Peter 3:8, that one day with the Lord is as a thousand years and a thousand years is as one day. Here is something much longer than twenty-four hours which ~~is~~ <sup>here</sup> called a day. There are many references in the Scripture to the Day of the Lord, and nobody believes that that is a twenty-four

day. There are a very respectable number of instances, though not a huge number of instances, where the word Day undoubtedly means a long period. So I think we can summarize that the word Day in the Scripture is a word which means a period of time, that this period of time may be singled out by the fact that it is light as compared with darkness on both sides, and in such cases ( $10\frac{1}{4}$ ) light, or that it may represent a very long period of time which has something that binds it together and makes it one period, like the Day of the Lord, or Jesus' Day, and so on. In between these two is a very common use of it to indicate one type of it, as the earth turns around on its axis, a period of light, plus a period of darkness. There are then those different uses of the word Day.

Now, which of these uses is used in Genesis 1? We have no right to assume in advance that it will be one of the three. But we have a duty to examine the passage and see what it indicates. And if we do not find enough indication to make it certain which it is, then what we have to do is to say it does not state whether this day was ten minutes long, whether it was ten hours long, twenty-four hours long, or two hundred years long or ten million years long, we are not told, and we don't know, unless we find a definite answer. But we cannot assume what it is, we have to look into the passage and see. We have the day used in a short interval, used in a long interval. Now in the other places in the chapter, is it used in the sense of a twenty-four hour day, or isn't it? What is the answer?

Well, we look then to see, how did they measure time, in those early times? And we are told in verse 14 that God said let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night. Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, that's what he said the fourth day. Does that mean there was no sun, moon, or stars before that, and God just created them in the fourth day? The light came from some other source previous to that. Possibly. ( $12\frac{1}{2}$ ) It certainly is definitely taught. Or was it that they were in existence before and for some reason not visible to this earth, that there was, for instance, a great cloud around the earth, which would ( $12\frac{3}{4}$ ) to equalize the light at different periods of the cycle, or some other reason. They were not visible. We cannot be sure. It says God made, but that may mean he had made and now makes visible. We can't be sure. We know God made them but did he make them in the fourth day. Well, he made them visible, he

certainly did that, Perhaps he made them on the fourth day. But what is the vital thing about the fourth day, is it the sun, moon, and stars coming into existence? That's not the vital thing. The vital thing is that they then become measurers of time. He says, let these lights be for lights in the firmament of the heaven, and it was so. He says them be here to divide the days from the nights. Let them be for signs, for seasons, and for days and for years. And so he made two great lights, the greater light to rule the days, the lesser light to rule the night, he made the stars also. He made them to be measurers of time. Now whether these were made in the fourth day, or whether God had made them earlier and caused them to become visible in the fourth day, in either case, they were not measurers of time until the fourth day. That is when it is definitely placed down as a command that they become measurers.

So we certainly can say that there is no ground before the fourth day for saying that a day was twenty-four hours. Now it might have been twenty-four hours, it might have been ten hours, it might have been ten million years long, but we have no ground to say it was twenty-four hours, because a twenty-four hour day is simply a division we make into twenty-four sections of the time that the earth turns once on its axis in relation to the sun, and the sun was not yet a divider of time until the fourth day. So that for the first three days it is entirely possible that the length was twenty-four hours or just as possible that it was twenty-two or twenty or eighteen or twenty-nine or ten million year, we just are not told, before the fourth day. And are we right in assuming that it means a twenty-four hour day these particular last three days when certainly the word day is used of the first three in such a way that the sun cannot be the determining factor as to its length.

I think we can safely say, then, that we do not know from the word Day in itself, how long it is, for it has not...

## O.T.History 23. (1)

...as far as the is concerned. Now, when I say that, immediately somebody raises an objection. They say, yes, but <sup>it</sup> ~~the~~ says it was evening and it was morning. The first day. It was evening and it was morning, a second day. It was evening and it was



morning, the third day. Now one thing we know is, it does not say the first day, that is a mistranslation in the authorized version, it says one day. The American Standard version has it more accurately. It is not the word for first, it is the word one. It was evening and it was morning, one day. It was evening and it was morning, a second day, there is no article. It was evening and it was morning, a third day, a fourth day, and having made four like that, then it says the fifth, the sixth, and the seventh. But it is a day in the first, it's just a second, a third, it's just one day. So that it is not the first day but it's the first day in our description <sup>after</sup> of creation, certainly, that we'll agree on. Now, it was evening and it was morning, what does that mean? Well, that is the Hebrew way of figuring a day. Our modern western way is to say, we take the time when the sun sets and the sun rises and we find the point halfway between the two and we call that midnight. And at that imaginary point, because nothing happens then any different than an hour before or after, we say that's the beginning of a new day, but that is strictly an imaginary thing. The Hebrews had a system which the ordinary man without scientific instruments, without modern clocks or anything like that, could determine. They considered that when the sun set a new day began. The Jews still use that. Once, coming from California on the train I got <sup>talking</sup> caught to different people on the observation car on a train and one of them was a young Jewish woman from New York City. And she told me that they had a Jewish theatre in New York City where they put on specific Jewish plays and she said that they put them on on Saturday evening, but she said, we have to start rather late in the evening, because our people who come to us from Brooklyn cannot travel on the Sabbath. So she said on Saturday which they call the Sabbath they have to see the first star appear, and when they see the first star visible in the evening that means that the day is over, it is now no longer the Sabbath, then they can take the subway and get into Manhattan where these plays are shown. So to this day, the appearance of the first star after the sunset indicates the beginning of the new day.

Now, when did the first day begin? Did it begin when Adam saw the first star in the evening? It couldn't be because there had been no day before. There was only darkness before so there was no point at which to start. There was no--how could you have an evening

without a preceding day? This is the Hebrew terminology. Evening and morning makes one day, in Hebrew terminology. It's just their way of saying a day, and so it is a figurative expression indicating beginning and end of a day, evening and morning. It does not mean literally morning because for the first day there would not be a literal evening at all. And the first day the sun was not a measure of time, nor were the stars measures of time. And in addition to that, on the first day, where was Adam or where was (4) ? They were not in existence.

The first chapter of Genesis is told, not from the viewpoint of an individual man of some point on the earth, but from God's viewpoint who covers all states (4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ). And therefore, from his viewpoint, when it is morning in Philadelphia, it is evening in Persia. And when it is morning in England I expect it's evening in Japan. I don't know the exact relationship but there is no instance today when it is not morning in half the world and evening in another half the world. Morning and evening, in a literal sense, are terms which relate to the time you are in a place on the earth. They are not divisions of absolute time, but of relative time, and they are purely figurative here in this chapter because this chapter is not written from the viewpoint of a man upon the earth at a specific point, but from the viewpoint of God the Creator, creating the universe.

And so morning and evening are here very definitely figurative terms simply to mean this period we call a day began and ended like a Jewish day <sup>would</sup> with begin and end, but it's a figure. Mr. Shellabarger? (student. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

It doesn't morning and evening, it says evening and morning. (student. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, and I would say that it means one period of time, there was a beginning and an end to this period of time, and this period of time may have been twenty-four hours, but if it was twenty-four hours I don't think the words evening and morning are literal terms referring to a change in the light conditions of the world, but, because that is going on all the time isn't it?-- but they are simply a figurative term to represent this period, whatever it is, whether it is twenty-four hours, whether it is ten hours, whether it is ten million years, this period had a beginning and end. Yes? (student. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, the stress is on the orderly method of creation, that there are successive periods, which come one after the other, and which run their course, and within which God performs certain

acts. But did it take God twenty-four hours to get light created? He would do that in one second probably. We are told he said ~~let~~ there be light and there was light. But there is a period of twenty-four hours involved if it's a twenty-four hour day. If it was ten hours, if it was a ten-hour day, if it was a period of ten million years, if it was a ten million-year day, what the length is we are not told. But we are ~~saying~~ <sup>shown</sup> that there is a progressive activity of God in regular orderly ~~fashion~~ divided into ~~identical~~ <sup>logical</sup> sections, but how long the sections are, if somebody wanted to believe they are twenty-four hours, the word day does not deny it, but neither does it prove it. Certainly God could do it in twenty-four hours, if he chose to. And maybe he chose to, but it does not say that. Yes? (student. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, I interpret that in connection with verse 14, which says that God made the sun and moon and stars on the fourth day become measures of time. So I interpret ~~that~~ the division between light and darkness was of a different nature previous to the fourth day than after the fourth day. Exactly what it was ~~it-w~~ I do not have the material to know. God could have given us two or three encyclopedias giving all sorts of details about these things, but he didn't. He gave us three hints to show us the orderly systematic way in which he proceeded with his creation, tells us quite a number of things about it but there are a number of facts which he simply has not told us, and we do not know. Yes? (student. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

No, this is very definitely theistic, but not evolution. It is the way that God did it, but evolution, I understand, to mean in its proper sense, the theory that all of life has begun with one single cell, from which by natural processes everything has developed without any intervention from outside, and I don't think that such theory has ever been proven, and I don't think that the Bible ~~keeps-in-step~~ <sup>teaching can be fit</sup> with such a theory as that. On the other hand, I don't think we have a right to jump to the opposite <sup>(a) ~.</sup> interpretation and say that everything that happened God intervened with a special creative act, because we are told that there were areas in which he caused things to develop before he proceeded to make another decisive intervention. So I do not feel that theistic evolution is a satisfactory answer. But neither do I think that we have to take a few words and build up a great deal upon them beyond what they say. Mr. ? (student. 9 3/4)

Yes, I would say that the--now the word evolution, unfortunately, is used in many different

senses, many, many, many. And anybody has a right to use any words in any sense they want as long as they make clear what sense they're using ~~it~~ <sup>them</sup> in. But the word evolution in its strictest sense <sup>is</sup> the theory that from one individual cell, by natural process, everything developed, that's in its strictest sense. And in that sense, I think proof is far, far short of proving any such thing, and I think that the Bible definitely (10 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Now, there are those who try to adopt evolution but say yes but it all happened because God made it happen that way, and they call themselves theistic evolutionists. Now if you ~~take~~ evolution and the Scripture (10  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) why, it wouldn't make any difference whether you called it theistic evolution or atheistic evolution in the end, because you're meaning that everything develops ~~from~~ <sup>from</sup> the process ~~within~~. If you say God put it within and it works out that way, well He ~~could~~ do that (11) but I think the Scripture teaches he did it a different way, but he certainly ~~could~~ have done that if he chose. <sup>(1)</sup> But there are probably many senses in which the word evolution could be used.

But I personally would not call myself an evolutionist because I believe that evolution in its strict sense is ~~very~~ contrary to the teaching of Scripture. But there are many people who use the word evolution in a sense which is not that at all. One fellow said to me, well how can anybody doubt evolution, why you ~~could~~ <sup>can</sup> see the evolution of a boy into a man. Well, you can. You can see the development and there is all kinds of development. The world is full of development and it would be silly to deny development. But just where is the line between that which develops and the point at which God made an intervention and initiated something different we are not given <sup>the</sup> detail on, but we are clearly told there were such points, and if there are such points, then a thorough-going theory of evolution contradicts the (12) difficulty <sup>(2)</sup>. Well that's another matter we can take up later-- evolution--I didn't mean to refer to it here except as it was brought up I thought it would be good to say a few words about it. But the point here about the days is simply that I do not feel that the Scripture tells us how long the days are. It seems to me it is very clear that the Scripture doesn't tell us how long the days are. And that doesn't mean that they may not be twenty-four hours. If a person likes to think of them as twenty-four hours

I see no reason why ~~they~~ shouldn't . I don't think the Scripture specifically says they're longer than twenty-four hours but neither does it say they're shorter. It just doesn't say how long they are. Mr. ? (student. 12 3/4)

No, I'm not trying to foundate (13) anything here, I'm trying to see what the chapter says, and I'm trying to see just what it says and not to read anything into it. That's what I'm trying to do. And then after we see--I see it as very foolish to ~~take~~ the Bible and try to twist it to fit anything that comes from outside. But I think it is proper to take it and see what are the areas of possible interpretation with it. And then ~~when~~ we see those areas, then when we take things from outside, we say this can fit within this area, this can fit within this area. It is possible that this can't possibly fit within the area of Scripture, therefore I'm sure it's wrong and will be proved to be so eventually. No matter who thinks it today, if the Bible clearly denies it I think it's wrong. But I don't think we should read into the Bible our ideas from outside. I think we should try to see what the Bible teaches. And I would say the Bible teaches definite <sup>periods</sup> areas within which God performs his great creative acts. It teaches an orderly creation, it tells what was done each time so that we know that it is giving something of what was done. The terms are rather general at times, the precise details we don't know, but we know a good bit about what happened in each of these periods. How long were the periods, we are not told. God could have put them all together into one section and said let it all be done and it be done like that. But did He, did He, that's the question. What does it say specifically? And it seems to me that specifically it just does not say how long the periods are. How long was the period within which he created light? Well, ~~now~~ certainly I would say, there's not the slightest <sup>inference</sup> evidence (14 3/4) that that period was a twenty-four day because before you had light you certainly couldn't have a twenty-four hour day, and before you had the sun as a measure of time there was no indication of a twentyfour hour day, and yet it could be twenty-four hours, it could be anything the Lord chose to make it. As far as what he did is concerned, for all we know, it could have been one second. On the other hand he could have done that and he could have left ten million years for that light to circulate, to spread around, to become established the way he wanted it. Yes? (student. 15 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

...you can have twenty-four hours, but we simply have no way of knowing this. We have no evidence on which to base a theory that they must have been. (student. 3/4)

They may have been twenty-four hours in length, we don't know. But we have no right to say they aren't. (student. 1)

I don't think so, that the deep problems of the Scripture are solved by the simple-minded, I think they are solved by comparing the words of Scripture and how they are used. It is true that <sup>1</sup>Olcott ( $1\frac{1}{2}$ ) in the early days of the Reformation when Luther ~~was~~ in the ( $1\frac{1}{2}$ ) Harzburg <sup>area</sup>, Calscott read that the Lord had hidden these things from the wise and prudent and revealed them to babes, so he put on a pair of overalls and went down the street and he would come to a man digging a ditch and he would say, would you please explain to me the meaning of this Greek passage here, the Lord has hidden them from the wise and prudent like myself, so I think ( $1\frac{3}{4}$ ) it is real.

The way to find out what the Scripture says is to study it carefully in the light of the whole Scripture, comparing words with words, passage to passage, and realize that any particular question we raise, God may not have chosen to give us the answer. But we can hunt and see if He has given us the answer. And when we do that, I am quite certain that on this point we will find that He has not given us the answer as to how long these days are. We just don't know. But if we want to think of them as twenty-four, there's certainly no harm in doing so. But if you want to think of them as ten million years, there's no harm in that, you just don't know, so ~~why~~ argue about it. Nobody knows. One says I think they were twenty-four hours, another says I think they were ten hours, another says I think they were ten million, maybe there were, we don't know. The Lord hasn't told us ( $2\frac{3}{4}$ ), we don't know. It's like the question of whether the infant Jesus, when he was ten years old, what time did he get up in the morning? Well, somebody may say I'm sure that his father being a carpenter, their being an industrious people, I'm sure he got up at six o'clock every morning. And somebody else says yes, but his father wasn't an ordinary carpenter who made houses, he made very fine things like lamshades and things like that, and people would crowd in late at night to get them so he'd sleep late, he probably didn't get up till nine or ten in the morning. Well, you could argue back and forth. The Scripture doesn't tell us so we just don't know. And I feel it's exactly the same way

about the length of the day. We don't know. And if the one person says to me it seems more natural to think of it as twenty-four hours, well, think of it the way it seems natural, but don't tell anybody else they should think of it the way it seems natural to you. Let them think of it as it seems natural to them. But let's all compare Scripture with Scripture and see if we can get light thrown on it to see what it (3 3/4) really is.

Mr. Jaggard? (student. 3/ 3/4)

Not necessarily, no. My guess would be that they were more or less the same length, all the various times, whatever they may have been. I personally feel that there is evidence which suggests but does not prove that they were longer than twenty-four hours. And let's look at that. This is just evidence in the passage. It has nothing to do with anything you find in geology or any other science. I think we should take the Scripture and compare it with what we find in the sciences, but I think we should do that after we first look just at the Scripture to see what the Scripture says, because that's the vital question, is what does the Scripture say? Not what does man decide from one method of research or another. What does the Scripture say? But let's not reach any conclusion unless it's absolutely certain in Scripture. Let's say well, it's within this limit. I would say the day is not less than five <sup>minutes</sup> ~~months~~ long and not more than two hundred billion years long, somewhere within these limits. Now if ~~I'm told~~ <sup>you find proof</sup> somewhere to show where (4 3/4) it's all right. But now let's see if you find any indication that may suggest about it within the chapter. I look at the third day and I find that on the third day the Lord said, let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear, and it was so. Now does that mean that the Lord said, all of a sudden, now let all the waters be there and <sup>all</sup> the dry land here. Just like that, it's done, or did it move until it got that way. I don't know. It sort of gives a little the impression that it's saying let them be gathered rather than let them be in one place, and the dry land in another. But I wouldn't (5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) much on that but the latter part of the day, he said let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth, and it was so, and the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind, and God saw that it was

good. I do wish the Theological Seminary Professor who wrote the article I referred to a couple of days in which he said that we must believe, in view of Genesis, that God created trees with tree rings in them, had read this first chapter of Genesis and this verse in particular. If he ever read it he didn't pay any attention to it, <sup>it</sup> he just went through his head like wood. Because it could very easily have said let the earth be covered with trees. The earth would be covered like that and whether they'd have tree rings in them or not, I don't know, but at least they'd be covered with trees like that, some of them what we would consider trees a hundred years as far as their size and strength <sup>were</sup> ~~is~~ concerned. But that's not what he said. He said, let the earth bring forth fruit. Let the earth bring forth grass and herbs and trees, yielding fruit after their kind. Let the earth bring it forth. And it was so.

Well, this first day then was a day in which the earth brought forth all kinds of vegetation. Now God certainly could very, he did not ~~cause~~ the earth to be covered with things (7) all of a sudden because it doesn't say that. That's not what he did. He caused <sup>them</sup> ~~it~~ to come up out of the earth. No question of that. But now you can take a moving picture camera and you can take picture now and another picture five minutes ~~from~~ now and another five minutes from now and you can run them straight along and you can see the way that the sun comes up in the morning, taking an hour or two, you can run it in five minutes. You can easily do that. And if the Lord chose to, he ~~could~~ do the same thing. The Lord could say, now, let the trees grow up fast and within the course of ten hours the daylight in the midst of that twenty-four hour day, great big oaks and strong Sequoias would come up, what would now take two thousand years to grow, could <sup>have</sup> ~~grown~~ up in ten or fifteen minutes, could have grown up like that, the Lord could cause that if He chose. And maybe he did choose. And if ~~the~~ it was a twenty-four hour day that is what he chose but it doesn't say so there, and consequently my guess would be that what it means is that during this <sup>third</sup> ~~first~~ day, they grew up more gradually and that it was a long period. Yes. (student. 8<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>)

All right, there's a possibility. When it says here, God said let the earth bring forth all different kinds of grass, fruit trees, herbs and trees and the earth brought them



forth, what it means is that that day during that twenty-four hour day these things had the amount of growth they would have in one day<sup>now</sup>, so that at the beginning of the next day you <sup>have</sup> would great oak trees which have grown up a quarter of an inch above the earth, great sequoias which have grown an eighth of an inch above the earth. You have all kinds of grass and herb and everything grown up maybe an eighth of an inch above the earth. That is a possibility. But it is either that or it took long enough for them to grow up and cover a substantial part of the earth. But now let's look at another day. Let's look at the fifth one. In the fifth day the Lord could have said, let the sky be full of birds, and the ocean be full of all kinds of fish. He could have said that and all of a sudden could have great big whales in the water, you would have great big eagles flying in the sky, you would have all this all of a sudden just like that. The Lord certainly could have done that if he chose. But the passage say he chose to do that? What the passage says is, in God said, verse 26, let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that has life. And God created great whales and every living creature that moves which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind, and God saw that it was good. And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth. Now maybe this means that all these birds and fish were one day old at the end of the ~~fourth~~<sup>fifth</sup> day. So that at the end of the fifth day the trees were three days old, and the fish and the birds, covering all over the earth, were one day old. That's possible. But the general impression I get from it is rather that there's a process that went on here whereby these came into existence and grew and spread and spread over the earth and had offspring and so on, that the third day was a period in which <sup>this</sup> ~~it~~ happened. Now I don't want to be dogmatic as between those two possibilities but this I would be dogmatic about, that God did not say, let the sky be full of birds, he said let it bring forth birds. Yes? (student. 11)

Well, we'll take up evolution as a separate thing later. We'll take up evolution as a separate subject later. At this point, I want to say this, whether I allow for a thing or not doesn't matter in the slightest. The question is what does the Bible teach? And the Bible definitely does not teach that God said, let the earth be covered with large trees. It does

teach that he said let the earth bring forth trees and the earth brought them forth. That much we can say definitely. Now as to the relationship between these, that is a matter that we should look at under separate heading. But now we're interested in the <sup>length</sup> ~~light~~ of the day, and as far as the length of the day is concerned God could have speeded this all up so that it just would go so fast that it would just make you dizzy to look at it. In twenty-four hours it's all done. He could have done that if he chose and maybe he did. But we don't have any hints that he did in the passage, there's no statement that he speeded up the process (12)

. Mr. Kang, you had a question. (student.12)

If vegetation had existed before the sun was made there was light already and vegetation can exist with light. You get the jungles in South America which are just dense with vegetation and you never see the sun. The trees are so thick that you won't even know there's a sun there but the light is diffused, it's the light that makes them grow. We have light the first day but we don't have the sun as a measure of time. Well, I see we have to stop now. I always plan to stop not later than twenty-five after and today I have run <sup>till</sup> ~~over~~ twenty-seven minutes, so we'll continue at 8 o'clock tomorrow morning.

## O.T.History 25. (1/3)

...When I was in Seminary I studied under Professor Robert Fitz Wilson who was at that time one of the leading scholars in these early Semitic languages, a man who was a great defender of the Word of God. I also, when I began teaching, was his assistant for my first year. I remember lectures Dr. Wilson used to give on the dependability of the Word, in which he gave some very excellent illustrations of it but at one point he used to tell about, one time, having given a popular message dealing with a certain verse in the Psalms and he brought out the interpretation of the verse as he found it in the Hebrew, and he said that a man came up to him afterward and said, yes, but that verse doesn't mean what you said, it means such and such. Dr. Wilson said, no, the way I gave it is the way the Hebrew has it. Well, he said look at here, look at the English, see this colon here, that proves it means this. Well, Dr. Wilson said yes, but that colon is not in the original.

He said the man saw what he meant and accented what he said. Oh, he said, that's been a very dear colon to me. And it illustrates what the attitude it's very easy for any of us to fall into, that our affection is attached to something which is a part of the translation or which is part of you might say the external wrapping or which is even part of the tradition, that is the interpretation, that we've heard other people give, and Satan is very anxious to get us to defending something that is not part of the actual Word of God and thus divert our attention from the Word which is ~~that~~ which God actually has given. We have to have parts of punctuation. They're part of our English language, it wouldn't make sense to us without them. We have to have chapter divisions, we have to have verse divisions. As we study the Word we have to pass it on to others and so there is all sorts of externalia that goes along with it, and this is all legitimate and proper but we should distinguish in our minds between it and what is the actual Word of God. The attempt of the man who put in the externalia which even includes the translation into a language other than Hebrew or Greek. He is doing his best to present what the original had. And your mark of punctuation may be necessary, it may be that your translation wouldn't bring out the original without your mark of punctuation. But even so your mark of punctuation is your attempt to present what you find in the original. If someone is going to be a real interpreter of the Word they must go to the original themselves and see whether the externalia that we have are justified.

I heard of a teacher in a class some years ago who used to use the Scofield Bible regularly in the discussion ~~in~~ class and one time, and stopped it altogether. And the reason that she stopped it was because one of the students, when a question was raised, said let's open the Bible and see what the note is, find out what the answer is. And she thought that they were not distinguishing between the Bible and the human notes at the foot ~~and~~ in the margin and the headings. And therefore she wanted to use a Bible that did not have much note, even though she felt that most of the notes in the Scofield were very helpful. I think she was taking a very fine attitude in distinguishing between human interpretation and God's Word. But if she carried that out strictly, she would have to use a Bible that had no chapter divisions, no verse divisions, no punctuation, <sup>marks,</sup> in fact no translation which wasn't in the original. When you have a Bible that has notes in it and

that has headings, and so on, you simply have someone's interpretation. And it's very important to learn to distinguish between interpretations and the Word of God. But it is equally important to learn to distinguish between the interpretation that the translation represents, or the interpretation of the chapter that is represented, or that the punctuation represents. So I'm not at all sure that her objective, excellent objective that it was, was much advanced by insisting on using a Bible without human notes. I think it would be better to teach the students to distinguish the importance (5) of what is the actual Word which we must take because it is God's Word. And the human notes which can be very, very helpful but which must be examined to see whether we feel that they are on merited foundation, (5½)

And any human note, including translation is going to run the risk of considerable error. ¶ Now we're speaking still about the meaning of the word day, number 6. And this we have already noted, that day in the Scripture is a term which indicates a period of time. That it is used for periods of time of various lengths. That its most common use in Scripture is for that period of time when there is daylight separated by two periods of darkness on both sides. That is the most common and the length of these periods varies greatly in different parts of the world and different seasons of the earth. That it is also used in the Scripture a very considerable number of times to indicate a very long period of time of undesignated length, and then of course it is used a very considerable number of times to indicate not a period of daylight alone but the period of daylight together with that period of darkness which immediately preceded. And this naturally would run approximately twenty-four hours although our present hour division is a matter of comparatively modern time. The adoption of the clock such as we have and so on, they had a different system of hours in the (6½) In the Hebrew usage starts the day at sundown. We of course today, with a more scientific method, start it at midnight, but a method which would not be applicable unless you had machinery which the ancients did not have to determine (6¾) as a midnight watch.

Well, then, a day is a period of time of indeterminate length. That does not say that it may not be twenty-four hours. But we have to examine it in order to find out what the evidence is. There is no evidence in chapter 1 to lead us to say these must be twenty-

four hours come whatever. A person thinks they're ten hour days, someone else thinks they're twenty-four days, somebody else thinks they're two-billion year days, as far as Genesis 1 is concerned, it does not say.

But we notice that in the third day, it did not say, let the world<sup>be</sup> covered with trees but it said let the earth bring forth trees. And it is possible that on that day the trees began to grow and at the end of the sixth day they had grown up maybe three-eighths of an inch. That is possible but it seems to be very unlikely, particularly if man when he was created was put into a garden in which there ~~are~~ already<sup>were</sup> trees large enough to have fruit. It would seem to be much more likely that this third day represents a long process of beginning to grow of all sorts of shrubs and of grass and of trees. And then we notice that in the fifth day God said, let the waters bring forth abundantly, the birds and the fish, and the waters brought them forth abundantly, this again might mean that they all began as little tiny infants and were three days old at the end of the sixth day, but it seems the more natural interpretation of it that they came to a very considerable number and of maturity during the fifth day.

Now on the sixth day the Lord said, not let the earth be covered with lions and elephants and tigers roaming about and enjoying the vegetation that God has established there but, let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind. And so these animals on the earth came not on the fifth day like the fish and the birds, but on the sixth day, and thus we see that some animals came one day and some animals came another day, and there is a progress in the order in which God brought the animals into existence. He brought first on the fifth day he brought the birds and then the fish and then the--on the fourth day--and then on the fifth day--that was the fifth day, and then on the sixth day he brought<sup>the</sup> larger animals and so there was cattle after their kind, everything that creeps on the earth after their kind, the reptiles were later than the fish and the birds. God saw that it was good. Usually after it says God saw that it was good, he proceeds and says it was evening and morning that day. Here it says, then God said let us make man in our image. So he created man in his image on the sixth day.

Now as we see then, these are the words of Scripture. This is what it says. Not let the earth be covered with, but let the earth bring forth. It seems to me most naturally to present a long process in each of these periods. It hardly seems to me satisfactory to think that in each of these periods they just began to grow. There would be so little difference <sup>in</sup> ~~of~~ the age of the grass and of the cows, that the cows would hardly have any grass to live on, three days later when they came into existence. It just wasn't started three days earlier. It would seem to me that it was (11) longer. It's not at all impossible that God may have caused them to grow <sup>at</sup> a tremendous rate. Dr. Bloch, one of my seminary professors, <sup>(11)</sup> had us as a guest at an eating club, and I remember one time he told the story of a man who was on the train in Holland, <sup>--he came from Holland--</sup> and somebody gave him some medicine to make his hair grow, and he put a couple of <sup>drops of</sup> the medicine on his hair and he said the hair just began to grow right up and reached out through the window and it got snarled up around a tree, and just then the train began, and he was afraid it would pull the hair out by the roots <sup>or</sup> ~~and~~ pull him out the window, so he began pouring it on his head and it grew and kept growing faster and faster so that the hair grew as fast as the train went, and the train was moving along to the next stop, the hair was growing and just barely keeping pace with it and he was afraid of his life that he would run out of the medicine and get his head jerked off or something, and he said he got down to the last couple of drops in the bottle, and just as he put the last couple of drops on the hair the train came into the next station. So fortunately it stopped before his head got jerked off of his shoulders and now he was able, when they stopped at that station, to get ahold of a pair of scissors and clip it off before the train started again. Well, of course it's a crazy sort of a story but it's not inconceivable, the possibility of things that may grow <sup>at</sup> so tremendously accelerated a rate. And certainly God could do it if he chose and God could choose to have a tree grow in twenty-four hours to be the size and maturity of a tree a hundred years old. He could choose to do that if he wanted to. But if that is what he did, my inclination would be to think that he would have given us some hint in the chapter. I don't believe he didn't, I do not think anyone is wrong who says that I, personally, think these are twenty-four hour days. But to me the (13) difficulty <sup>is</sup> in speaking of them as twenty-four hour days and accept-

ing the wording of the Scripture exactly as it stands with no reference whatever to anything we find anywhere else, is much greater than taking the word day in the sense in which it has many places in Scripture, that it is a period of time of indeterminate length but separated by the fact that it is a distinct period of distinct divine activity (13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) and that the Lord separates the two. Mr. ? (student. 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, on the fourth day the, let's read exactly the statement about the fourth day. Oh, this is a special (13  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) Mr. Steele had his hand up, let's see if it's similar to the thing I was just going to read, if so, I might take it first. Mr. Steele? (student.14)

Yes, it could have been simultaneous before the sixth day as far as any (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) but in this case . I would say that--now on the fourth day it says, let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth, so it tells of the making of fish and of birds. Well now it is rather natural to think that he made fish first and then birds but that we could not say with any certainty at all. He might have made birds first, he might have made fish next, he might have made them both simultaneously. It does not say. But then when he says evening and morning were the fifth day, and then on the...

O.T.History 26. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...It very definitely teaches that the air animals and the water animals came before the land animals. <sup>1</sup> That is definitely plain by the fact that they come on different days. And I would think it possible, you might say there is a suggestion by the mention of birds before fish, no, fish before birds--there's a possibility that fish preceded birds but we cannot say with certainty, since they're not separated by a day. (students. 1)

Yes, well, now let's go on, let's leave the fifth, the second chapter till a little later (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) because we have a section which describes the creation of the universe, chapter 1 and the first few verses of 2. Then from verse 4 on, we have another section, and any problem that comes up between 2 and 1, I'd like to take up, but I'd rather wait

till we get to 2, so any problem that any of you have in mind of the reation of 1 and 2, don't hold it back, bring it up, but bring it up after we get to 2. For the present I'd rather just take what relates to 1. Mr. Tow? (1 3/4)

Oh, you mentioned about the fourth day. Well, were the others still on this. If they are we'd better take them first. Mr. Shellabarger? (student. 2. In bringing forth a king or judging according to man, to bring forth a prisoner, they wouldn't expect them to drag him in by inches, so that bringing forth would have the idea of the bringing him forth and still be quickly brought forth into the place. I'm interested in the use of this verb in its various shades of meaning.)

Yes, very good. You normally represent the type speed that would be natural for that particular activity. If you said, if you commanded that a prisoner be brought into the court, and the prisoner was in the jail next door, you would expect him to be brought within a few minutes. If you commanded that a man be brought as a witness who was, you were here and he was in California, you would expect to reach that court in a few days until he could normally be brought there. Now this statement here is that the earth bring forth, that the waters bring forth, and that wouldn't seem to me to mean let the earth be covered with the two of them, it would seem to me to mean let them begin to grow up out of the earth. And the Lord could have said let them bring forth so they will be mature immediately. And he might even have done that. But we just don't have evidence he did. (student. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ , But the word wouldn't limit you to saying that he did.) No, the word could be taken either way. I don't say that it proves it's a long period, not at all, I say it does prove that they were not created mature animals, mature trees, that they grew up, that is proven, but as to whether the growth was at a normal rate or whether at this time he caused an unusual speeding, it doesn't say. It could've been done in two minutes, certainly could've, it could've been done in twenty-four hours, but since it does not say it was done in unusual ways, now you take the man who is a judge in New York. He commands that the prisoner be brought from California. Under normal circumstances the representative of the court would go out to California and get the prisoner. Under normal circumstances he'd go out by train. He'd get out there in about three or four days. He would get the prisoner and



he'd probably spend the night out there, and then he would start back. Now if the judge wanted ~~for~~ the judge could say I want this prisoner here tomorrow, I want him here tomorrow, don't you go out and get him, you get the Los Angeles to send a policeman with him and send him by jet plane so he'll be here in four hours. He could do that, but it would not be understood that he was going to do it unless he gave orders specifically. Now in this case, we do not have necessarily everything God ordered or did and it's entirely possible that he gave additional orders beyond what we have. But we have no right to be sure he did unless we're told. Neither are we sure he didn't. The point I'm -- I don't know, they may have been twenty-four hour days. But my feeling is, that in view of what he said, it is to me a more probable interpretation that they were longer. Mr. ? (student.5½)

The old question, which came first the chicken or the egg, and the answer is that in either event it was a miracle. God did something that was utterly miraculous whatever happened. And we can't say he couldn't have done this or he couldn't have done half he says he did. That's all. How could vegetation come before insects? Because the insects have to carry the pollen from one plant to another in order to cross fertilize them. (6½)

How could you have them before then. They said, when I was in a class in Botany, I remember the Professor was telling us about how plants grew and he stressed how all these plants needed Nitrogen. And I asked where they got the Nitrogen. He said that the air is full of Nitrogen but no plant can take it out of the air except the peas and the beans, <sup>and plants like that,</sup> none of the others did the Nitrogen do any good (6 3/4)

the very word Nitrogen means life-giving. Without Nitrogen everything would die. And we get all our Nitrogen from something that grows in land which peas or beans or something related to the legumes have lived in because they alone have the power to take the Nitrogen. So I said to him, well, now in your scale of evolution the peas and the beans come rather late in the scale. How did anything live before without any Nitrogen, before they had beans and peas? (7½) Who <sup>picked them?</sup> Well, she said, a little bit of Nitrogen can be picked by lightning. And maybe, for all we know, if their theory is true, there may have been a period in which they had constant lightning at tremendous rate <sup>(of speed)</sup> in order to make it possible for things to grow (7½)

. But when you

come to how the Lord produced the, I think we just don't know, we can say this seems more natural than the other but we can't say it's necessarily like that. But the language here doesn't sound, it sounds like a gradual ~~coming~~ <sup>bring</sup> out; let the earth/forth, let the waters bring forth, not let it be covered with, let it suddenly be there. Yes? (student. 7  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) Well, now, in the case of light, there is no affinity between light and darkness, it's either light or it's dark.) It's either light or it's dark? (Well, if you want to admit a gray shade in between, it's still light. If it is dark on one occasion we all recognize that it's dark and when he said let there be light, it means that there wasn't light up till then or he wouldn't have commanded it to be light. That has to be said.)

Yes, the beginning of light has to be said, but the full outworking of light might take a very long time. (student: that's true but light (8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) or <sup>n</sup>othing in this case.)

Yes, I find, I am very conscious of gradations of light, much more than I used to be, because now in the daytime I don't wear glasses ordinarily, except when I'm reading. And in the daytime I sit in the car and I read that speedometer, how many miles, how many tenths without the slightest difficulty, I just look at it and I know exactly what it is instantly. But the minute night comes, I can see perfectly in the dark but I can't read that because the light is insufficient unless I put on strong glasses. I find I'm very, very conscious, I'll take these glasses and I'll read through the day, and it gets along to twilight--I didn't notice any difference in them, I have to put on stronger glasses to read in that light. And the gradation of light is a tremendously complex thing, the gradations of it and the thing that is outworking. Why did God who took one day to do all this multiplicity of animals, tremendous variety, only took him one day, why did he need a whole day just for making light. He said make it and in one second it's done? Yes, he started to make it but <sup>guess</sup> (9  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) that the reasons that the whole earth were light was that he caused the light to work out in various ways. Of course I don't know, that's just my guess. It seems to me a rather peculiar way of working, on one day to do things that's just hard <sup>for us</sup> to imagine (10) and on another day to do something in one second and it's done. But I wouldn't be personally at all surprised that in the whole creative process there is tremendous (10 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

far beyond what any man knows anything about. God directed it, God planned it, God ordered

it, but <sup>as for</sup> the details, we're just given a few highlights. Just a sketch of it is all we're given, and the Lord didn't give us the Bible so we could understand the whole situation, but he gave us the Bible in order to enable us to know how to be saved. And in connection with that he gives us a few hints (10 3/4). I was up at Cornell University about three years ago and <sup>the fellow whose</sup> guest I was lived in a house there in which quite a group of the brighter students in the Seminary, in the University, lived together in this house, and he had me as a guest there, and there they had some very outstanding speakers. And it just happened that when I was there they had the head of a philosophy department in a university and he gave a talk on religion, and he told them how in the middle ages everybody, the world was very, very simple, there was the earth and then there was an area around the earth that had the clouds in it, and then there was an area around that which had the planets in it, and then there was an area around that, the planets and the sun, and then he showed all around that, the next area had the stars, and then around that there was God. Then he said, now, astronomy has discovered that the earth is not the center of the universe at all, the sun was the center of the solar system. So the sun is there and the earth just goes around it but he said they have found that the other stars are other suns, many of them far larger than ours, and now he said that we have found there are a couple of million of these great suns which are, most of the stars we see, which make up one galaxy. And then there are millions of other galaxies just as great as this, and so you fill all space and there's no room for God <sup>any more</sup> in it. God's outside the stars, God has just disappeared, (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) completely. And that's the modern <sup>feeling,</sup> theory, there is no space for God any more <sup>since</sup> if we have found all this out. Well, the Bible (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) nowhere says the earth is the center. No one ever thinks the sun goes around the earth. It nowhere says anything of the kind. And when astronomers first said that the sun goes around the earth, that the earth goes around the sun, some people were shocked, why we've always heard sermons in church talking about the sun going around the earth, this is contradicting the Bible. Well, it wasn't, the Bible nowhere says any such thing. And the same thing's even true of the earth being round. There's not a word in the Bible saying the earth is flat, not a word. But, as a matter of fact, we know that a good many of the <sup>Greek</sup> philosophers and astronomers considered the

earth to be round. We know that before the time of Christ one of them worked a geometrical system whereby we measured from the <sup>relation of the</sup> sun the distance around the earth and got it very near to the correct distance. We don't know just what the Hebrews thought in the time that the Bible was written, but we do know that many at least of the Greeks thought the earth was round. But during the middle ages everybody thought it was flat and they interpreted ~~it~~ they took for granted it was flat. Now we find out that the earth is round because we've actually been around it so we have no question. Many people thought that destroyed the Bible. It doesn't because the Bible doesn't say it. But many people took for granted that that was what the Bible means. Now we know that in the universe there is a complexity far beyond what people ever dreamed of in the middle ages. But the Bible doesn't enter into this complexity. It does not attempt to give us a whole account of the universe. But it gives us an account of our relation to Christ.

But, where it touches upon the universe it will touch upon it correctly. What it tells us about the universe is dependable. And when the Bible says that God did this and the next day he did that, and then the third day he did that, we know that these happened in this order. But we're far from understanding all the details, and personally I've just been thinking the last few days, was this earth the first planet God created? The Bible doesn't say it was anywhere. May there not have been, between the original creation of matter and the establishment of this earth as the place on which man might live, a very, very long period. May not he have been very active in connection with other areas. The Bible doesn't say...

O.T.History 27. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...the Bible gives us an account which touches upon certain main features of the universe as a whole, but the attention is focussed upon this earth, and these things which it tells about this earth do not rule out what he may have said for another planet or another sun.

And so we come to this fourth day that Mr. Tow asked us about and on this fourth day the Lord said let there be light in the firmament ~~of~~ the heavens. Now, many people insist

that this word firmament shows that, according to Genesis 1, God made (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) like a thing around the earth, that firmament means something firm, something hard. The word (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) \* is related to a word that means, that is something like brass, that suggests the idea of powder, some light powder that you get from bright brass, is the general idea in this word (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) \* . It's not a common word in Scripture. Exactly what does firmament mean? Does it mean something firm, something big, something solid out there, or does it mean something that looks sort of shiny and polished, like when you look at shining brass, which is a picture of what it means when we look into the sky, that is that expanse around the earth, conservative scholars have nearly all interpreted it as an expanse rather than a fixed solid thing, this firmament.

Well, the firmament, God said let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven. Now that is speaking of the relation of those lights to us as we look at them. We look up and God said let it be that as you look at the <sup>firmament</sup> ~~birds~~ of the heavens you see light. He's not saying in this particular verse let light be placed in this firmament because we know perfectly well that firmament just means (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Let this be visible from this earth. He's not talking here of the relation among stars and among planets, and among the visible parts of the solar system. Let there be lights in the firmament of heaven to divide the days <sup>of</sup> ~~from~~ the year from the nights, and let them be for signs and for seasons and days of the year, introducing these as measures of time. And it was so and God made two great lights, (2  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) how that God made ~~the~~ sun and the moon, that is very definitely put. But did God necessarily make the sun and the moon on the fourth day, or did God on the fourth day cause the sun and the moon to become visible from this earth, to take a place in the firmament, visible about the earth? I don't think we know. I don't think it's stated. I think it is entirely possible that God made the moon and the sun on that fourth day. He could just say like that, let the sun be there. He could do that if he chose. But I think it is equally possible that the sun was up there long before this earth ever came into existence, and that what happened this fourth day is that God caused that they become visible to this earth, and that they become available as means of dividing (3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) <sup>?</sup> time. . That seems to me is the more probable interpretation

of this fourth day. God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night. He made the stars also. That's a very brief statement to cover millions of galaxies, each of them having millions of great suns. It is a very brief statement. It is sufficient, because God is not giving us a (4)

He would need several encyclopedias if that was the purpose. But he does not give us anything here which contradicts any true facts that man will discover. He gives us a few glimpses of the great universe that he's made. He made the stars also and God set them in the firmament of the heavens to give light upon the earth. God taught that from the earth, as you look up, you see these in the firmament above us. He didn't set them in the firmament of the heaven in the sense that he put a big wall around and he put a star here and a star there and a star there. We know that this situation is altogether different from that and there's nothing here to contradict the situation as we find it here. Mr. Deshrande? (student. 4 3/4)

Well, I think the question isn't what seems to us to give him glory but what did he actually do. That is, I might say this, I might say, if God instead of taking ten million years, or ten billion years, to create the universe, did it in six periods of twenty-four hours, that's a hundred and forty-four hours, did it in a hundred and forty-four hours, well that's one billionth as long so it's a billion times as wonderful, much more glorious. But on that reasoning I would say that it would still be another billion times more glorious if he did it in one second. So wouldn't it glorify him much more if I'd say that these days were one second long and he did the whole thing in six seconds. That is to say, I do not believe that we can figure what God did by what would seem to us to be more glorious. I would think if I was going to stick on that point, why didn't he kill Satan immediately when he entered the Garden of Eden, instead of letting him fall. Why didn't he save us all the misery we have by just removing Satan and not allowing the fall. We don't know. We know that the infinitely good and loving God chose to do it this way. And we know that it is the best way or he wouldn't have done it. And God could have caused me to come into existence at my present age, knowing what I know now but having ahead of me all of the years that I've wasted behind me in learning what I now know, and I would like it a lot better.

But he didn't choose to do that. And I think all we can do is look at the Scripture and try to figure out what he didn't, what he tells us that he did do, and recognize there'll be a great deal that he did that he hasn't told us anything about. And many things which he's fairly (6  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

Mr. Tow. (student. 6  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

I have no idea. The Lord could have said let this happen instantly or he could have (7) that it would be part of the process (7 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

I don't know. It is placed more or less on a level with (7 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

Mr. Jaggard, you had your hand up quite a while ago. (student. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

There may very well be some overlapping of activity, just as the suggestion was made that when the earth brings forth the trees and <sup>the plants</sup> ~~grass~~ it just means that they start to grow and they might be continually growing (7  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

There might be an overlapping of activity but there's no indication of it. My guess is that much more than that happened on one day. Now, as to the overlapping of the days, if there was an overlapping, to any great extent, I would think it rather strange that this terminology, the terminology seems to make a rather definite break. <sup>So</sup> ~~Though~~ my guess would be that there's not an overlapping. I don't feel that this language would have been used if it was meant to be a definite overlapping. Mr. ? (student. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

No. This is a picture of man's relation to God and he gives us the picture of those things which he has done particularly that have relation to us. And consequently he tells us that on the fourth day he caused that the light, that the earth should have light visible which would be available for purpose of time division. And that would not necessarily mean that was the only purpose by any means. As a matter of fact, one thing that is never mentioned anywhere else but here, that I see, is one of the very most important things that God did. As I understand it, I don't know a great deal about Physics or Chemistry, but as I understand it just about everything, just about every element, if you have it in a gaseous form and you lower its temperature enough that it becomes liquid, it takes up less space. And then if it is a liquid form, you lower its temperature and it takes up less space. And then you lower it still more so that it becomes a solid and it takes still less space. And so <sup>cold</sup> ~~where~~ causes contraction and heat causes expansion. And that is true, as I

understand it, of most substances. But there is one substance, one of the very commonest substances in the world, which goes the exact opposite at one particular point. When one substance becomes cold enough that it ceases to be a liquid and becomes a solid, instead of occupying less space it occupies more space. And that makes human life possible, outside of water. Because if water was just like practically everything else, when our lakes and our rivers began to freeze, they would freeze, they would become smaller, therefore heavier, they would sink to the bottom, they would freeze from the bottom up, there would be no water available. It would be solid rivers, solid frozen rivers. We know that even up near the North Pole they have great (10 3/4)

with ice upon the top and the submarines now go right underneath them, through the water underneath. Of course, that is something that in Bible times they didn't have to worry about. But they would have to worry about this, that if all the lakes and rivers were solid, there would be no animal life left, there would be no water available for it, outside of the (11)

And the Lord made provision to make human life possible. From the viewpoint of human life, it is one of the most important things he ever did. But the purpose of the Bible is not to give us the understanding of all these things. The purpose of the Bible is to tell us of man's relationship <sup>with</sup> to God and how man can be saved from his sins and he just sketches in a few (11 1/2)

And so the attempt, you can let your mind run, imagine on these things, and you could have lots of fun imagining how he did a lot of things, how he worked them out, and in the course of it you might hit on some very valuable things. But to my mind the vital thing is to recognize this--that there are certain things very clearly said in Scripture, and those things we can depend on, and there are other areas of understanding where the Lord has not made it clear, and we just don't know.

Like again, the illustration I like to give, if I said I came here from Chicago last week I wouldn't say (12 1/2) how I came, or by what means I came, or whether I stopped over on the way. And to my mind, when the Lord says one day, a second day, a third day, in this context here the word day means a period of time, the enumeration of them, the evening or morning where they showed that they were successive periods of time, it gives us an order, a method, by which the Lord proceeded in doing these things, with hints of various details



And when it says that on this day he made fish, he made birds and fish, I should say it suggests <sup>to me</sup> that the birds came first, but I must not say it says birds came <sup>before fish</sup> /~~first~~, because it does not say that, it merely names the two of them and they may be named in a chronological order and they may not. Mr. ? (student. 13)

Well, it might very well include (13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) in it. We just don't know.

Yes? (student. 13 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

That's a later type. Number seven is the seventh day after six (13 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

But maybe there are one or two more (13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) on the sixth day and then we'll come to that. I'm glad you raised it because I might not have intended to take time to deal with it, there's so much but I am intending, but we'll leave that for now. Mr. ? (student. 13 3/4)

I don't find it anywhere (14)

Death came upon humanity. (student (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ))

Well, the Bible doesn't say one way or the other. It would seem to me most likely that they did. It does not state.

O.T. History 28. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, Mr. ? (student)  $\frac{1}{4}$

All men. The curse (3/4)

but I don't think that's necessarily to mean all <sup>death</sup> men. It would doubtless include (3/4) painful death, it would include ~~that~~. The emblem (1)

but then if it was God's will that they should live their lives through a cycle, and a cycle, he may have chosen not to do it that way, we don't know, we don't know. There are many people who say Genesis is just a myth and a legend because it talks about men after the fall living such terribly long lives, it's impossible, such longevity. Well, nothing's impossible with God. The question is what did he do. On this, I don't think (1 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

Mr. f (student. 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) In this 14th verse, God said let there be lights in the firmament. I was wondering (1 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) . There seems to be a distinct possibility that these lights could have come into orbit at such a time as this.) Yes, you mean that it was the fourth day when the earth began to orbit around the sun. (student: yes.) It could be. It could be that the Lord had the earth off somewhere else, (student: 3/4. : or that they all were gathered in) Yes. It's entirely possible. Personally I think it's very unlikely because my guess is that the gathering together of the dry land and the earth bringing forth the grass, my guess is that came before a great movement of the earth (2) but not necessarily, the Lord could have done it either way he chose. We just don't know.

Well, maybe we can go on now to number 7. Number 7 is the seventh day, 7 seventh day, and certainly the seventh day belongs to this picture. The Archbishop <sup>I think</sup> was a little bit burdened when he began this task, he was probably was intending to make chapter divisions for a long time until he couldn't put it off any longer, he said I'm going to do it this morning, and then he got a sudden sick call. So he jumped on his horse, and as he went, he said I can't put this job off any longer, I must do it immediately and his Latin was a little bit rusty, so he looked down there and he saw the words, thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and the host of them. And he said well that must start a new chapter, so he started chapter 2 with the <sup>verse,</sup> ~~words~~ thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. Actually he should have started with verse 4, these were the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created. The two mean substantially the same thing. But verse 1 is concluding the six days of activity and leading up to the 7th while verse 4 is concluding the seven days and going to another chapter with a distinct subject. And so I just wish that that person's illness had come a day later so the Archbishop had **gotten this more accurately** here. Because people often read the first chapter as a unit and then they leave the 7th day to belong to the second chapter where it doesn't belong. It belongs with the first chapter. But on the other hand, maybe on the providence of God; it was best to be this way because it calls to our attention, right at the beginning of our Bible, the fact that the chapter divisions, convenient as they are for us, are only a human device and extremely fallible. Campbell Morgan said, in one sermon I heard him give,

that he believed the chapter divisions in nine cases out of ten were in the wrong place. I think he was much too hard on the Archbishop. My personal guess is that in many, many cases they are very well placed. But there are many cases where they are very badly placed, and this is one of them, right at the beginning of the Bible. But the 7th day then, thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them, and on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made, and he rested on <sup>the</sup> his seventh day from all the works which he had made, and God blessed the 7th day and sanctified it because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made. God was so tired after this heavy activity of these six days that he just had to lie down on the seventh and take it easy for one day, then on the eighth he got up and began going again. I don't think that's what it means at all. I don't think, as it says further on in the Scripture, shall the creator of the earth grow weary, shall he be tired, I don't think God is tired, I don't think God needed rest. But I think that God gave us a picture here to give certain lessons for us. God finished the work in a creative order and then he ceased from his labor. He spent a time in contemplation of what he had done, in rest, in cessation from his labor, as an example to us of the fact that he had made man in such a way that after six days of work, it was the proper thing for man to take a day and rest and to take a day and to look back over the (5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) and to contemplate what he had done, to contemplate the works of God and to think of the meaning (5  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) . He gives us here an example for our lives, of a recurrence of six days of work, and one of ceasing. Not only that but he gives us the principle of life, the eschatological principle, as Professor Bloch used to say. He said the seventh day here was given us an introduction of the eschatological principle, that creation moves toward a goal, there is an end, there is a terminus, there is a day of rest, and that God has a plan, His plan moves toward a goal, and when we take our seventh day and we stop on our seventh day, we remind ourselves of the fact that life is not, as the old Greeks thought of it, just a cycle that goes round and round and round indefinitely forever, but that it is a progress toward a goal, that there is a purpose in (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) that God has a plan and that He is moving forward toward that plan.

And so God directed everything in the Old Testament times looking forward toward the

completion of his spiritual work with us, even as he completed his physical work here of creation, and then since Calvary we still look forward to God's work that He is going to do but we also to an even greater extent look back to what Jesus did at Calvary by His death and His resurrection. And so we observe the Sabbath day on the first day of the week and we look back to, we have the two ideas, we look on to God's finished work until He comes, but we look back to the foundation of it which He did by His work on Calvary. There is then, in this seventh day, there is not so much a revelation of specific things that God did, as ~~it~~<sup>there</sup> is a revelation of certain lessons that God wants us to have. And I think that all through this there is much we can learn about what God and how He did it. But perhaps even more important for our lives on what we can learn about our lives, and what we ought to know. I see that the clock is moving fast and I must mention about the fact that, on the coming Friday, at the section hour, there will be a brief written lesson for the Middlers and Seniors, a lesson which covers all the Hebrew of one great chapter, the first chapter of Genesis and also ~~everything~~<sup>else</sup> that was done in class. Now it may not be very long, it may cover about half the hour, or a little more I'm not sure. And that will be the section hour for the Middlers and Seniors this week. Monday the Juniors will meet alone in the section hour. Next Monday morning at ten-thirty and our next lecture will be Monday afternoon.

(9<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>)...seventh day. I did not give separate headings to the other days because the material is fairly easy to understand in most of them and we did discuss a little bit of several of them in connection with our discussion of the meaning of the word day. In a detailed consideration of the first two chapters of Genesis, we would have to spend some time on each of these days, but for our present purpose it will not be necessary. Consequently I did not give them a separate head. But the seventh day I have, and we've noticed a little bit about the meaning of the seventh day. Did God rest for one day and then start working again? Why God is always working. He holds all things together by the word of His power. God is not a man that he gets tired and needs to rest. It is not rest in the sense of human rest. It is cessation from his creative activity. He ceases the creative activity and rests from that. We do not believe the universe would continue without God holding it

together. God is always working. But he ceases from the creative activity. Does he cease from creative activity for one day and then go on further? Or do we have six periods in which he carried on creative activity and then for the following period he ceases? How long is that period? Are we still in the seventh <sup>day</sup> ~~period~~ as far as the days of creation are concerned? Or has God again started a cycle of creative activity? Those are questions which we merely mention. It is not necessary for the purpose of this course to find answers to them. The <sup>big thing</sup> ~~sixth-day~~ that I believe is most important (11 1/4) in our Bible study, if we're going to be interpreters of the Bible, is to learn that fundamental matter of seeing what the Bible definitely says and standing on that. Then, where there are possibilities of different interpretation, recognizing the possibilities, saying I personally feel this is the more likely but I may be wrong. (11 3/4)

But what the Bible is clear on, on that we stand. So to make a distinction between what is clearly taught in the Bible and what is a matter of interpretation, a selection between two or three possible interpretations, all of which may be possible and true in relation to what it states (12 , that is but I think it's extremely vital in all our (12 1/4) understanding of the word and of our interpretation of it too. Unless there is some question on the seventh day, we move on to a much more difficult problem.

Number 8, How the knowledge in this chapter was imparted. How did we get the material in Genesis 1? Well, now, briefly to summarize an important section of the course in Old Testament Introduction, necessary at this point. Our knowledge of God has come to us in two ways. (12 3/4)

You might say three because we see God and his works of creation in the world generally, we see God, we see His activity, we learn something about (13) We learn of His goodness, we learn of His power (13)

Most that we know about God comes from one of two ways. The first of these is by revelation. And when I say we receive revelation from God it's exactly the same as if I said I received an <sup>communication</sup> ~~invitation~~ from one of you. If someone were to ask me when was Mr. Millheim

born I would look at Mr. Millheim and I would examine the appearance of his face, the amount of hair he has, the number of teeth he has, and so on, and I would try to make an estimate of how old he was, and my father used to be able to, he'd look at a man and he'd say well, he'd say his shoulder looks like a man of about 46 but from the back he looks more like a man of 45, I don't know whether he's 45 or 46. He could estimate just about within a couple of months a man's age, by his physical structure. Personally, if I get within 10 years I'm doing pretty good on that basis. But I don't think even my father would've been able to look at Mr. Millheim and tell you what month he was born, I'm sure he wouldn't. There's only one way in which I could find out what month Mr. Millheim was born. That is to have been present myself when it occurred and thus know about it by observation, or to have somebody tell me. This would be communication. Mr. Millheim would tell me what month he was born, I would then know. There has to be a communication, giving me facts that would not otherwise be available to me.

Now, when God gives a revelation to you and me he does exactly the same thing that everyone of us does when we give communication to one another. We give them, we transmit to them some knowledge, and <sup>they</sup> we take it from <sup>us</sup> them. And nine-tenths at least of what any of us know about anything comes by revelation in this...

## O.T.History 29. (3/4)

...in order to know we have to get them by revelation from God. Well, now revelation then is God transmitting, and I mean by some sort of a communication to us human beings, and the Bible contains revelation. The Bible tells us that God said to Moses these are the ten commandments. He gave them to him. That God said to Isaiah go out into the region outside Jerusalem and speak to Ahab. It has revelation which God gave to a human being. So much of the Bible came by revelation. But not all. There are many sections, you take the book of Luke. Luke says that he has investigated the details of the story he writes, talked with those who were connected with <sup>him at</sup> various stages of his career, gathered evidence, compared it,

arranged it, and presents you the conclusions about it. He has gone at it in the scientific method of gathering evidence, examining it, checking it, and giving you the results. He tells you what the eye-witnesses told him of what they saw and heard. When Matthew says that Jesus said this is the way you are to preach, God did not have to reveal to Matthew that Jesus gave the Lord's prayer. Matthew may have been right there present and received it from the Lord as a communication just as I receive a communication from one of you. When John tells us that Jesus went into the Temple and he drove out the money changers, God does not have to reveal to John that Jesus drove out the money changers. John may have seen it happen and he writes down what he saw. So there are many parts of the Bible which were not given to a writer by a revelation from God. The writer wrote down something that he had gained a knowledge of in some other way than by a revelation. But we believe that the Bible--all of it--was inspired of God. And that is a different thing from revelation.

Inspiration is the activity of the Holy Spirit in leading the writers as to what they're to write and keeping them from error in what they wrote. Jesus said the Holy Spirit will guide you, He will remind you of what I said, and He will lead you into further truth. The Holy Spirit gave them revelations but we believe that He led in addition in other ways. And one way was to inspire them and in keeping them from error as they wrote the material down. John might have thought that at a certain location there were ten men present, at a certain place. But John may have been mistaken, there may have been eight men and two women. In such a case the Holy Spirit would lead John, instead of saying there were ten men there, to say there were ten people there. It would be people would be true, men would have been a mistake, because two of them were women. If the ten were men, people would still be true, but God would have led him to use the word, the Holy Spirit would have led him to use the word which would avoid putting into it any erroneous idea that would (4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) be in his mind. An inspiration, God keeps the writers from error. The result of that is, that no matter how the man got that idea, no matter whether he misunderstood somebody, no matter whether he thought he saw <sup>something</sup> and really something different happened, no matter whether he made a mistake, as I'm sure everyone of the writers of the Bible made many, many mistakes in his life, I've never seen the person that didn't make a mistakes frequently. I get dis-

gusted with some of the mistakes I make myself and wonder how any sensible human being could make them. We all make mistakes but the Holy Spirit kept the writers from incorporating their mistakes into that which He would have as part of the Word of God, so that the Bible as it came from the hands of the writers was free from error. Now that is inspiration. Well, now, that being the case, then as far as I personally am concerned, it doesn't make any difference to me whether God dictated the first chapter of Genesis to Moses by giving it to him by revelation, or whether Moses was there and saw the whole thing happen and just described what he saw. Because in the latter case the Holy Spirit was keeping him from error, and the result is that to me it is a revelation from God, even though to Moses it was in such a case merely a writing down of what he saw, or what he heard someone else predicate in any particular way we don't (5 3/4)

Well, now this is a very important distinction to have in mind, the whole Bible is then a revelation to me from God. If the Bible says the coat that I left Troas bring with me, where Paul writes that to Timothy. If the Bible says that, that is a revelation from God. I know that the Lord <sup>sets the</sup> ~~said to~~ seal of his approval upon the fact that Paul left his coat at Troas and that Paul asked Timothy to bring it to him, with him, to Paul here. That is a revelation of God to me. As far as Paul is concerned it is not a revelation from God, it is a remembrance of the fact, a realization that winter is coming on and he stayed here longer than he expected and that therefore he asked Timothy to bring it with him in order that he wouldn't have to do a week's extra tent-making in order to buy a new coat. He could spend that much on preaching the gospel instead of having to do that much extra tent-making. So then it is a revelation from God to me but it is not a revelation from God to Paul.

So now with those considerations in mind, and there's quite (7) for our attitude toward all (7 1/4), the question ~~is to~~ how the knowledge in this chapter was imparted is not a tremendously important question. Because as far as I'm concerned it is a revelation of God to me. I know that this chapter, correctly interpreted, is true. I know that whatever is said corresponds to fact, but how did Moses know. Well, the Holy Spirit kept him from error as he wrote it down. Yes, but where did Moses get the ideas. Personally, I do not ~~feel~~ <sup>believe</sup> that Moses was there when it happened. I don't



think he heard the Lord say, let there be light, I don't think he saw the light come into existence. I do not believe that he is writing as a personal eye-witness in the things he tells us in Genesis 1. Well, then, did God say, Moses I want you to write down these words, in the beginning God created heaven~~s~~ and earth, and go on and dictate Genesis 1:1-3. Maybe he did. I don't know. But the Bible nowhere says he did. Therefore, I do not know that he did and I do not know that he did not. I have absolutely no grounds on which to make a judgment, whether God dictated the first chapter to Moses or not. Maybe God ~~told~~<sup>caused</sup> Moses to see a vision. Maybe God said to Moses, now in writing this book that is going to be so important for the people you are leading up into the land of Canaan, I want you to have an idea of how the world began so I'm going to give you a vision, maybe up there on the mountain in between giving him the various laws, God gave him a vision, and Moses went into sort of a trance and heard God's voice and he saw changes take place and then he described what he saw. That's possible. If he did, we know at least the Holy Spirit kept him from error in what he wrote down so that what he wrote down, by being a description of what he saw, is a description of what actually happened in the creation. Even there's much of it we may not know, between two or three possible interpretations which is right, yet whatever is clearly stated there (9 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

because the Holy Spirit kept him from error as he wrote.

Maybe then that is the way that Moses got it. Maybe Moses, when he was a little boy and the Egyptian princess had hired his mother, not knowing she was his mother, to be his nurse, maybe this, the mother, told him a story. Moses, the little boy, looked up and he saw the sky and the clouds and he said, Mommy, where did all this come from? And his mother told him the story she <sup>(10) N.</sup> remembered, how she thought it had come into existence. And Moses, years later, remembered this story and the Holy Spirit caused him to write down an account of how it came into existence in which those parts of what his mother said were true, were included, and in which it would change those that were not in accordance with facts. It's not a complete story of creation. That would take several encyclopedias certainly. It only touches upon certain things. But what it touches is true. Maybe that's where Moses got it from.

Now where did Moses get the account of Abraham? Did God say Moses, here's what happened to Abraham? ~~It~~ I don't think that's so. Did the account of Abraham come from ~~the account~~<sup>what</sup>

Moses' mother had told him. I don't think likely, it's too detailed. My guess is that Moses had manuscripts that Abraham or someone of Abraham's family wrote down what happened. And these had been passed along and Moses took these manuscripts and used them. Were these manuscripts free from error. I don't think so. They might have been. But I have no reason to think that the writer of these manuscripts was inspired. But Moses was inspired and so Moses was led of the Spirit to select from the manuscripts about Abraham those matters which God was desirous of having in the sacred Scriptures. And to omit from it any portions of them which did not fit with God's purpose in Scriptures or which were untrue. Consequently, it is possible that Moses utilized writings from someone connected with Abraham and maybe that included an account of creation, I don't know.

Of course, that pushed the problem a little further back, then where did Abraham get it? The answer to this is we do not know. Now suppose a man comes to me and he says here we have discovered in Babylonia an account of creation. And he says this account of creation which we have discovered in Babylonia was written long before the time of Moses and it is so similar to the account of Genesis that it must be the source from which the account of Genesis was developed by abbreviating, omitting quantities of details, rearranging and making a story out of that, and that's where this came from. I will not accept his statement that it came from such a source as provable without a very, very careful and thorough examination of evidence. I'm not going to take an important thing like that on just a light off-hand superficial conclusion of somebody or even of one that rests on a good bit of study.

But, I will say this, if it should be proven, if this could be proven, that Genesis 1 was a condensation of a Babylonian heathen narrative, with the polytheistic details omitted and certain things changed around by the writer, if that could be true, I would be ready to say, well, maybe that's the way that God brought it about. That in the Bible here (13 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) there would be this , that he enabled Moses or someone before Moses to take this Babylonian material, to select what was right and what was true, omit what was wrong, to make certain changes, and give a correct account. But the thing that matters is that the Holy Spirit who inspired Moses kept him from error, so that what I have is God's word to (13 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

Now, for me to say this is the way it came into existence would be very foolish. I would need very, very definite evidence before I'd say (13 3/4) but what I do say is that it is not impossible that ~~you~~<sup>it</sup> could have come into existence that way. The gital thing is that the Holy Spirit inspired~~d~~ the writer and kept him from error.

Now, there are many people today who become very much excited about verbal inspiration, and very much against it, but who are real Christians and who believe what we do about the Bible, but are against verbal inspiration because they interpret verbal inspiration as meaning dictation, and they say how terrible to think that the Bible was given by dictation. Well, verbal inspiration doesn't mean dictation, it means that the words of the Bible are the words God wants there. The term verbal inspiration deals with the results, not with the method of producing them. But suppose it were given by dictation, what's wrong with that? I can dictate a letter to a secretary, nobody things anything wrong with that. Why couldn't God dictate the Bible, if He chose to do so. Now I don't think he chose to do so because we have great variation in the style of different books. We have evidences of the human personalities such as to lead me to feel convinced that when the writers describe a thing and see a thing, it is in their own language, their own personality shows through ...

O.T. History 30. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...I see nothing wrong with the idea of dictation, but I do not think that it's an idea that is taught anywhere in Scripture, or required by Scriptural teaching, and the facts as I find them in the Bible do not fit with it, therefore, I do not believe that the bulk of the Bible was given by dictation, but I do believe that all is verbally inspired and part of it is by dictation, wherever we have precise<sup>words</sup> dictated, put down, as independent (1) , we have that given by dictation. Where Jesus gave the Lord's prayer, and they wrote it down, that was certainly given by dictation. Wherever we have dictation in the Bible, but I think it's a comparatively small part of it, but I believe all of it (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) is verbally inspired.

Well, then I believe that as Christians we can say that Genesis 1 is entirely (1 1/4) as any other part of the Scripture, provided that it's been correctly transmitted, there's always the possibility of error in copying, but leaving out that possibility, it is entirely true, it was entirely true, <sup>as</sup> it came from the hand of the writer in the original manuscript and I believe it because it was inspired of God, not because I know how Moses got the information.

Now, I think that's going to save us a great deal of difficulty, if we have a clear understanding of this concept. There are those who talk about the Old Testament as being a derivation of Babylonian myths and legends and I'm sure that the faith of many Christians is wrecked upon that. Well, it is not a derivation of Babylonian myths and legends. There are many parts which certainly have nothing in the world to do with Babylonian myths and legends and many parts which sharply contradict them. But if at any point, it should be proven that the information came in this way, that does not injure anyone's faith, provided you keep a firm hold on this point, that what was actually written in the Bible was inspired <sup>of</sup> ~~by~~ the Holy Spirit from heaven, free from error and 2 3/4)

Well, so much then for a rather rapid survey of this very important question, how the knowledge in the chapter was imparted. You might say (3)

I hope that it's not too much for some of you to take in in a brief space, but I hope that you've gotten at least some of the main thoughts (3 1/4)

If some of you haven't gotten, don't worry too much, because we'll touch upon them from time to time, they are so (3 1/4) . Mr. ? (student. 3 1/4)

Well, the word (3 1/2) ~~plenary~~ <sup>plenary</sup> literally means full, sufficient. I would say that (3 1/2) ~~plenary~~ <sup>sufficient</sup>, means that it is sufficiently inspired to be (3 1/2)

And verbal inspiration means that what is inspired is the word. And I don't think inspiration applies to anything but word (3 3/4) If it's thought, that's revelation. God revealed something, but He inspires the writer to put down the correct thing. So to my mind, neither term is an altogether satisfactory one and I believe

they  
in both verbal and plenary. But if somebody is terribly upset by the fear that verbal inspiration may mean dictation and prefers to use plenary, I have no objection. To me either term is . And there are people, there are some good Christians, who are very, very, who believe in plenary inspiration but are very, very much shocked at the idea of verbal inspiration, and I believe that is a misunderstanding, what we mean by them, but I don't think we should try to overcome it, I think we should try to get the reality (4 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Well, so much for this 8th point then, and I think probably the best thing to do is to ask you folks to explain it to me one of these days, and then I will find out just how far short I came of getting this across, the whole understanding of this very complex matter, and I'll know what points I'll need to repeat or stress again (5)

But we'll go on to number 9. Number 9 is the claim of Babylonian origin for this chapter. And here I am in a little bit of a dilemma as to the proper method of handling this subject. The claim of Babylonian origin for this chapter. The Babylonian material, that is material from Mesopotamia, Babylonia and Assyria, when first discovered related mostly to the books of the Kings and it was only later that material was discovered relating to Genesis. And this is so important for the understanding of the relation of archeology to the Bible that, at least one year when I gave this course, I ~~changed~~ the order around stopping with the book of Kings. And then the second semester I went back to the beginning of the Bible. There's much to be said because the understanding of Old Testament History, of the subject as a whole not just the very vital question what does the Bible mean, is in these things closely bound up with the understanding of some of the main features of Biblical archeology. And Biblical archeology is easier to understand if you start with the period of kings and go back to Genesis. Well, this year I'm going through in the natural Biblical order which I think is better to deal with Old Testament History, but we must deal with some of these matters of archeology. And therefore, at this point, under this subheading, the claim of the Babylonian origin for Genesis 1, at this point I'm going to take an excussis, you might say, an introduction to the matter of archeology. We won't go into any great detail on it,

we'll do that later (6 3/4) ,but I want you to have an understanding of the importance of archeology for Biblical study in Genesis, and an understanding of how the relation of archeology to this chapter fits into the movement of archeology. So let me say that 120 years ago practically everything we knew of ancient history, aside from the Bible, was subsequent to 500 B.C. Practically everything we knew aside from the Bible, subsequent to 500 B.C. Now somebody says, well, everybody knew about the conquest of Troy by the Greeks, and that was at least 500 years earlier. Yes, a hundred and twenty years ago, every educated person had heard the story of Homer's Iliad, of the conquest of Troy, but nobody believed there was much truth in it, because it was a story in which the gods of Greece enter in, fighting against one another in the most grotesque ways imaginable, there's so much ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> myth and legend mixed with it, that 120 years ago everybody considered that this was the product of the imagination of the Greeks' destroying, of the conquest of Troy. Maybe there was a city called Troy, maybe it was conquered, but we didn't know anything about it, because the story we have is so mythical. Well, it was toward the end of the last century that there was a German, what kind of store, was it a meat market he ran, I forget, butcher, yes, a German Butcher who did not have a great deal of education but was self-educated, an excellent business man who had made a fortune for himself, was self-educated and read Homer's Iliad, and was greatly interested, went over to Troy--or to (9)

which are mentioned in Homer's Iliad and he began to excavate, and the scholars who saw what he was doing laughed. He wasn't educated, he wasn't trained to do anything like this, they thought it was nonsense, but he believed there was a solid foundation back of the story of the conquest of Troy and of the great civilization in southern Greece (9 1/4)

and so he carried on the excavation and he found buried the remains of a great city with a civilization similar to that described in Homer's Iliad and different from that of later Greece <sup>(9 1/2)</sup> at the time when the Greeks (9 1/2)

And it was recognized that that was what he had discovered and everyone knows now that there was an actual Troy and there was a civilization in Greece at that time very different from the later civilization of which we find echoes in The Iliad. Well, this of course puts the

story of Troy on an entirely different footing than it was before but it does not mean that we believe that Jove (10) or that Venus and Juno and Athena offered an apple to Paris and the Trojan War came as a result. It doesn't mean we accept any of the Greek mythology but we do believe there is a historical background for these events. And that is the part that denotes the progress of archeology. We begin to find the remains (10 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Well, one hundred and twenty years ago that that had not been found and at that time the events in the ancient world were practically unknown except except for the Bible, back of 500 B.C. A few mythical stories that we didn't pay much attention to, that was all we had (10  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

But we had, a hundred and twenty years ago, we had in the Old Testament an account of many kings who lived before 500 B.C. We had an account of great cities otherwise unknown, destroyed before 500 B.C. We had account of whole nations otherwise completely unknown. And one hundred and twenty years ago there naturally were unbelievers, they would say well, this is just a mythical story made up, there's no truth to it, there's no background of fact to it. Then I say a hundred and twenty years because it was about a hundred and sixteen years ago now, that a French Vice-Consul named Emile Botta went to Moso (11 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) he was Consul at Moso on the upper Tigris River, and there he went across the River and he began to dig there into a mound in the desert and there he found the remains of an ancient city. And he dug for a long time but he didn't find any evidence of what the city was, but a young Englishman named Henry Layard came along and he began to dig in a different part of the mound and there he found the evidence as to the actual name of the city and something of its greatness and found that it was the city of Ninevah, described in the book of Jonah as a city of three days, and here was Ninevah, destroyed before history began, completely forgotten. People questioned there ever was a great city like Ninevah. And now we had actual proof of it and they brought to the British Museum and the the Louvres in Paris, statues from Ninevah, a great (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) would stand up here two-thirds as high from the ground as a (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) . And made in those days when inscriptions on them telling about the kings were made. And pretty soon they began to find inscriptions in Ninevah and this area, making reference to Israelite kings who are named

Rice tells me he will be able to make it available to students here for a little under five dollars. And he will be ordering some in the near future. Now I ~~thought~~<sup>trust</sup> before the end of the year every one of you will have a copy. But I'd like to know how many might care to order it now so that Mr. Rice could put in an order and might be able to get ahead of publication date. Would you raise your hand, any of you who right now are ready to say. Would you like to count them, Mr. Rice, or would you rather have a list of names? (student)

Yes, the title is The Ancient Near East, edited by James<sup>B</sup>/Pritchard, The Ancient Near East, an anthology of text and pictures, to be published October 31 this year. As I say, I hope we can get ahead of the deadline. They sent me a free copy on Saturday because I had advised them what text to include in it, to be sure to be of most value to our course. Mr. Jaggard? (student. 2)

No, anybody that prefers these two, \$16 for one, \$18 for the other, except you can get a discount on them, naturally you don't need them, <sup>or</sup> but if you're going to specialize in Old Testament, I, personally, think it's worth the extra five dollars to carry those around (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Well, now, this book, we will probably use more next semester than this one, because it has the text which touches on the history of the later Israelite kings and we'll look at many of them. This semester we will look at a few of the type which relate to earlier things in the Bible. There aren't so many relating to that as there are the later ones, but the study of them is in a way more important than the later ones, and the bigger one is in the Library. You can find the complete Babylonian creation story in it, this has the last half of the creation story in it. <sup>That's</sup> ~~At~~ one place Dr. Pritchard didn't follow my advice, I urged him to put the whole creation story, but he put the last half of it in, but he has a very good collection on the whole. <sup>If</sup> ~~He~~ didn't follow my advice on the one point, I think on most points he pretty well (3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) followed what I would think is the best collection for the purpose. Mr. ? (student. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, it is impossible to make a translation of anything without your background affecting it to some extent. But I don't think that it affects it to a great extent, for this reason: that most of the texts are not just discovered now, most of them have been known for some time. Various people have made translations. When poor translations have been made, others



have jumped on them, and criticized them, and <sup>while</sup> there are (4) places where — a theological pre-supposition would affect these translations, I think they are comparatively few in the book. I believe that the book is a very good presentation of the text; though it is a translation and any translation is not exact, can't be, and their theological ideas would affect it in some places, but I don't think a great deal. It is better than any other book on the subject I know of because for one thing it's more complete, for the other it's much more up-to-date (4½)

But archeology resulted in the years from 1840 until about 1855 or 60, in those years, it resulted in the discovery of many evidences of the existence of the Israelite kingdom and of other individual cities and nations, mentioned in the Old Testament, that they actually existed and that they existed at the time in relation to today which the Bible mentioned. That is to say, the Bible mentions an Assyrian is conquering Israel, here you have an inscription by the Assyrian king naming the Israelite <sup>kingdom</sup> / it conquered. That shows they were at the same time, and it's pretty difficult over a long period to just use the names, you didn't know anything more about them, to get them correct in that (5½)

There was very good evidence of the dependability in general of the historical accounts of the time of the later Israelite kings in those evidences which came to light before 1860. Now of course, many more have come to light since. They've been studied over, I understand they have been proved, they have a tremendous amount of evidence, not to prove the Bible is true. We could never prove a book the size of the Bible is true, too much detail of course. But it ~~is~~ disproves attacks made upon it and it shows a background fitting evidence with statement. (6½)

that wherever we have sufficient evidence to fairly test the statements of the Bible, the Bible stands the test. That's what I was (6½) trying to say. Wherever we can test (6½) light it stands.

If you could test it everywhere of course you wouldn't need it, you'd have the whole thing from some other source. But this was a great progress of archeology and in 1870 it took a further (6 ¾) <sup>2.</sup> step.

In 1870 a man in the British Museum named George Smith, who was studying cuneiform text there, sent a letter to a newspaper in London, Excavation had just about stopped for about ten years. People had stopped giving money to it, they had so many tablets, so much already

dug up that they couldn't study it all, what was the need of spending a lot of money to get more. Interest had lapsed. But George Smith gave a report in his letter to this London newspaper of the tablets he had found in the British Museum which he said a Babylonian tablet which described the flood, very similar to the account in the Bible, and that aroused tremendous interest. Here was actual evidence of the flood. George Smith found a Babylonian tablet telling the story of the flood. Well, the London newspaper gave money, they gave a sum of money to George Smith, to go to Mesopotamia and look for more texts, for more (8) to be dug. Because what he had actually found was about six tablets which he was able to fit together, broken tablets, fit them together, and got an account of the flood very similar in many (8½) to the account of the flood in the Bible, in this Babylonian cuneiform writing, the wedge-shaped writing.

Well, George Smith rushed to Mesopotamia and began excavating, hunting for tablets, found more flood tablets and then he found some tablets which told about a creation, and he said here we have evidence not only of the truth of the flood but of the truth of the Biblical story of creation. And in 1875, I think it was, wasn't it, George Smith published a book which he called *The Chaldean Account of Genesis*. This book that was published contained the description of the creation, the deluge, the tower of Babel, the destruction of Sodom, the times of the patriarchs and Nimrod, Babylonian fables, and legends of the gods, in the cuneiform inscriptions, by George Smith. No, 1875 when he published it. And he found evidence of the story of creation from Babylonian ~~stories~~ <sup>sources</sup> showing that Genesis was true. And then he went back to Mesopotamia and began more excavation and he caught fever and died. And the whole world was excited by the death of George Smith, and the result of it was that several nations immediately raised money to send their own groups to begin excavation, and ~~that~~-excavation has gone on more or less ever since. And George Smith contributed to the interest in archeology tremendously by his discovery of the flood tablets in the British Museum. Then his death contributed to ~~archeology~~ <sup>the interest</sup> in archeology because so much interest had been taken in George Smith that when he died the whole civilized world was interested in it, excited about it, and then they sent more expeditions and ever since there have been many nations working in excavations, learning more about ancient Mesopotamia and ancient

Egypt. Now we'll look at further details of these things later, but what I'm trying to do now is to give you the general progress of (10<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>)<sup>u.</sup> thought. You see, first, evidence found that the statement about the kings of Judah and Israel were true. Monuments put up by some, more particularly monuments put up by Babylonian kings or by Egyptian kings, refer to these men mentioned in the Bible in some (10<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>) event, recorded in the Bible. Now that comes from wonderful ~~corroboration~~ <sup>corroboration</sup> of the dependability of the Biblical account of the kings. Then we find evidence of the flood story, and evidence of creation. And it reached a point where there were Christian people who were ready to grab a word out of any Babylonian tablet that looked like a word in the Bible and say look at here, marvelous proof the Bible is true. Here's this word here that corresponds to this and proves the Bible is true. In other words, they just kind of went overboard and forgot everything about sound reason <sup>in thinking</sup> ~~about~~ because the first discoveries proved the accuracy and dependability of portions of the Bible that anything you find anywhere in Babylon that has a similarity to something in the Bible proves the Bible is true. And when you have this attitude, this attitude continued among some Christian people for a long time, you had some unbelieving people who were very disgusted with it, very much against it, though there wasn't anything much they could do about it, and then, was it 1905 or 07, it was just about that time, that the Germans decided to start a great excavation in Babylon, and they decided to send, to raise money for the German Orient Society, to carry on excavations in Babylon and they held a big meeting in Berlin, for the purpose of which they had the noted Professor of E Friedrich Dalry (12<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>)<sup>u.</sup>, son of the great Biblical commentator, Franz D , to give the great address. And Friedrich D came to that meeting, and the Emperor of Germany, Kaiser Wilhelm, was there at the meeting, with the leaders of his court, the ambassadors from all the different countries, it was such an audience ~~never~~ as you rarely get for a scientific lecture. They were all there for this big meeting and Professor D gave the first of his series of his Bible and Babel lectures. And in this lecture he said, first he said, the historical statements of the Bible are wonderfully proven by archeology. Grand to know about these later in the writings, how accurate they are. Then, he said, in the one (13)<sup>u.</sup> part of the Bible you have stories of creation, the flood, and so on, he said we have these things in Babylon too. But the difference is

that the Babylonian records were written hundreds of years before the Biblical. Consequently, he said, these stories are things that no human being thought, they're not historical, they're simply myths and legends. The Biblical stories are simply imitative from the Babylonian myths and legends. And there's no truth in them at all, they're just stories, the only thing ~~this is~~ <sup>is, he says,</sup> the moral tone of the Babylonian is much higher than the Biblical. For instance, he says, in the Babylonian story you find that the Babylonian Noah says, he looked out of the Ark and he saw people floating about like logs of wood and he weeped to think of all the people that died in the flood. He says there's no indication of compassion whatever in the Biblical <sup>Noah</sup> ~~account~~. Of course, that's purely imaginary on his part and shows the hatred which this <sup>Friedrich D</sup> man/had toward the Bible which his Godly father <sup>Franz D</sup> taught, had done so much to expound. Friedrich D, who was an utter (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) wrote a book later on which he called The Great Fraud, in which he attacked the Old Testament and a great unbeliever and denier of Christianity, he gave this great lecture here with all (14 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) these <sup>what</sup> people around, he said got into the telegrams all over the world, was featured in the big newspapers, for the next two weeks, they say anywhere you went, everybody was talking about it, at the barber shop, (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) saw the cabmen waiting for people for their cabs, they were all arguing, was D right? A post card they put out showed a dog baying at the moon, had letters below, is D right? And it was the big topic of discussion/for the next three or four <sup>and continued to be</sup> ~~weeks~~ <sup>years</sup>. And some unbelieving professors said, isn't this wonderful? Babylon has destroyed Babylon. What was meant by that? Here was evidence from Babylon that proved the Bible true, but now here is evidence from Babylon to prove that the stories of creation, flood and all this, are just old-fashioned Babylonian myths and don't prove anything about the reality at all. So that which was a great instrument toward the increase of faith and substantiating of belief in Christianity, has now become, in their minds, an instrument for the tearing down of faith/<sup>in Christianity</sup> and for the destruction of the Bible. Babylon has...

Then after that, then to show this movement in which it was used, archeology, as a great  
 (3/4) that would be <sup>the</sup> a logical approach from the viewpoint of archeology.  
 But from our viewpoint of going through the Bible in Biblical order, the first place we come  
 in contact with archeology is where we have the story of Genesis 1 and we have the statement  
 made by so many writers, that the Biblical story here is simply taken over from the Babylonian  
 story. Now here is a book written by Professor Byron M. Price from the University of Chicago,  
 a professor a good many years ago, and Professor Price I believe was an earnest Christian.  
 Professor Price said, in comparing the Babylonian story with the Biblical story, he said  
 note the resemblances and differences, and he gives six resemblances and only three differ-  
 ences. He says, how can you account for those few unlikenesses. Did the writer of the  
 Genesis record borrow his account from the Babylonian tablets, or did the Babylonian writing  
 have its origin in the Genesis account, or did both <sup>derive</sup> their story from a common original source.  
 Professor Price tried to prove the third, that they both derived from an original source.  
 But is that the fact? What is the fact of their relationship?

My personal belief is, that if the so-called Babylonian story of creation had been  
 first found without any relation to the Bible and studied as such simply as a Babylonian  
 myth, it would have been very, very difficult <sup>to convince</sup> ~~for anybody to prove~~ that it had any re-  
 lationship to Genesis. But it was George Smith and the other believers in the Bible who  
 grabbed a couple of words and said look, here's proof of the Bible, and they got people  
 into this viewpoint that anything you find that sounds like something in the Bible, that  
 proves the Bible is true, and made the groundwork for Professor D and for various  
 others to take this argument and turn it around and use it as it has been, as a potent  
 argument, to destroy faith in the Bible and it is so being used today.

I sat in a class twenty years ago at the University of Pennsylvania with Professor  
 Barton. There was a young Orthodox Jew and myself, the two members of the class, and Pro-  
 fessor Barton was reading us the Gilgamesh story. As we read it Professor Barton would  
 make comments, like we would read about Gilgamesh, he was two-thirds god and one-third man.  
 Well, Professor Barton would say, that's where they get the idea of the god-man, half-god,  
 half-man, Gilgamesh. Then we'd go on and we'd read how one of the goddesses, in response

to somebody's prayer, took some earth and kneaded it together and breathed into it and made a man out of it in order to fight another man, to deliver the people from a plot there in ancient Babylon, or (3 3/4) one city near Babylon. And he'd say, that's where the idea of man being made of the dust of the earth with the breath of life came from. And this other student <sup>would</sup>/look ~~at~~ there and say, my, isn't it wonderful to know where it all came from, where it all started. It's not surprising that later on, he left his <sup>original</sup> ~~religion~~ (3 3/4) intention of devoting ~~devoted~~ his life to Bible study and he devoted <sup>himself</sup> ~~his life~~ now entirely to linguistics, the study of linguistics, English and Japanese and other languages, after a start of many years, <sup>study</sup> why he's completely left it because it just completely destroyed his faith in it. Well, we have to know something about this because you will find, if you deal with educated people you'll be surprised how often you'll find this is a vital point in their relationship to Christianity, and so we want to look at this ~~before-we-go~~ but I see out time is up, we'll do that tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock. Yes? (student. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

No, it's his son, ~~his~~ son.

...write your name on it and underneath that simply write the name of the first discoverer of the Babylonian tablets of creation and the flood. I told quite a bit about him yesterday--just his name. Just write your name and his name, is all I want. ...

Now we were speaking yesterday about the Babylonian story of the flood. And we noticed that George Smith found this tablet and that on this tablet it said that he raised the stars to give light and to set time, and he said how similar it is to the fourth day in creation. And then they found other tablets which referred to the establishment of making of animals and to the making of fish, and different things similar to creation so they said here is the Babylonian story of the creation. Of course, at that time nothing was known about these except the little <sup>bit</sup>/he could gather from these tablets and not a great deal was known about the Babylonian language anyway. ~~If~~ Something was known, we could read simple things, but when it came to the complexities of the language, there have been many years of study and great progress made. And also we have since that time discovered many new sections of the various epics, Babylonian epics, and we have found that some tablets which he thought were part of the creation story belong to different stories altogether, as a matter of fact,

there are quite a number of different Babylonian stories which refer to the creation of one other thing in the world. For instance, I will read you one of them, which, if you don't yet have your books, The Ancient East, I will read you this one, it's a rather brief one, but it's quite interesting. It's on page one hundred of Ancient Near East text, and it's also, I believe, in the <sup>portable?</sup> anthology? (81 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) .

The title which is given is a title which has been given by modern <sup>people?</sup> teachers; so I won't read you the title until after I read you the text, but here is the text which has been followed and which <sup>is</sup> has not been considered a part of the main creation story to which we've made reference. "After Annu [that's the god of heaven] (had created the heaven) <sup>Heaven had</sup> and created (the earth) ~~The earth had created the rivers~~ ~~The rivers had created the canals~~ ~~The canals had created the marsh~~ (And) the marsh had created the worms, ~~The worm went, weeping, before Shamash, [Shamash was the sun god] His tears flowing before~~ <sup>Ea:</sup> ~~Ayah [Ayah was the god of wisdom]~~, "What wilt thou give for my food? <sup>sucking?"</sup> What wilt thou give me for my <sup>sustenance?</sup> "I shall give thee the <sup>ripe fig</sup> ~~ripe fig~~ (And) the apricot." "Of what use are they to me, the ripe fig and the apricot? Lift me up and among the (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) teeth <sup>And the gums</sup> ~~//as-the-doves//~~ cause me to dwell! ~~The blood of the (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) tooth~~ I will suck, ~~and-of-the~~ And of the gum I will gnaw Its roots!"

Fix the pin and seize its foot.

Because thou hast said this, O worm,

May Ea smite thee with the might

Of his hand!"

What do you learn about creation from that? Well, the title which was given that by modern interpreters is "A Cosmological Incantation: The Worm and the Toothache." And the words, "Fix the pin and seize its foot" are supposed to the dentist and telling him how to pull out the tooth which is being bothered by this worm. And after this, there follows on the tablet certain details about the treatment, the injunction to repeat this incantation three times and the remark that this text has been copied from an ancient tablet and an-ancient the name of the scribe. Here you have, then, an incantation about toothache, with directions about how to get rid of the tooth that is aching and in telling it, <sup>gives</sup> this incantation

gives this story, of the coming into existence of one thing after another, leading up to the worm, the climax of creation (10 3/4)

There's no mention of man in the scale of those things that are created. It is not a complete creation, of course, by any means. Now, there a number of different records like this, of ancient <sup>B</sup>abylonian myths, the Babylonians were a curious people, I mean curious, filled with curiosity. They were thinking about various things and there were a number of stories among them to account for the existence of what we find. One starts with a rather dry (11 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) , the main creation story starts with a wet . They start different ways. This one about the tooth, you notice is quite brief. There is one about a younger daughter (11 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) who created a pig. But of course you'd be silly to take all the various records you find having anything to do with creation and then say that Genesis 1 must be derived from them. There are people who do that though. The so-called (11 3/4)

of religion group, not so extensive now as it was <sup>it still is effective,</sup> ~~in-the-middle-of-the-century~~ looking back it was very <sup>extensive(?)</sup> effective. They would take something in the Bible and make (12)

all through mythology of all the nations to find something similar, then say they got this idea from this unto this and this and this from this. If you use that method you can derive anything from anything, but the question we're interested in is not as expansive as that, it is a specific question. Does the Babylonian story of creation so-called, this one long story, which was a very important thing to the Babylonians when it was recited at the New Year Festival, the fourth day is the New Year Festival every year and it was recited, down in Babylon, showing their reestablishment of light after the chaos of the winter. Does this story give the groundwork from which we can see how somebody could have taken and re-gised it and derived from it Genesis 1? Well, that is assumed today by most critical scholars, that Genesis came from this particular Babylonian creation story. I don't like the title, the Babylonian story of Creation, which is generally given to it. In fact, it's a question among scholars of Babylonian study. It's usually given the title the Babylonians gave it themselves. They entitled it from the first two words, Enuma Elish. And <sup>if you're</sup> ~~according~~ going to discuss this matter in any scholarly way, that is the proper title to use. I'll give you the spelling: Enuma Elish. That is the title of the story. The Babylonians



recorded it in their various writings, Enuma Elish, which are the first two words, they mean "when (13 3/4) <sup>above</sup>" because that's the way it starts. Just like the Hebrew Bible, many of the books of the Old Testament, the book is named after the first couple of words of the book. That is a common custom in many lands.

Well, the assumption is taken today very widely that Enuma Elish is the source of Genesis 1. I believe if you would take critical commentaries today you would probably find that most of them give it as the source of the Genesis story. I read to you from Price's book, The Monuments of the Old Testament, in which they said (14 1/2)

Even <sup>Heidel</sup> Heidel, Alexander Heidel, whose book on the Babylon story of creation published by the University of Chicago Press about ten years ago, Heidel was a member of the Missouri Lutheran Synod, a very, very conservative group, he was very conservative in theology, but Heidel in his books <sup>that he</sup> says / feels that the two are definitely related...

## O.T.History 33. (1 1/2)

...and I was in a group last week where the Professor was speaking to a group of (3/4)

<sup>Heidel</sup> students and said to them, he said, when even an ultra-fundamentalist like Heidel felt that the Babylonian stories were the <sup>source</sup> stories from which Genesis 1 comes, we need have no hesitancy (3/4) That was his statement, I don't follow it.

But that shows the general attitude toward it. Yes? (student. 1)

There is nothing wrong with (1 1/2) if you feel like that, but there's a lot wrong in seeing anything without evidence. Now if the fact that many people today consider and relate it, one can on the basis of that assume it. One can say, well, now I haven't got time to spend much study on this matter, to make it completely for myself, let's just assume it and then go on and see what's (1 1/2) but if you do that, assume it with a question mark because scholars' opinions may change. But that is the general attitude of scholars today, that (1 3/4) And this group

with which I was last week, the Professor said, since the Babylonian story is the origin of Genesis 1 and since the Babylonian story in Genesis, when from above, there was nothing

and so on, then these things began to happen, he said we can naturally assume that Genesis 1 starts the thing (2) instead of according to the general statement, in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, it's when God began to create heaven and earth, the earth was developed (2 1/2)

I don't want to take much at this point, but let's see what (2 1/2)

(student)

Oh yes, well in this last one I was referring to what I'd heard orally. I'd rather not say the name. Heider, is that the one? Heider (2 3/4)

Yes? (student . 2 3/4)

Yes, now any book on the subject of factually will tell you, Enuma Elish is much older than Genesis 1 and therefore, of course, Genesis 1 must be taken from Enuma Elish. Now they have ~~proven~~ <sup>assume</sup> that Genesis 1, being part of the (3 1/2) was written at about maybe 500 B.C. Most conservatives believe that Genesis 1 was written by Moses, we don't know the date of course, but it certainly would not be earlier than (3 1/2)

The Enuma Elish, all the copies we have of the Enuma Elish, comes from not earlier than 700 B.C. But from the <sup>contents</sup> concepts of this it is believed by all scholars that they represent copies of something that was written about 2000 B.C. So it is pretty well agreed that the time of the <sup>composing</sup> ~~supposed~~ of the Enuma Elish is earlier than the time of Moses. I don't think there's any reason to question that. Another thing, though, might be said. To my mind, it's extremely questionable that Genesis 1 came from Enuma Elish <sup>personally</sup> because, but the idea that Enuma Elish came from Genesis 1 to my mind is impossible. That is, I just don't see how it can possibly have developed from Genesis 1, however (4 1/2) it may be possible. Yes? (student. 4 1/2)

But right now I would like to look a little bit, not into the question of what does it mean if the two are related, but the question are they related? I'd like to look into that a bit first: Mr. Deshpande? (student. 5)

Abraham came out of Babylon, he could have brought something with him from Babylon. Moses was from Egypt, he could have brought something with him from Egypt. That's true. That

contact. But is there anything that we know of which would seem to be the source. I know of nothing from Egypt that is similar <sup>enough</sup> to Genesis 1, that would suggest the thought. Now there is much in Egyptian literature that is (5 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

but there's nothing that I know of (5 3/4)

Yes? (student. 5 3/4)

Well, how that would depend. I will say this, supposing that you had two men at the battle of Bunker Hill here in the United States. These two men were there and they didn't even know (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Let's say that one of them, let's say they were (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) from Boston. ~~this is his~~ friends. One came from France and one came from Germany. They were visiting friends in Boston. And there they got upon the housetop with the other people there to watch the battle. They didn't even meet each other, knew nothing of the other's existence. They went home to their own country, they each proceeded to write a novel based upon it. You would compare the novels and you would find much of similarity because they both were familiar with the same event. Now supposing that a Babylonian and an Israelite had both stood on the top of Mount Arrarat and watched God creating the world, and then after it was all finished each of them wrote a story even though they didn't know each other at all, the stories could be rather similar. But since I don't believe either one of them saw the creation of the world, I don't see how that could form a source for I don't see how anybody could have learned anything true about the creation of the world unless God (7 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

it to them. I don't see how they could learn from the facts because nobody was there. Yes? (student. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Well, sure. But God must have given it for some other purpose. If the Lord gave it to Adam, Adam could've written it down if the Lord taught him how to write, and then the story that he wrote could've been passed on till it came to Moses and somebody else could've read that story and from it imagine a different story, develop from it, that could've happened, but you see that would be simply another (7 3/4)

It couldn't come from the facts of creation because there would be nobody there to know any facts. That would have to be (8)

Now of course we don't know, if you want to speculate you could say God could've told people the general outline of it, thus the other story developed. But we have no evidence God did it. So it's just as easy to assume that God dictated this to Moses as it is to assume he dictated it to Adam. Whoever got it, it came from God, not from human knowledge because no human being was there. Yes? (student.  $8\frac{1}{2}$ )

Well, let's ask it. We're begging the question. I said let's not consider the question of what their relation means till we consider whether they are related. That is I asked that a while ago ( $8\frac{3}{4}$ )

Let's see how they are related. Yes? (student.)

And then the consideration of how they are related would be the next problem, to consider what their relationship means. But first what is the relationship? Now the Enuma Elish consists of seven tablets and the Biblical story has seven days in it, and some of the earlier books have pointed that out as a similarity. Later books today will say the importance of the number seven is one of the relationships, because the seven tablets actually do not correspond to the seven divisions. Sometimes they come right in the middle of a paragraph, they're simply as if you wrote in seven pages, big pages, of course, a tablet is, a tablet has maybe a hundred and twenty lines. But the tablet is just the amount of space to fill up, so the fact of seven tablets proves nothing. And today most ( $9\frac{3}{4}$ )

Well, now the Babylonian story begins this way, just listen and see if you can notice either how it is echoing the <sup>language</sup> line of Genesis or how Genesis takes this language and reduces it, leaves out some things, and gives it to us in Genesis 1. I don't say it'll do that, I say listen and see, if you feel that's what is done. This is bottom of page 60, in The Ancient Near Eastern Texts.

Tablet I then begins: When on high the heaven had not been named,  
 Firm ground below had not been called by name,  
 Naught but primordial Apsu, their begetter,  
 (write that name down please because we'll refer to it a good deal later, Apsu)  
 (And) Tiamat, she who bore them all,  
 (write down Tiamat. Tiamat then is the name of the mother and Apsu the name of the father,  
 and nothing existed but Apsu and Tiamat. Now this word Tiamat is the name of a being. It is usually interpreted that Apsu is the fresh waters and Tiamat is the salt sea, that that is represented, but they are pictured here as individuals rather than as ( $11\frac{1}{2}$ )

but they existed it said before any heaven or any ground. You get those two names then, Apsu and Tiamat. Now Tiamat is etymologically similar to a word in the second verse of Genesis. And the Spirit of God--darkness was upon the face of (11 3/4) \* and \* is somewhat like Tiamat. We translate \* the deep, they considered Tiamat as representing the great salt sea, so here we have a similarity already. The title points out, however, that the Babylonian word Tiamat which means the deep, the great deep, and the Hebrew word (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) \* are sufficiently different that neither of them could have been borrowed from the other, though both might have been derived from the same original source, but neither could've been taken from the other, as they would come from the original Semitic language groups. But (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) in the two languages. But the two words are related. Does that mean because the two words are related, the concepts are taken over by one or the other. Heider says in that case we expect the same form to be taken over instead of having the h out in (12 3/4) \* . See, the Babylonian has no h and the original h of the early Semitic must have disappeared long before Babylon came into existence (13 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

Well, that is the first point of similarity and we know that's a questionable one.

Tiamat, who bore them all,  
 Their waters commingling as a single body;  
 No reed hut had been matted, no marsh land had appeared,  
 When no gods whatever had been brought into being,  
 (Evidently they don't think of Apsu and Tiamat as gods, but they are personified, they're thought of as individuals.)  $\psi$

Uncalled by name, their destinies undetermined--  
 Then it was that the gods were formed within them.

(that is within Apsu and Tiamat)

Lahmu and Lahamu were brought forth, by name they were called.  
 Before they had grown in age and stature,  
 Anshar and Kishar were formed, surpassing the others.

(You might take down the name of one of these, Anshar. This represents one of the earliest gods to come into existence, the third of the great four (14).  
 $\sim$       $\sim$       $\sim$

They prolonged the days, added on the years.  
 Anu was their heir, ef-his-(

(That is Anshar had a son named Anu. This is the Babylonian word for (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) <sup>in heaven?</sup> heather.)

Just write the word Anu because we'll refer to it later.)

Anu was heir, of his fathers the rival;  
Yes, Anshar's first-born, Anu, was his equal.  
Anu begot in his image Nudimmud

(now here is a particular name for a god who is later called by his common name, so I'll just give the common name instead of the particular name, Ea)

Ea.

(So you see you have a god Anshar coming into existence, out of the (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) of the waters. And then he has a son named Anu and he has a son named Ea.)

Anu begot in his image Ea.  
This Ea was of his fathers the master;  
Of broad wisdom, understanding, mighty in strength,  
Mightier by far than his grandfather Anshar.  
He had no rival among the gods, his brothers.

### O.T.History 34. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Well, here is the beginning. You don't see much similarity here at the beginning to Genesis thus far, do you? Genesis tells nothing of the coming of God into existence. It assumes the existence of God from the very beginning. This has matter before heaven and earth came into existence, it has matter in existence, and it has Apsu and Tiamat, the great bodies of water, which are thought of as individuals and from them the gods came into existence and therefore are thought of as the father and mother, ancestors, of the gods.

Now we have an incident described here, very interesting incident. It says,

The divine brothers banded together,

(The gods now that have come into existence)

They disturbed Tiamat as they surged back and forth,  
Yea, they troubled the mood of Tiamat  
By their hilarity in the Abode of Heaven.  
Apsu could not lessen their clamor  
And Tiamat was speechless at their (ways).  
Their doings were loathsome unto (...)  
Unsavory were their ways; they were overbearing.  
Then Apsu, the begetter of the great gods,

(You got the name Apsu. ...the begetter of the great gods)

Cried out, addressing Mummu, his vizier:

(Now you might write down the name Mummu, though it's much less important than the others. It's important right in this little section of the narrative. ...his vizier. Now I don't know what English would be for vizier. It's sort of like a secretary, the general idea of one who does things for one, carries messages, and the (2 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) German word has taken over, in this vizier.)

"O Mummu, my vizier, who rejoicest my spirit,  
 Come hither and let us go to Tiamat!"  
 They went and sat down before Tiamat,  
 Exchanging counsel about the gods, their first-born.  
 Apsu, opening his mouth,  
 Said unto resplendent Tiamat:  
 "Their ways are verily loathsome unto me.  
 By day I find no relief, nor repose by night.  
 I will destroy, I will wreck their ways,  
 That quiet may be restored. Let us have rest!"  
 As soon as Tiamat heard this,  
 She was wroth and called out to her husband.  
 She cried out aggrieved, as she raged all alone,  
 Injecting woe into her mood:  
 "What? Should we destroy that which we have built?  
 Their ways, indeed are most troublesome, but let us attend kindly!"

(You notice the attitude that she has taken on it, just the opposite, toward the gods who are disturbing their rest.)

Then answered Mummu, giving counsel to Apsu:  
 (Ill-wishing) and ungracious was Mummu's advice:  
 "Do destroy, my father, the mutinous ways.  
 Then shalt thou have relief by day and rest by night!"  
 When Apsu heard this, his fact grew radiant  
 Because of the evil he planned against the gods, his sons.  
 As for Mummu, by the neck he embraced him  
 As (that one) sat down on his knees to kiss him.

Now that is, then, the plot of Apsu to destroy the gods, but you notice Tiamat was unfavorable to the plot. She said they should not destroy the gods. Now we have what happened after that. The gods heard of it. What did they do. This, what they had plotted between them was repeated to the gods, their first

they had plotted between them,  
 Was repeated unto the gods, their first-born.  
 When the gods heard (this), they were astir,  
 (Then) lapsed into silence and remained speechless.  
 Surpassing in wisdom, accomplished, resourceful,  
 Ea, the all-wise, saw through their scheme.  
 A master design against it he devised and set up,

Made artful his spell against it, surpassing and holy.  
 He recited it and made it subsist in the deep,  
 As he poured sleep upon him. Sound asleep he lay.  
 When Apsu he had made prone, drenched with sleep,  
 Mummu, the adviser, was powerless to stir  
 He loosened his band, tore off his tiara,  
 Removed his halo (and) put it on himself.  
 Having fettered Apsu, he slew him.  
 Mummu he bound and left behind lock.

Now you see what has happened to Apsu, he's been killed, and Mummu is captured and made powerless, and Ea has done this. And Tiamat didn't want the gods killed (5), did she? So how much similarity do we have to Genesis 1 thus far? Now it continues then:

Having thus upon Apsu established his dwelling,  
 He laid hold on Mummu, holding him by the nose-rope.  
 After Ea had vanquished and trodden down his foes,  
 Had secured his triumph over his enemies,  
 In his sacred chamber in profound peace had rested,  
 He named it "Apsu," for shrines he assigned (it).  
 In that same place his cult hut he founded.  
 Ea and Damkina, his wife, dwelled (there) in splendor.  
 In the chamber of fates, the abode of destinies,  
 A god was engendered, most able and wisest of gods.  
 In the heart of Apsu was M

that's the shrine that was made, in which this god lived now, after the killing of the original Apsu,

was Marduk created,

now get this name, Marduk. Marduk, you see, is the son of Ea, who does not come into existence until after the destruction of Apsu, and Marduk is the god of Babylon, and the purpose actually of Enuma Elish is to glorify Marduk, the god of Babylon. Marduk was never heard of until about two thousand B. C. Earlier records have no reference to him. These other gods are mentioned in records going back hundreds of years before then, Marduk is not, he is the god of the little town of Babylon which became a great city, conquered most of the world, and then this epic was written, to glorify Marduk. But you notice the great destruction of Apsu has taken place before Marduk ever came into existence. ~~In-the-heart-of~~

In the heart of holy Apsu was Marduk created.  
 He who begot him was Ea, his father;  
 She who bore him was Damkina, his mother.

Alluring was his figure, sparkling the lift of his eyes.  
 Lordly was his gait; commanding from of old.

And so it goes telling you what a wonderful one this Marduk was, until the account of this



new god ends up with the way he was addressed:

"My little son, my little son!  
My son, the Sun! Sun of the heavens!"

And so they wrote to say that Marduk was a sun-god, although actually the sun-god in Babylonian is Shamash, but Marduk is here addressed as the sun of the heavens. Does that make Marduk the sun-god, or could they just call any god the sun ( $7\frac{1}{2}$ ), I would trust <sup>^</sup> <sup>^</sup> <sup>^</sup> very serious.

But anyway you have Marduk described as this wonderful new god that has come into existence. And then after Marduk has thus come into existence you find that new troubles begin.

You find that:

Clothed with the halo of ten gods, he was strong to the utmost,  
As their awesome flashes were heaped upon him.  
Anu

that's the god of heaven, his grandfather,

brought forth and begot the fourfold wind  
Consigning to its power the leader of the host.

He produced streams to disturb Tiamat.  
The gods, given no rest, suffer in the storm.  
Their heart(s) having plotted evil,  
To Tiamat, their mother, said:  
"When they slew Apsu, thy consort,  
Thou didst not aid him but remainedst still.  
When the dread fourfold wind he created,  
Thy vitals were diluted and so we can have no rest.  
Let Apsu, thy consort, be in thy mind  
And Mummu, who has been vanquished! Thou art left alone!"

Thus we have Tiamat now threatened with danger by the gods because they have killed Apsu and she has favor to her consort but had not helped him. Now they're against her, and most of the rest is the conflict between the gods and Tiamat. You see it's utterly different from the contents of Genesis 1. And the assumption that is taken by most everybody that the two are related, personally, it seems to me that if George Smith hadn't happened to find first a couple of lines that spoke about the making of the stars, and if he hadn't happened to find other tablets, unrelated to this, that spoke of the creation of animals and of fish, that I would question whether anybody <sup>ever</sup> would have thought that they were related but it is dogmatically stated that it is done, and it is taken for granted by so many, that therefore we must face a little bit of the implications, if they are related, but personally I think it's a rather <sup>foolish</sup> thing to take for granted because, you see, up to this point

how many lines here are similar to any lines in Genesis 1? Up to this point, not a single line, except that these are very short. Yes? (student. 10)

Oh, definitely some. We'll look at it. I think it's worth taking time to look at it because it's much discussed. It's discussed a great deal by people who've never read it and people will read, somebody says these are related in such a way and then they'll discuss the relationship. They will say, for instance, look at the great similarity, the Biblical story has light created on the first day, and the sun not till the fourth day. This one has, toward the end of it it has the moon and stars created, and light must have been created before - great similarity. But up to this point, have you seen anything about the creation of light. Some will say there was light before because Marduk was the sun-god, he brought light. Do you think the first of the story everything was in darkness before Marduk came? with all this as described before then? Others say that light came into existence, ~~people~~ <sup>they</sup> say the great similarity between Genesis and this is that Genesis begins with darkness on the face of the deep. This begins with a great darkness. Did you notice any reference to darkness here? I saw no reference whatever to darkness here. There is no mention here of creation of light, that is light's taken for granted, just like sound is taken for granted. There's no mention in Genesis 1 of the creation of sound, none at all. It's just taken for granted. Well, in this light is taken for granted, as sound. There's no mention of its creation. It's just not entered into the picture, it's assumed by the writers. But that is one that Heider says is one of the great similarities. You have light created in Genesis before the sun, that in this you have light created before you have the moon and stars. Actually there's no creation of the sun (11 3/4)

Well, we have Marduk who has come into existence after the defeat of Apsu and his death, Tiamat who had not wanted to injure the gods, she's left alone, now they're afraid of what she might do, so they start sending winds to make it worse for her, in other words, (12 1/2)

and so in that situation we find that Tiamat decides she's got to do something about it. And so we find that Tiamat is gathering her friends and she says, let's make monsters, let us do battle against the gods.

They thronged and marched at the side of Tiamat.  
Enraged, they plot without cease night and day,

They are set for combat, growling, raging,  
 They form a council to prepare for the fight.  
 Mother Hubur, who fashions all things,  
 Added matchless weapons, bore monster-serpents,  
 Sharp of tooth, unsparing of fang.  
 (With venom) for blood she has filled their bodies.  
 Roaring dragons she has clothed with terror,  
 Has crowned them with haloes, making them like gods,  
 So that he who beholds them shall perish abjectly,  
 (And) that, with their bodies reared up, none might turn (them back).  
 She set up the Viper, the Dragon, and the Sphinx,  
 The Great-Lion, the Mad-Dog, and the Scorpion-Man,  
 Mighty lion-demons, the Dragon-Fly, the Centaur--  
 Bearing weapons that spare not, fearless in battle.  
 Firm were her decrees, past withstanding were they.  
 Withal eleven of this kind she brought (forth).  
 From among the gods, her first-born, who formed (her Assembly),  
 She elevated Kingu

now here is Kingu, one of the gods who were with Tiamat, is called Kingu, and Tiamat makes Kingu the leader of her forces, she elevated him,

made him chief among them.

The leading of the ranks, command of the Assembly,  
 The raising of weapons for the encounter, advancing to combat,

And then there are several lines of how she gave great power to Kingu, she-gave

She gave him the Tablets of Fate, fastened on his breast:  
 "As for thee, thy command shall be unchangeable, (Thy word) shall endure!"  
 As soon as Kingu was elevated, possessed of (the rank of Anu),  
 For the gods, his sons, (they decreed) the fate:  
 "Your word shall make the fire subside,  
 Shall humble the 'Power-Weapon,' so potent in (its) sweep!"

So now you Tiamat determined to resist these gods who have killed her consort Apsu, and she has formed these alarming monsters, and she has other gods with her, and she has appointed one of them, Kingu, to be her commander-in-chief. And in that situation the gods consider what they're going to do and you have an account of how the gods try to find one who can deliver them from the danger they fear from Tiamat. Actually, as you read it, they are the aggressors right straight through, but here they have raised their propaganda so you think it's her, <sup>as the great threat,</sup> the great danger, and they are planning what they can do against Tiamat...

let repeated over again. Here is Tiamat, she is raging against us, it goes on for several lines, she is raging against us, she has created monsters, and then you have about fifteen lines naming all the monsters all over again, and then you have, she has taken Kingu and she has made him commander-in-chief and you have about ten lines with all the power she has given to Kingu, given him the Tablets of Fate, and told him he's to have complete power over his forces, now ~~you~~ <sup>they</sup> say to this god what will you do about it? Can you deliver us? And this god says I'm afraid of Tiamat, there's nothing I can do about it! So then they go to another god and repeat the whole story about sixty lines, and this god says I'm afraid of Tiamat I can't do anything about it. So they had the ~~thing~~ repeated about three times, takes ~~about-three~~ <sup>a couple of</sup> tablets and finally they come to Marduk, the new god come into existence, born from Ea and Damkina, after the defeat of Apsu, a comparative newcomer to the kingdom, they come to Marduk and say will you deliver us from Tiamat, and Marduk says yet I will deliver you from Tiamat. But he says I won't deliver unless you give me absolute power. He says you must take all the power that you various gods have of controlling the world and give it all to me, and so before Marduk will do anything against Tiamat, it is necessary that the gods give him absolute power, and so they agree to do it. Now this has described the first three tablets. The summary which has so much material of great value in it doesn't start until tablet 4 of what is Enuma Elish. All of the first three tablets are omitted. But if you're going to compare it with Genesis you need to know something about it, so I read you a fair amount and gave you a summary here and you notice how little similarity there is to Genesis 1.

Well, the gods came together because they had to something against Tiamat and Marduk wouldn't lead them unless they gave Marduk all their power all their authority. And so we read they came together and we read all the great gods, this is page 65 the very bottom:

All the great gods who decree the fates.  
 They entered before Anshar, filling (Ubshukinna).  
 They kissed one another in the Assembly.  
 They held converse as they (sat down) to the banquet.  
 They ate festive bread, poured (the wine),  
 They wetted their drinking-tubes with sweet intoxicant.  
 As they drank the strong drink (their) bodies swelled.  
 They became very languid as their spirits rose.  
 For Marduk, their avenger, they fixed the decrees.

So now they're giving Marduk the powers he says he must have if he is to deliver them. They have this great council at which they all get drunk before they give him the power. Quite a picture of the gods.

They erected for him a princely throne.  
Facing his fathers, he sat down, presiding.  
"Thou art the most honored of the great gods,  
Thy decree is unrivaled, thy command is Anu.  
Thou, Marduk, art the most honored of the great gods,  
Thy decree is unrivaled, thy word is Anu.  
From this day unchangeable shall be thy pronouncement.  
To raise or bring low--these shall be (in) thy hand.  
Thy utterance shall be true, thy command shall be unimpeachable.

And so it goes on with the great power that they've given Marduk because of their fear of Tiamat. Marduk is a comparatively new god here, came into existence long after the rest, it's a reflection of the coming into power of Babylon, a comparatively late city to become important. But Babylon, about 2,000 B.C. became the strongest city through the very clever planning of Hamaradi in (4½) conquered most of the regions around him, those they couldn't conquer they made friends with, talked very nice to and worked with a while and then suddenly turned against and conquered them too, till eventually they had all the near east in their hands, and then somebody wrote this epic to show the god of Babylon whom nobody ever heard of before is the greatest of all gods. So you all this (4 3/4)

we've been looking at, written for that purpose very clearly, and here are all these lines telling of how all the gods gave all their power to Marduk. And then here are some very interesting lines. They address themselves, they told him of his great power, granting him kingship over the universe entirely, this is page 66, line 16:

We have granted thee kingship over the universe entire,  
When in Assembly thou sittest, thy word shall be supreme.  
Thy weapons shall not fail: they shall smash thy foes!  
O lord, spare the life of him who trusts thee,  
But pour out the life of the god who seized evil."  
Having placed in their midst a piece of cloth,  
They addressed themselves to Marduk, their first-born:  
"Lord, truly thy decree is first among gods.  
Say but to wreck or creat; it shall be.  
Open thy mouth: the cloth will vanish!  
Speak again, and the cloth shall be whole!"  
At the word of his mouth the cloth vanished.  
He spoke again, and the cloth was restored.  
When the gods, his fathers, saw the fruit of his word,  
Joyfully they did homage: "Marduk is king!"

Now, one of the great similarities between this and Genesis 1 is that Genesis 1 has creation by word, God said let there be light and there was light. Here you have the same thing, Marduk said let the cloth vanish and it vanished. Marduk said let the cloth be whole and it was whole. And that's the only place in these whole seven big tablets that you have anything similar, and yet that is pointed out as one of the great similarities. Creation by word. Because they gave Marduk this power which he displayed by making this cloth whole or making it disappear. Well, then they declare that Marduk is changed, they give him all this power, now that he's got all this power that he wants, he gathers them together, and he leads them against Tiamat, and then we have a vivid account of how he comes, it takes about a hundred lines, how Tiamat comes leading the gods and they rush toward the raging Tiamat and they attack her and the monsters and the various ones--of course you always fall the people on the other side monsters--but they go against them and attack them and there's a very vivid account of the attack, how he takes a net and tries to catch Tiamat in the net, and <sup>how</sup> he attacks her with spells and incantations, the various methods he used, and ultimately he gets control of all of the forces against him, when Tiamat opens her mouth to consume him,

He drove in the Evil Wind that she close not her lips.  
 As the fierce winds charged her belly,  
 Her body was distended and her mouth was wide open.  
 He released the arrow, it tore her belly,  
 It cut through her insides, splitting the heart.  
 Having thus subdued her, he extinguished her life.

She must have learned here what it means to appease (7 3/4) because when Apsu wanted to destroy these gods she held him back from it, so finally they destroyed her, and now you see they are destroying her.

He cast down her carcass to stand upon it.  
 After he had slain Tiamat, the leader,  
 Her band was shattered, her troupe broken up;  
 And the gods, her helpers who marched at her side,  
 Trembling with terror, turned their backs about,  
 In order to save and preserve their lives.  
 Tightly encircled, they could not escape.  
 He made them captives and he smashed their weapons.

Then you have a little more about his conquest and then he seized Kingu, her commander-in-chief, and bound him, and then he turned back to Tiamat whom he had bound.

The lord trod on the legs of Tiamat,  
 With his unsparing mace he crushed her skull.

When the arteries of her blood he had severed,  
 The North Wind bore (it) to places undisclosed.  
 On seeing this, his fathers were joyful and jubilant,

The other gods were all earlier than he was, they're all called his fathers. He was a young upstart but he became the head because none of them were, they were all afraid to attack Tiamat.

They brought gifts of homage, they to him.  
 Then the lord paused ~~to view her dead body,~~

that's the lord Marduk--

to view her dead body,  
 That he might divide the monster and do artful works.  
 He split her like a shellfish into two parts:  
 Half of her he set up and ceiled it as sky,  
 Pulled down the bar and posted guards.  
 He bade them to allow not her waters to escape.

You see, here, after all he's gone through and the end of Tiamat's force, here we find what is said to be the source of Genesis 1 where he divided the waters above the firmament from the waters underneath the firmament. (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Here he took the <sup>Apsu</sup> ~~even~~, which is the great <sup>deep</sup> ~~beast~~ and split it in two and put half there and half down here. There is a similar picture to this picture in Genesis. Did the author of Genesis read the Babylonian story and get this picture from it and therefore get that into Genesis 1? Or ~~did~~ the Babylonian read Genesis 1 and get the idea from him and put it here. Or did some man, two men see both of these happen, one of them write one and one the other. Actually I don't think anybody saw it happen so it must have been taken from one or the other, if they are related.

This is the account then of how he made the firmament. But before he got winds, he got storms, he got clouds, he got (10 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) he got all these, but now he takes Tiamat and divides her in two, he takes her body. Then it goes on, Tablet V:

He constructed stations for the great gods,  
 Fixing their astral likenesses as constellations.  
 He determined the year by designating the zones:  
 He set up three constellations for each of the twelve months.  
 After defining the days of the year (by means) of (heavenly) figures,

Now this doesn't <sup>say</sup> ~~mean~~ he created <sup>stars</sup> ~~time~~, doesn't say constellations, that could be done by creating stars or by (10 3/4) <sup>^</sup> ~~arranging~~ stars. It doesn't say. All it says is he made

constellations in order to divide the months into years.

Alongside it he set up the stations of Enlil and Ea.  
And opened up the gates on both sides,  
He strengthened the locks to the left and the right.

Now some say that the gates on both sides must mean where the sun comes up and where the sun goes down, and therefore this applies to the sun, creating it, but there's nothing said here about the sun, just that he strengthens, opens up gates on both sides. Then he did this in Tiamat, whom he has put up there over the sky.

In her belly he established the zenith.  
The Moon he caused to shine, the night (to him) entrusting.  
He appointed him a creature of the night to signify the days:  
"Monthly, without cease, form designs with a crown.  
At the month's very start, rising over the land,  
Thou shalt have luminous horns to signify six days,  
On the seventh day reaching a (half-)crown.  
At full moon stand in opposition in mid-month.  
When the sun (overtakes) thee at the base of heaven,  
Diminish (thy crown) and the retrogress in light.  
(At the time of disappearance) approach thou the course of the sun,

You see, this is astronomical, and this takes us to line 22 of Tablet V, and the rest of Tablet V has not been found. There are a few little fragments nobody can read. So now with our various discoveries we have most of the Enuma Elish except Tablet V. In Tablet V we have only these first twenty verses, the rest of it is quite unknown. Now some people say one similarity between Enuma Elish and --even this book by Price here points out-- one of the similarities between Enuma Elish and the Genesis is, he says in Genesis God created the animals and creeping things, in the Babylonian, the assembly of the gods created the animals and ~~the-creeping-things~~ <sup>little creatures.</sup> Where in the assembly of the gods, where are we told that they created animals and ~~little-creatures.~~ <sup>living</sup> Why in Tablet V in the part that's never been found. See? In the Babylonian creation story, as we have it, there is no mention whatever of creation of animals and creeping things, except for the account of Tiamat making the monsters to fight with, well that wouldn't be the creation of the animals certainly. But that's ridiculous to call that, but if you leave that out, there is no creation of animals or of creeping things, anything like that, in Enuma Elish. Absolutely nothing.

Well, the creation of man is further on but we won't have time to look at that now. This afternoon we'll look at it, the creation of man.



...Enuma Elish story. Many people discuss the relation of the Enuma Elish story to the Genesis story of creation without having read the Enuma Elish story. They read what some people say about the similarities or what people state as to evidence that one is derived from the other but they don't actually read through the Enuma Elish story. As the story stands it is not easy to read through because there are no paragraph divisions. In this book, Ancient Near Eastern Texts, Dr. Speiser says, <sup>who is the translator</sup> ~~with-th~~ of this, that he was greatly tempted to put in paragraph divisions but he decided that doing so would be making arbitrary judgments and therefore it was better to just give what you have there. There's much to be said for that position. It's leaving it to you to make your own <sup>division.</sup> decision. But ~~for~~ the person who's not going to study it a great deal, if you don't have any divisions it's much harder to find out what they're driving at, particularly in poetic language like this. If it was presented with little running summaries it would be much easier for the average person to get into it. I don't think there's any question as to what it teaches, what it contains, but it takes just a little while to get officially into it (2) to

from a reading. If you will read it through two or three times, I'm sure you will understand it very well. But I have tried to give you a running summary to make it easier for you to follow. And one thing I'm trying to bring out is how little there is in it that has anything to do directly with creation. It is the story of a battle, it is the story of early Babylonian gods and their fights and, as a result of it, sort of a by-product of it, we notice that he took Tiamat and divided her in the middle and put half up above and half below. He doesn't say he put half below but I guess that's understood, says divided her in the middle and then stretched her up above <sup>to make</sup> the firmament.

Now, we ran through it, I did not read you one or two of the tablets but gave you a summary of them and I pointed out that they contained a tremendous amount of repetition, because the whole story is given at full length to each of two or three different deities, of how Tiamat had created the monsters and they've got to do away with Tiamat and she'd made Kingu supreme, and it quotes several lines of how she'd given him his position of authority. And then unfortunately, that fifth tablet, we only have 24 lines. It doubtless is about the same length <sup>as</sup> ~~of~~ the other tablets, around 160 lines originally, but we have

never found anything other than just the first twenty-four lines. And some assume that the rest of it would tell about the creation of vegetation, the creation of animal life, birds and fishes, and so on. But that's pure assumption. Heider in his discussion thinks that extremely unlikely. He says the astronomical presentation of the arrangement of the moon, when it's full, when it's a quarter, and so on at the beginning, suggests very strongly that it goes on with the description of astronomical arrangement. And that's the reason we take up a whole chapter. In addition to that he points out that chapter 6 begins when Marduk hears the words of the gods,

His heart prompts (him) to fashion artful works.  
Opening his mouth, he addresses Ea

Well, now words does he hear. Chapter 5 began with his establishing stations for the gods among the stars. Heider says that at the beginning of chapter 6 suggests very strongly that a large part of chapter 5 deals with the words of the gods that lead on to what Marduk (4½)

and therefore he thinks that by the time you get to the astronomical part it could easily take a whole tablet and whatever this is the background of the beginning of 6, there's no space left for any creation of plants or animals or anything like that.

Be that as it may, as it stands there is no, as we have it, has no creation of animals in it anywhere except the creation of monsters by Tiamat which is a different thing altogether. Now chapter 6 is <sup>of</sup> a very special interest to us, very special and so let me read to you the first part of chapter 6. We read there the first 34 lines of chapter 6 is of very, very special interest, a good part of this was only discovered within the last few years. And here's what it says; ~~when-Marduk-hears~~

When Marduk hears the words of the gods,  
His heart prompts (him) to fashion artful works.  
Opening his mouth, he addresses Ea

Remember Ea is his father, Ea is the god of wisdom, Ea is not the leading god of the Babylon (5 3/4) at all, but he is quite an important deity, and we will speak of him often later, in various connections, so it is important that you be familiar with Ea.

To impart the plan he had conceived in his heart:  
"Blood I will mass and cause bones to be.  
I will establish a savage, 'man' shall be his name.  
Verily, savage-man I will create.

He shall be charged with the service of the gods  
That they might be at ease!

~~The ways of the~~

Now this suggests that perhaps the last half of 5 was the gods telling what they want to happen to be at ease, the sacrifices they'd like, the food they'd like, and so on, we don't know, but at any rate, he's dealing with the need whatever it is, and he said I've got an idea, I'll make ~~sacrifices~~ savages to do this for them. The Bible doesn't tell us that man was made in order to perform service (6 3/4)

but that was interesting to hear.

The ways of the gods I will artfully alter.  
Though alike revered, into two (groups) they shall be divided. "  
Ea answered him, speaking a word to him,  
Giving him another plan for the relief of the gods:  
"Let but one of their brothers be handed over;  
He alone shall perish that mankind may be fashioned.  
Let the great gods be here in Assembly,  
Let the guilty be handed over that they may endure."  
Marduk summoned the great gods to Assembly;  
Presiding graciously, he issues instructions.  
To his utterance the gods pay heed.  
The king addresses a word to the Anunnaki:  
"If your former statement was true,  
Do(now) the truth on oath by me declare!  
Who was it that contrived the uprising,  
And made Tiamat rebel, and joined battle?  
Let him be handed over who contrived the uprising.  
His guilt I will make him bear. You shall dwell in peace!"  
The Igigi, the great gods, replied to him,  
"It was Kingu who contrived the uprising,  
And made Tiamat rebel, and joined battle."

Who was this Kingu, have you ever heard of him before? How many have heard of Kingu before? He is the one whom Tiamat told was to be the commander. I don't/<sup>know</sup>if there was an earlier part that she aroused him (8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) that Kingu aroused Tiamat. He seems simply to have been selected by her to be the leader. But here these enemies blame it all on Kingu, say that Kingu made Tiamat rebel, she's dead now, Tiamat is dead and that's what they say about Kingu. It was Kingu who contrived the uprising and made Tiamat rebel, and joined battle.

They bound him, holding him before Ea.  
They imposed on him his guilt and severed his blood (vessels).  
Out of his blood they fashioned mankind.  
He imposed the service and let free the gods.  
After Ea, the wise, had created mankind,  
Had imposed upon it the service of the gods--

And then it goes on to tell how they arranged the Anunnaki, the very spirit of the heavens and earth, but this is all it says about the creation of man. You notice he created man by killing a god, taking his blood, and it says that out of his blood they fashioned mankind. There's nothing like that in Genesis. But that is what it says, that is the method given here of the creation of man (9 3/4) mankind.

The next part of the chapter, of the six tablets, line about 91 to 120, or no, line 35 to 90, deal with the making of the city of Babylon. This makes it out that the city of Babylon was formed by Marduk at a very early time when man first came into existence. Now, of course, we know that isn't true; it's imaginary because we have much history before Babylon ever was mentioned. Babylon was a comparatively late city, but in this account of the making of great Babylon, we will not take time to read that, that will be in the book which many of you are buying and you can read it if you want but it's not very important for our present purpose. Then, after that is mentioned, then it's mentioned how he went, line 91 and following, he went on to establish <sup>the</sup> a home for the gods and they give honor to Marduk who has done this, and they say continuing about line 107:

"Most exalted be the Son, our avenger;  
Let his sovereignty be surpassing, having no rival.  
May he shepherd the black-headed ones, his creatures.

That's mankind, black-headed,

To the end of days, without forgetting, let them acclaim his ways.

And so it tells how mankind (11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

honor

Marduk, and then it says, in line 120,

Let the black-headed wait on their gods!  
As for us, by however many names we pronounce, he is our god!  
Let us then proclaim his fifty names:

The rest of tablet 6 and all of tablet 7 are declaring the fifty names of Marduk and these fifty names of Marduk, each of them honors some special thing about Marduk like, well I'll read one or two of them: number 1--

Marduk, as Anu, his father, called him from his birth:  
Who provides grazing and drinking places, enriches their stalls,  
Who with the flood-storm, his weapon, vanquished the detractors,  
(And) who the gods, his fathers, rescued from distress.  
Truly, the Son of the Sun, most radiant of gods is he.  
In his brilliant light may they walk forever!  
On the people he brought forth, endowed with life,

The service of the gods he imposed that these may have ease.  
 Creation, destruction, deliverance, grace--  
 Shall be by his command. They shall look up to him!

That's name one. And there are fifty names. Here's the 24th:

Enbilulu, the lord who makes them flourish, is he;  
 The mighty one who named them, who instituted roast-offerings;  
 Who ever regulates for the land the grazing and watering places;  
 Who opened the wells, apportioning waters of (...).  
 Enbilulu, secondly, they shall glorify as

And then it gives the 25th name, Epadun,

The lord who sprinkles the field,  
 Irrigator of heaven and earth, who establishes seedrows,  
 Who plow land and grazing land,  
 Dam and ditch regulates, who delimits the furrow;

And then it goes on and gives the 26th and so on. There are fifty of these names. They are simply glorifying and Marduk in quite general terms. There's only one of them that has any particular interest for us in relation to Genesis 1 and that's number ten. Number 10 is Asaru, bestower of cultivation, who established water levels;

Creator of grain and herbs, who causes (vegetation to sprout).

Is that a statement of the creation of vegetation? It says Marduk is the creator of vegetation, of grain and herbs who causes vegetation to sprout. Does this represent his continual care over the farmers or does it refer back to a creation of vegetation, the only reference in the whole epic to the creation of vegetation. Yes? (student. 14<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>) Asaru.

Now, this is a rapid run-through of Enuma Elish to show the nature of most of the contents and, as you see, there are references to certain matters which are similar to matters touched in Genesis 1. But I think we can say this, take chapter 1 of Genesis, you won't find more than 3 or 4 verses in it that has anything very similar likely in the whole of Genesis. That is as far as identical verses or near anything like it. And if you take the epic here, out of seven tablets, rather six pretty full and the ~~sixth~~<sup>fifth</sup> you have the first part of it, out of say a thousand lines...

...you can find more twenty or thirty that really deal at all with anything that is dealt with in Genesis 1. So actually the material, the two groups of material there, is comparatively little when it comes to comparison. My personal belief is that if George Smith had not had this attitude which was common in his day, anything we find similar to the Bible, this is the Babylonian story of the same thing, isn't that wonderful, why I question whether people would have very seriously thought of comparing this story of battle and fighting and destruction of these gods and all that with Genesis 1, to say that either one of them was taken from the other. Now out of these verses in Genesis 1, the mention of the days, there's nothing like it here, the fact that it should be on seven tablets is not (1 1/4)

There's no mention of the days of Genesis 1, there's no statement that God looked upon what he saw and that it was good which is repeated after practically every day in Genesis 1. The whole framework of Genesis 1 is different. The fullest account of creation in Genesis 1 is the creation of vegetation, trees after their kind, grass and earth and so on, is rather fully given, fishes and birds, animals, all that rather fully given, nothing there in any part of Enuma Elish that we have, there's nothing in Enuma Elish about the creation of light which is the first ~~thing~~<sup>day</sup> in Genesis 1. Actually the similarity is so very slight that my own personal opinion is that it is an idea which developed in a natural way as we pointed out, which conservatives took first through a misguided and erroneous idea that anything they could grab from Babylon which sounded like something in the Bible was proof of the Bible. And then when the Babylon Bible movement came (2 1/2)

they twisted it around and put the argument against them, and they were to some extent already converted, and the enemies of the Bible took over from them that which they had given as fact, and they are all convinced of it now quite strongly, that this is the source from which the Biblical story came. Now, most interpreters of the conservative point say, well, suppose it is, we can explain it, or suppose that maybe they both came from a parent source, or some other explanation. I do not think that it is impossible that God could have caused that a Babylonian tablet should be a source from which ideas were taken and eventually developed into something that He caused a writer to correct and, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, to write something that was definitely true (3 1/2)

But I think it extremely unlikely because to me the similarities are far too small to require any such approach at all. Now, if you take up almost any critical book on the subject they will give you evidences why the two are similar and even most conservative books will take that position. I read to you the other day a little bit from this book by Price.

(3 3/4)<sup>1.</sup> Ira Price is quite a conservative man, on the whole has a very sound attitude toward the Bible. His book, *The Monuments of the Old Testament*, went through many editions. In 1924 it had a thoroughly revised edition which was excellent for 1924. It had the archeology right up to date, and it was amazing how up-to-date it was in 1924. Now there's never been an edition since so of course that's very much out of date now, but even so, most of the material in it is very good. It is an excellent job. But in his book he compares these two and he says, before passing on to other features of Babylonian tradition, let us look at some of the resemblances and differences between Genesis and these records.

1. Genesis knows of a time when the earth was waste and void. The Babylonian accounts mention a time when all was chaos.

2. In Genesis light dispels darkness and order follows chaos. In the Babylonian records the god Marduk (4 3/4) from overthrowing the demon of chaos, Tiamat. Well, I don't see that that second is a similarity. Light follows darkness in Genesis, and order follows chaos; in the Babylonian records the god Marduk moves and overthrows Tiamat. You might as well say in the account of the second World War, Winston Churchill routed and overthrew Hitler. How is this really a similarity to Genesis 1? I would question very much whether it is similar at all.

3. In Genesis, after a time, the dry land appears. In the Babylonian account Marduk created the dust and poured it out.

4. In Genesis the stars, sun and moon are set in the heavens. In the Babylonian Marduk places them as the mansions of the gods.

5. In Genesis God created the animals and creeping things. In the Babylonian the Assembly of the gods created animals and creeping<sup>things</sup>. If they did, it's in the broken part of chapter 5. We have no evidence.

Then number 6. In Genesis God created mankind. In the Babylonian Marduk created mankind. Well, they both tell of mankind.

Now, he says, but the unlikenesses are extremely significant.

1. Genesis mentions God the creator of all things. The Babylonian record mentions no one created all things but various gods come in for their share in the beginning.

2. Genesis describes the (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) wastes and the . The Babylonian account personifies these as words.

3. Genesis is pervaded with monotheism while the Babylonian account is shot with polytheism.

How can we account for so few unlikenesses? Did the writer of the Genesis record borrow his account from the Babylonian tablets, or did the Babylonian record have its origin in the Genesis account, or did both derive their story from a common original source? These questions will receive attention at the close of the chapter.

How can you account for so few unlikenesses? Well, how many likenesses are there? You've got a thousand lines here and you've got about thirty verses here, and maybe five percent of the material has a similarity, and the rest of it is entirely different. It seems to me that the likenesses are very, very few; the unlikenesses are very, very many. In various senses the two are utterly different. Look at the similarities Price points out. Among them he says they created the animals and creeping things, created the sun, moon and stars and put them in the heavens, created mankind. Well, if you have a creation story, what kind of a creation story would you have if these things weren't created. Suppose anybody were to sit down and say let's make up a story of the origin of the universe. Would not his story include the making of mankind, the making of animals and plants, the making of the sky? The fact that you have these in simply shows that it's a creation story, and any true creation stories are pretty sure to have those things in common. It doesn't seem to me that it necessarily shows any similarity between the two other than that they both have creation stories. So that, to my mind, it is a type of thinking that's very easy to get into, that every time you find any similarity in two things, one of them is simply taken from the other. You could easily read an account in the newspaper, if you want to, or a magazine, about how in 1914, shortly after the beginning of World War I a German Admiral named Graf Spey was directing his ship near the (8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) islands off



the coast of South America and there he was met by a British fleet and the British fleet was larger, had more powerful weapons, and the German ships were sunk and Graf Spa went to the bottom of the ocean with his ship. You could pick up a history of World War II and you could read how, in 1940 or 41, a German pocket battleship named Graf Spa, named after the man who went down off the coast of South America in World War I, a German pocket battleship with that name, met three or four British ships and they had a battle and the Germans sank the boat Graf Spa rather than allow it to fall into the hands of the British. You could read these two accounts and look at the similarities. They're both in the same place, they happened. Graf Spa was in one case the Admiral and the other the name of the boat. Of course that could be a point of misunderstanding there. But in both cases it's the British and the Germans, in both cases there is the beginning of a world war. You could easily say that second account has just been derived from the first, copied after the first, a few slight changes made as it was copied. Actually, they represent two different events which were twenty years apart. Some of you here read of both of them, probably most of you read of one of them at the time.

The fact of a similarity does not prove one is derived from the other. There must be something more than that. If you have any two creation stories they're going to have some things in common, how many do you have to have in common to show that one is related to the other. It is very interesting to take this little booklet<sup>of</sup> Alexander Heider's, I have here the first edition of it, which was in type, was offset from type, the second is printed, much easier to use but the two are almost identical in this section, and I'm used to this one so I'm reading from this one. But in it he discusses Old Testament parallels between these Babylonian creation stories, he discusses various Babylonian creation stories, and after he discusses these, he takes up similarities. He says Babylonian has *Tiamat*, the Bible has (11) \* a Hebrew word translated deep in verse 2. But he shows the difference in the form of the two words. It's very important to show that this (11) does not show relationship between the two.

Then, he says, another correspondence is the idea of a primeval darkness. In *Enuma Elish* this idea is not expressly stated. Well, then what right have we to assume it. He

says we can derive it from the fact that Tiamat according to Beraduk was shrouded in darkness. Beraduk was a Babylonian priest, in the very latest days of Babylon, who gave us an account of creation which has some features in common with Enuma Elish, and many that are different, and it doesn't seem to me that Beraduk is actually less like Genesis 1 in some ways than Enuma Elish, in other ways more. Beraduk doesn't enter this discussion, Beraduk was certainly not (11 3/4) to know Genesis 1. If they knew Enuma Elish, the question is it say anything about primeval darkness? I found no word that says anything about it here. Genesis says, darkness upon the face of the deep. If darkness was on Tiamat's fact, how did she do all the things that she did (12 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) I don't see any . Then he says, light for the luminaries and before the luminaries and this says Heider is a very, very marked similarity. Both accounts refer to the existence of light, and the alternation of day and night before the creation of heavenly bodies. In the Enuma Elish day and night are spoken of as being already in existence at the time of Apsu's revolt against the ways of the gods his children. Yes, they're just taken for granted. Light is taken for granted. But nothing is said about it's being created. The Bible says God said let there be light. It doesn't seem to me that's a similarity. One has it, the other doesn't. Furthermore, tablet 1 expresses speaks of the rage of Mummu, though Mummu is just a vizier (13) proves anything about him. Finally, Marduk, the conqueror of Tiamat, was the solar deity (13 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

In Genesis day and night are likewise mentioned as in existence before the celestial bodies but here light is a creation of the (13 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) and not a divine attribute. It seems to me that's a difference rather than a similarity but later on he gives it as a very marked similarity between the two accounts. Then he speaks of the Marduk-Tiamat conflict which many writers claim is the background of various statements in other parts of the Bible and he gives a very good argument to prove this is not true. But, of course, that is not dealing with our present (13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) of Genesis 1, though it is in a general way of relations to the Bible.

Then he mentions the creation of the firmament and that is a similarity. The Bible says

God said let the waters, let there be a firmament in the midst of the heavens and let the waters be divided, the waters above the firmament from the waters under the firmament. The other says he took Tiamat, cut her in half, and put half up in the sky. It is a similarity but doesn't seem to me extremely close. But there is a fair amount of similarity. The Bible doesn't say anything about cutting her in half and putting half up there. But it does divide the waters, it does that.

Then he speaks of the creation of the earth and it's rather vague here as much of the Enuma Elish (14 $\frac{1}{8}$ ) creation of the earth. He doesn't say a great deal about it. Then the creation of the luminaries, there is a similarity. The Bible says that God put the moon and stars in the heavens, and the sun (14 3/4), <sup>to divide</sup> five days and night, months and years, and so on. This account says that he established stations for the gods in the heavens and caused that the moon should mark off the months. But after all all nations have divided time according to the sun, moon and stars. It doesn't necessarily show a similarity between two accounts for this to happen. (15)

Then he speaks of creation of plant and animal life, he says to date no portion of Enuma Elish has been recovered which contains an account of vegetation, of animals, birds, reptiles or fish. The opinion is frequently expressed that this actually has been recorded in the missing <sup>portion of</sup> tablets V, but then he goes on to show why he thinks that is extremely unlikely. Then he speaks of the creation of man in which he thinks there is a similarity and...

O.T.History 38. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...he says Enuma Elish devotes almost two full tablets but I don't see that in Enuma Elish. Enuma Elish ends with praise to <sup>Marduk,</sup> ~~Isis,~~ a great banquet celebrating in praise to Marduk, it doesn't seem to me there's much similarity between that and God resting on the seventh day. And in almost any account of any great victory you'll have a celebration. (3/4)

The Biblical isn't a celebration and it's a different sort of thing. Then he speaks of the seven tablets and the seven days and shows that this is not a relationship, but then he compares the order and he thinks the order is remarkably similar, particularly that you have light before the sun, though the Babylonian doesn't mention actually the creation of the sun at all. It refers to Marduk as a sun, as a sun-god, but there are other sun-gods mentioned in it too. He says that the order is remarkably similar. He says our examination of the various points of comparison shows quite plainly that similarities are really not so striking as we might expect, considering how closely the Hebrews and Babylonians were related. In fact, the divergencies are much more far-reaching and significant than are the resemblances, most of which are not any closer than what we should expect to find in any two more or less complete creation versions. This (2) would have to account for the same phenomena as (if) <sup>1.</sup> human minds think along much the same lines, which might come from entirely different parts of the world and might be utterly unrelated to one another. But the identical sequence of events as far as the points of contact are concerned is indeed remarkable. This can hardly be accidental since the order for them is different, thus the luminaries could have been created immediately after the formation of the sky. There no doubt is a relation between the two stories. That's his conclusion. Which seems to me unwarranted, and I mentioned to you how last week I heard it said, since even an ultra-fundamentalist like Heider thinks they're related, we can take it for granted that the two are related and therefore since Enuma Elish starts with an adverbial clause, "When from above, there was no heaven, and so on", therefore we can be justified in saying doubtless Genesis 1 would start the same way, and it isn't "in the beginning God created the heaven and earth" but it is "when God began to create heaven and earth, then the earth was without form and void" and so matter existed before the earth was created. To me it's not an argument for how Genesis 1 ought to begin, and I think it's unfortunate after all the good evidence Heider gave to show they should not be considered as related that he ends up by saying yes but they are related. On what seems <sup>to me</sup> to be very, very slight evidence. Yes?

(student. 3½)

No, I'm glad you raised that point. It's worth mentioning. There was a Jewish interpreter

about 1200 A.D., called Raschid, who in his commentary says that he believes that this should be taken as a central thought. Grammatically it is possible and he suggests it as a possible interpretation. It has not been accepted by many other people until in recent years, and it is usually advanced on the ground that there's no article with the (4) and that therefore it must be a (4) consonant. So we don't have to have a certain commentary, pointed out, the \* ordinarily doesn't take an article anyway but that is the big argument (4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) for it and then this is given sometimes as a concluding argument to clinch it, is that Enuma Elish often

But it doesn't seem to me that would prove it at all. But that <sup>is</sup> was given as a strong supporting argument by some people but not referred to nearly as much as the other one.

Well, I have here a very interesting book, The Book of Genesis, the Westminster Commentary series, The Book of Genesis, by S. R. Driver (4  $\frac{3}{4}$ ). Driver was the great leader of the English liberal interpreters of the Old Testament, died about thirty years ago but his books were, most of them, excellently written. He's careful, he's methodical, you can depend on the factual content of most of his statements. And he did as much as any other individual to make the higher criticism receive acceptance in the English speaking world. With his basic views I very heartily disagree, but his material is usually worthy of consideration and he's careful, he's (5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) many of them, he's careful and methodical and he always deserves consideration. Well, it is very interesting to read what he says about this relation. On page 30 in this commentary on the book of Genesis, after discussing the Enuma Elish and quoting the parts which are most similar to Genesis 1 but not quoting the other part, then he says, "The differences between the Babylonian epic and the first chapter of Genesis are sufficiently wide: in the one, particularly in the parts not here repeated, we have an exuberant and grotesque polytheism; in the other a severe and dignified monotheism: in the one, chaos is anterior to Deity, the gods emerge, or are evolved out of it, and Marduk gains <sup>his</sup> supremacy only after a long <sup>contest</sup> process; in the other, the Creator is supreme and absolute from the beginning." Now those few words (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) described <sup>as</sup> the object, are very excellent, and give an excellent statement of this vital difference. But now (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

"But, in spite of these profound theological differences, there are material resemblances between the two representations, which are too ~~marked~~ and too numerous to be explained as chance coincidences. The outline, or general ~~portion of them~~ <sup>course of events,</sup> is the same in the two narratives." Well, the outline is the very few things that are related, after all that excludes nine-tenths of both of them, but he doesn't say that. "The ~~but~~line, or general course of events, is the same in the two narratives. There are in both the same ~~an~~ abyss of waters at the beginning, denoted by almost the same words, the separation of this abyss afterwards into an upper and <sup>a</sup>lower ocean, the formation of heavenly bodies and their appointment as measures of time, and the creation of man. In estimating these similarities, it must further be remembered that they do not stand alone: in the narrative of the Deluge we find ~~traits~~ <sup>traits</sup> borrowed unmistakably from a Babylonian source." Now that we'll take up when we get to the flood, it shouldn't enter our consideration at this time. "So <sup>that</sup> with the antecedent difficulty which might ~~have~~ <sup>felt</sup> ~~otherwise~~ been <sup>in</sup> ~~supposing~~ elements of the <sup>Creation-</sup> ~~same~~ narrative to be traceable ultimately to the same quarter is considerably lessened. In fact, no archeologist questions that the Biblical cosmogony, however altered in form and stripped of its original polytheism, is, in its main outlines, derived from Babylonia. Nor ought such a conclusion to surprise us. The Biblical historians make no claim to have derived their information from a supernatural source." Well, the Bible as a whole is derived from a supernatural source and the fact that it doesn't specifically state it in Genesis doesn't prove to me that it isn't. But it is true that we ~~do~~ not know how Moses got the information. I don't think I need to read the rest of this ~~paragraph~~, but the next one, the beginning, is very interesting.

Driver says, "We have said 'derived ultimately'; for naturally a direct borrowing from the Babylonian narrative is not to be thought of: it is incredible that the monotheistic author of Gen. 1, at whatever date he lived, could have borrowed any detail, however slight, from the polytheistic epic of the conflict of Marduk and Tiamat." Now if that's the case, then as he holds, it went through a long period of gradual change until finally it reached this form. Well, if that's the case, why are they (8 3/4)

If that's the case, if Driver's view is correct, then the relationship is so slight actually

to go through a long period (9) <sup>change</sup>, that it doesn't seem to me to be a factor to bother with. But most of the books treat it as if it is a very, very vital factor. However, there is one book I came across which I'd like to read you a few words from because I found it extremely interesting. This is a little book called, "A Woman Unslain" (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ ), <sup>as</sup> a Babylonian tablet speaks today, by Edward <sup>Tierra</sup>, late professor of Assyriology, the University of Chicago, edited by George G. Cameron, instructor in Oriental languages at the University of Chicago, that's when this book came out, he was, in 1938. Mr. Cameron is now the Professor of Babylonian at the University of Michigan. Published in 1938 by the University of Chicago Press, they wrote on <sup>slate</sup> (9  $\frac{3}{4}$ ), the Babylonian tablets speak for themselves. This is Tierra's material and Tierra was professor of Assyriology at the University of Chicago, edited by Cameron, who is now Professor of Assyriology at the University of Michigan. Now this book is an entirely different sort of a book from those at which <sup>we've</sup> you've been looking. Price here was at the University of Chicago until his death about twenty years ago, he was a very conservative man. Tierra is not a conservative. You will be interested to see the background of his attitude here. He tells here about the various tablets in the museums there and the interest of it, it's a very interesting book, but here he says:

"Let us leave for the time being late historical accounts and pass to something more interesting such as myths and cosmogony." This is page 119 of his book. "To start from the beginning, let us take the creation story in the first chapter of the Bible. Here it says in almost every book dealing with the subject, this story is immediately compared with the Assyrian creation ~~narrative~~ and deductions are made. A considerable amount of erudition and ingenuity is generally expended on the work and finally the responses will come in more or less these words. The similarities found are not sufficient to suggest either direct (11 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) <sup>quality</sup> or direct relationship, and this <sup>settles</sup> ~~then~~ the problem to the satisfaction of (11 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) . But the procedure, simple and effective though it may be, takes too much for granted. And then he goes on to say the Bible contains not one but many creation stories." And of course that's the liberal view and we will examine that as we go on. But he says, "The Bible does not give us one creation but several <sup>of them</sup> ~~but~~ and the one which happens to be featured is in chapter 1 of Genesis, appears to be the one

which had the least hold among the common people. It stands alone at the very beginning of the holy book and represents the highest development of Hebrew theological thought. Its sections are so beautiful and so lofty as to give it a place by itself, although creation stories in other books of the Bible are completely at variance with it. The Assyrian story which is generally compared with it, (that's what I've been calling the Babylonian story because Assyria and Babylonia are often used more or less synonymously although actually there is a difference.) is not Assyrian at all but goes back thousands of years to the earliest <sup>era</sup> era of time. It happens to have become the Assyrian story because it is the first creation account discovered and because it was written in Assyrian, a language easily understood, instead of in Sumeric (12 3/4) which still presents many difficulties of interpretation. We can say in its favor that it must have been a very popular story to have survived thousands of years, to have traveled from ancient (12 3/4) Zumer to the city of Ninevah and even to have been translated into a different language. That it deserves the popularity it enjoys, (this is the Babylonian story, in the main) there can be no doubt; it is dramatic, it has plenty of action, and fully explains what it intends to explain." He doesn't mention here but what it intends to explain is how Marduk became the leading god, and it does explain that very nicely.

But then Tierra continues, "The opposite is true of Genesis, chapter 1. That certainly contains a more beautiful context and it does reflect a very high state of theological development. Nevertheless, it is merely an enumeration of facts and the style is stilted and (13 1/2) monotonous. — It was evidently produced in (13 1/2) scholarly — circles and of necessity condemned to remain there, or the general public would have known. If we wish to compare that kind of scholarly presentation with a cuneiform narrative, we must compare it with another type of story than the Babylonian story. It is useless to hope to get results by comparing a page from a book of philosophy with a drama born out of the passions and emotions of daily life." Now that's very interesting but that was Tierra's reaction to the two stories, and, while I would differ on most points of theology with Tierra, it seems to me that <sup>in</sup> his judgment of the relations of the stories, he is certainly right. The Babylonian story is a dramatic story of battle, and of how Marduk, according



to the Babylonians, became the leading god in the pantheon. The Assyrians took the same story and put the name of their god in place of the name Marduk, and made it try to represent how their god became the leading god. But, the Biblical story is an entirely different sort of a story, in an entirely different sort of a style, and the two of them deal with creation (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) . So I, personally, feel, now here there are two things I'd like to distinguish (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) . One is, what is fact? The second is, what is our attitude to be as Christians, apologists and Christian workers?

Now, as a matter of fact, I personally believe that the evidence for relationship between Enuma Elish and Genesis 1 is too slight to consider that there actually is any real relationship between them. I think the average (15) idea should be sufficient to fairly well establish that as a fact. But now secondly, as to our attitude as Christian apologists; today most interpreters go into, take the view that the two are related...

O.T.History 39. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...but I do not think that it is a vital thing to make a statement quite . That is to say, I would say this, if you have time to deal with someone at length on the matter, give him the evidence, read him the Babylonian story, I don't think it should be difficult to convince him of the facts that the two are not sufficiently related, <sup>that</sup> as we have ~~them~~ <sup>to say that</sup> they came from a parent source or either one from the other. But if you are dealing with someone on the matter of the truth of Christianity, and this is only one of various points that come in, it seems to me that then it is better to say, well, now, actually the material that has relationship, if it does, is comparatively little, and suppose this in Genesis was taken from the Babylonian, which I personally don't think it was at all, but supposing it was, it's completely (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) cleansed of its polytheism, it's completely changed in its approach, it's completely changed in its presentation. Why would not God have taken material from a Babylonian source and allowed the writers over a period of time to cleanse <sup>it</sup> of its polytheism, and to make it something which became the vehicle for the presentation of His truth. I don't think He did. But suppose He did.

What we have <sup>is what</sup> here/God has inspired and it's free from error and is entirely different in ninety percent of (1 3/4)

In view of what I just said, I hesitated about taking quite as much time making you familiar with the Babylonian material as I did, but I think it is wiser, for the material which we'll look at, to get an idea of the type of material, and you can't tell how <sup>opinion</sup> things may shift. Five years from now, more and more people may move away from the idea of a relationship. The time may come when it would be very fine to be familiar with this evidence and help give the death blow to this which I think is a theory founded on very little of fact. Just at present I don't think it's vital enough to make it a major issue, but I do think it's important (2 $\frac{1}{5}$ ) to be familiar with the facts about it. I don't think we need to spend a lot of time trying to explain the resemblances because I don't think the resemblances are enough to need much explanation. But if it be assumed that (2 3/4)

assume the two are related, well, as Driver said, it's so completely changed that if this came from the other it would have to be over a long period of gradually spreading through Israel and gradually being cleansed of its polytheism, and if that's the case then surely the final result would've gone through such a long process that the fact that one starts with an ~~adverbial clause~~ would (3 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) have <sup>nothing</sup> to do with how the other ought to start. Well, now, we'll go on to the next point in our outline.

This was the claim of Babylonian origin for this chapter, number 9, and I think that we might be justified in closing our discussion of chapter 1 at this point and going on to chapter 2, unless there's some vital question about chapter 1. And since the relationship of the two <sup>is</sup> ~~was~~ important, even if you have a question, it might come in later on. Because the relationship is the vital thing. Very vital. Let's look at, this was A, wasn't it? A was the creation of the universe. Then B, we'll simply call, Genesis 2.

B, Genesis 2. And under B, number 1 will be, is this another account of creation? This is a very important question. Is this another account of creation? It is common today for somebody to ask, do you believe the story of creation in the Bible, and you say yes, and they say, which story? You've got two contradicting each other, Genesis 1 and 2. Which story do you believe? That is a very common attitude today. In this group I was

in last week which I mentioned, the statement was made, we have two contradictory stories of creation beginning Genesis. One of them starts with ~~water~~, one of them starts with earth, but they both start with adverbial clauses. And that's similar to Enuma Elish, all three start with adverbial clauses. But they are, it is another contradictory account of creation. Now do we have here another account of creation? My answer is, yet, we have another account of creation. If you ask the question that way. Suppose you have an account of the building of this building here. And you have another account of the building of the Post Office in Podunk City. Do you have two building accounts? Certainly you have. But they're accounts of the building of different things. Now in this case, you have two accounts of creation but they're not the same creation. Do we have two accounts of the creation of man? Yes. Genesis 1 has two or three verses how man was created, Genesis 2 has three or four verses how man was created. Do we have two accounts of the creation of the creation of the universe. No. Genesis 1 is the account of the creation of the universe. Genesis 2 is a more detailed account of the creation of man. When people say two creation accounts, you might think they meant two accounts of the creation of the universe. Well, Genesis 1 tells of the creation of light. It's not mentioned in 2. Genesis 1 tells of the creation of the firmament, it's not mentioned in 2. 1 tells of the creation of the sun, moon and stars, it's not mentioned in 2. 1 tells of the creation of vegetation, it's not given in 2. 1 tells of the creation of animals, only referred to in 2. Not (6 3/4)

What kind of a story of the creation of the universe do you have without any sky, any heaven, without any light, without any sun, moon and stars. And without vegetation. And with creation being presented. The two, somebody has given a figure, which I think is not quite accurate but pretty good, they said like two maps in the beginning of an atlas, the first is a map of the world and the second is a map of North America. I don't think that's very good but I think it has a basic idea. I would like to say it this way, it's like two maps in an atlas, the first of which is a map of the world and the second is a map of the United States. You see the difference? You look at the map of the world and the United States is on. You look at the map of the United States and you see something of the parts

of the world that touch the United States. You look at the map of the world and the United States is a little tiny thing in it, just a very small part on the map of the world. You look at the map of the United States and this little tiny bit is given in much more detail. On the map of the world, it might show three or four cities of the United States. On the map of the United States they might show several hundred. It gives us an account of the creation of the universe, including God's resting on the seventh day, with the creation briefly stated in its proper place. Then he takes up the story again, to deal with that which more particularly concerns us, telling about the creation of man. Genesis 1 begins with a watery chaos, Genesis 2 begins with a great God. Is that a contradiction? Yes, it is <sup>if</sup> they are two accounts of the creation of the universe. But if one is a larger area than the other I might give you an account of my trip to South America last summer and I might say that we started out here in Elkins Park riding in a car, then I might be telling somebody about our airplane trip to Miami, to Brazil, last summer, and I might say that we started out taxiing down the (9) way <sup>^</sup> — into the airport, and then rose into the air. Oh, somebody would say one story starts with riding in an auto and the other riding in an airplane. They contradict each other. No, they don't, one starts in a different place than the other. If the <sup>earth</sup> airport was a watery chaos at one time, after God separated the dry land from the water, there would be times when the trees would be (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) when the dry land was dry, when it lacked the water that it needed. The question is, where do they stop? And if the second one says nothing about the creation of firmament, of light, of sun, moon and stars, what reason to say it starts at the same place as the first. The two contradict each other in that they have opposite starts. They do not actually contradict each other because they're dealing with different things, they're dealing with a different point in the story. Now we'll want to look at that in a little more detail tomorrow morning. I think it's a very vital thing because this is one of the most widely spread ideas today against the Bible, that it starts with two contradictory stories of creation. And it's very important that we have a clear understanding about them.

...the date and the name of the first excavator of Ninevah. I pointed it out in class yesterday morning. Your name and the date, and the name of the first excavator of Ninevah. We haven't said much about him but I spelled his name out.

We began yesterday our discussion of Genesis 2, and under that we looked at number 1, is this another creation account? It is not a different creation account, it is an account of a different portion of creation. The first was like a map of the world, this like a map of the United States. It takes a very small portion of the whole creation and covers it in more detail. Then we notice that this chapter contains, the creation of the universe is hardly a true name because there is no creation in it of the firmament, there's no creation of light, there is no creation of sun, moon, and stars, that goes quite a ways to cut down the name, the creation of the universe. However, you will find some critical commentaries that will say, this account contradicts the first account because it has a different of creation, that in this account you have the creation as follows, here, that you have man created, and then you have vegetation, and then animals, and then woman. Whereas, in the first account you have the order, vegetation, then animals and then man and woman. Is that a true statement? How many of you would say that that is a true statement? Would you raise your hand? Nobody thinks it's true. Well, who then says it's a false statement? Nobody says it's true and only one says it's false. Well, the Middlers and Seniors have been assigned the geographical places in this chapter but have not been assigned the consideration of creative acts. But the Juniors were asked to examine all the creative acts in this chapter. So I would expect every first-year student immediately to know whether the statement I just made is true or not. That is, I'd expect everybody to know that the statement is true, that in the first chapter of Genesis we have vegetation created, ignoring other things, these things are created in this order, vegetation, animals, man and woman, in the first chapter, male and female created he them. That is the order of the first chapter. Everybody should know that. So everybody should say yes that is true as far as the first chapter. But as far as the second chapter is concerned, I would expect every Junior immediately to say yes or no to this question, does the second chapter say that the order of the creation was man, that is of these things,

leaving out the others, man, vegetation, animals, woman. Well, Mr. Steele is not a Junior but his head is shaking no. And I'll have to call on him. (student. 5)

Well, for the moment, ignoring that; for the moment, assuming, for the moment, that the order in which things are stated is the order in which it occurs, then is the statement true that chapter 2 is creation in this order, man, vegetation, animals, woman. How many would say yes, that's the order? Would you say yes, Mr. Bitterman? Did you have your hand up. Who did then? Oh, Mr. Watson, you had your hand up? No, but is this the order in which the creation is described in Genesis 2. (student. 6)

Well, now, is the creation of these things listed in this order, regardless whether it's the order in which it actually happened? Mr. Watson, where does it tell about the creation of vegetation in chapter 2? Yes, well, now everybody look at the chapter and see where it describes the creation of vegetation in chapter 2. Now the Juniors should know that instantly because they had an assignment about a week ago. The others might not, but I would expect the Juniors to be able now to point to a verse which the critics say describes the creation of vegetation. Verse 5. Well, now, verse 5 doesn't say, it says the vegetation had not yet grown the first time. Every plant in the field before it was in the earth, every herb before it grew: for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth.

Verse 5 refers to the time when the plants were not growing. (student. 7 1/4)

Verse 5 would seem to imply they had already been created but were not yet growing, because it says the reason they weren't growing was that it wasn't raining and there was no man tilling the ground, but it implies they were created and (7 3/4) growing some time. (student. Verse 8 and 9 doesn't necessarily mean the creation of man because it refers to Eden.) Verse 8 and 9 say, And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Well, we do not have mentioned here of grass and of earth but we certainly have trees mentioned. Is there here the creation of vegetation mentioned subsequent to the creation of man? (student. 8 1/4)

It would seem to imply they were already created. Mr. Watson? <sup>or Myers?</sup> (8 3/4)(student)

Yes, there might be an implication but not an actual (9 1/4) , but how many times?

Mr. Shellabarger?  
~~But how many times~~ (student. 9 1/4)

Yes, that actually they were created. So that there's an implication in verses 5 and 6 that the creation of vegetation preceded that of man, just an implication. But some critics say the order of creation is man, vegetation, animal, woman. How did they get the creation of vegetation after the creation of man. They get it from verse 9, and out of the ground made the Lord to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight. (student. 10)  
 That is a good argument that can be said, but that is not creation. But there's also another (10 1/4) . That is only the Garden of Eden

Verse 8 and 9 is the account of a special (10 1/4) , not the account of the creation of vegetation. It is the account of the preparation of the garden of Eden. It is <sup>not</sup> the account of the creation of vegetation and about half of the critical books recognize that fact. That is to say, about half the critical books say chapter 2 contradicts chapter 1 because it has a different order of creation, it has man, vegetation, animal, woman. While the other half say chapter 2 contradicts 1 because it has a different order of creation, it has man, animal (and they don't mention vegetation because they recognize that this verse is the verse describing the planting of a garden, not the creation of vegetation). So half recognize this and half don't. But if you meet somebody who, in a superficial way, just passes on what they heard, that the two chapters contradict each other and they contradict each other and they contradict each other in this way, that the order of creation is different, it's probably because they think that it has man, vegetation, animals, woman, instead of vegetation, animals, man and woman. And that's the first step to show them that this is not so, is to show that this does not include vegetation at all.

So that our present point is, is this another creation account? Our present point is not, does it contradict, but is it another creation account? And under that present point, whether it is another creation account, we notice it does not refer to creation of the firmament or of the sun, moon and stars, or original matter, it leaves out a very great part of (12 1/4) to that we now add, it doesn't seem

So it is only an account of a portion. (student. 12 1/4)

But it's only a portion, only a very small portion. Yes, it is an exposition of the last little section of chapter 1. Chapter 1 is like a picture of this room, chapter 2 a picture of this blackboard--it is a very small portion of the whole room. Mr. Jaggard? (student. 12 3/4)

No. Well, 5 and 6 are a little hard to interpret. My guess <sup>would be</sup> is that 5 and 6 applied to a portion of the world but not creation. Because back in the third day it says, let the earth bring forth, the earth brought forth. That would seem to mean that they were already growing in a substantial portion of the earth, but 5 and 6 imply that they already were in existence but that in a portion of the earth they had not yet grown, and then the mist began to come up and they began to grow in that portion. I don't think 5 and 6 are an account of creation but they perhaps imply a previous creation. But the critical claims that the two are contradictory accounts of creation is not true because this covers a very small part (13 3/4)

. The first is like a big panorama and this is a little section of it. The first is like a map of the world, this like a map of the United States, as far as the overlapping is concerned. Mr. ? (student. 14)

O.T.History 41. (1 $\frac{1}{8}$ )

...yes, well, 5 and 6 do not ~~kill~~ <sup>say</sup> Adam tilled all the ground, they say there was no man to till the ground. I think the implication is that eventually man would till the ground. But the implication is not (3/4) Eventually man tills the ground, but he doesn't till all the ground. We have great forests with no man tilling them, there's so much jungle. But for the, you might say for the protection of (1) it is necessary (1 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) . This is a negative (1 $\frac{1}{8}$ ) <sup>2</sup> statement rather than a <sup>1</sup> positive statement, it doesn't have

But now then for our first point I think we have answered in saying the only creation explicitly mentioned in this chapter is the creation of man, woman and animals. There is no other creation explicitly mentioned in this chapter. Therefore this chapter covers a very, very small portion of the whole account of creation. So that that answers the first,



is this another creation account? Yes, it is <sup>but</sup> an account of only a <sup>small</sup> portion of creation, an exposition of the finer points of the big account. <sup>Mrs. Hyland</sup> (student. 2)

No, (2 1/4) that verse 27 is in verse 21 in chapter 2, that this goes back

Well, that's our first question then, is this another creation account. The second question is, does Genesis 2 contradict Genesis 1? Does Genesis 2 contradict Genesis 1? It is alleged that it contradicts it. It is alleged first that it contradicts it because that starts with a watery chaos, and this starts with an arid waste. One starts it with it too wet, the other with it too dry. But I think we notice that our answer to that is that they start at different places. There's no contradiction when they start at different times in the history of creation. I gave you an illustration the other day of one account of my trip to South America last summer which was started from here, riding in a car, another which was started as we were leaving Miami riding in an airplane. There were contradictory because they started differently, but there was no actual contradiction because they started at different times in the journey, and the world would have started as a watery chaos, but eventually the dry land was separated, then the dry land becomes too dry and it is necessary to provide a means of taking the water which has been separated from the earth and using it to irrigate the earth. So they start at different times. So that's why the contradiction is not <sup>proved</sup> proven.

Now, the second alleged contradiction I've already called your attention to, the allegation that the order of creation is different. And in answer to that we notice <sup>in the</sup> that first place that vegetation is not, the creation of vegetation is not here described at all. And it is merely the planting of a garden, and you could say that whether you went out in the springtime and planted a garden and caused corn and oats and (4 1/4) to grow up out of the garden. You would not be creating vegetation, you would be preparing a place for it to grow and putting the seeds in that particular place, and consequently this is the planting of a garden, not the creation of vegetation; do you have a question? (student. 4 1/2)

(student con'd.)


Yes, what did it say? (student)

Yes, well, the whole face of the earth, does that mean the whole world, or does it mean a portion of the world? If it says the face of the whole earth, that would seem to mean be the whole world, wouldn't it? But the whole face of the earth might be a portion of it. It is difficult to know exactly what the passage means, and I believe the translators of the RSV are anxious to show how the two contradict each other, but I don't think it's necessary to translate it in such a way as to . . . As far as the verse is concerned, it does not prove vegetation was actually growing in some sections but since in the first chapter we have it growing already, it would seem to me to be a probably interpretation that this refers only to a portion of the world. Mr. Myers? (student.6)

Yes, well, now, we want to take that up but first I want to deal with vegetation. That is, as Mr. Myers points out, while some said ~~it was~~ <sup>in their commentaries,</sup> ~~to say~~ <sup>(6 $\frac{1}{4}$ )</sup> vegetation was created in a different order, many of them recognize the fact that it is not the creation of vegetation, but the planting of a garden. But they all say that the animals were in a different order. But before we go to that, I want to look at the plants a little more. That is the important thing we'll have next. But first the plants.

Even though this is not the statement of the creation of vegetation, I would like to examine the order of events. What happened? The Lord, what does it say, in verse 7, the Lord formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul, and then God said, let there be a garden come into existence, all of a sudden, with great trees growing, a lovely place for a man to live, and we'll take man and put him in it. Is that what he says. It is not. It says God planted a garden. Now could have planted a garden, he could have put the seeds into the ground, and he could have said let these seeds sprout up so fast that <sup>an oak</sup> ~~no~~ tree will grow to be a hundred years old inside of half a day. He could have said that. But I don't think we're justified in (7 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

What is then the correct assumption about it? The correct assumption about it is

that he planted the garden before he created man. The Lord God made man and the Lord planted the garden where he made everything to grow. When did he plant the garden, he planted it in sufficient time that when man was created the garden would be ready for his occupancy. What kind of a picture of God as a workman is this, if it shows that God takes the dust of the ground, breathes into it the breath of life, here he has man living, so now where's this man going to live? Well, we've got to make a place for him to live, all right, put him up on the shelf to dry for a hundred years while the trees are growing and till the garden gets ready to put him into it. Certainly there is no implication that God was that sort of a workman. God, the implication is that God, when he had man made, had the garden all prepared but he started the preparation of the garden first. It was said he (8 3/4) <sup>1</sup> found there was to come into existence a garden already, that would--I know of a college in California which purchased a place in Pasadena and advertised through the country that it would be a very, very fine place for a college, they had a lovely property, and they were previously in a little place down in Los Angeles where they were crowded. They were going to move to this lovely place here, they sold their place in Los Angeles, they had everything all advertised, it came two weeks before school started and they learned that according to zoning regulations they could not have a school in that part of Pasadena. So they immediately looked around and they found in Santa Barbara, a hundred miles away, an old estate which was in good shape and was for sale and they purchased it like that and moved up there and started in. They had to get something that was all ready because they wanted to start their school. Ever since (9 3/4) and have developed that place and made a nice place for a college. But they suddenly found they had to get a place that was all ready. Well, that, such things happen in human life occasionally, but not ordinarily. Ordinarily, when you (10) move , ordinarily you get the place ready first before you make the move. You start your preparation before you actually need it. And here it could say, and God put Adam into an excellent garden. It could say that. But it doesn't, it says he planted a garden. The inference is that he planted the garden before he created man, so the garden was ready when man was there. Now the Hebrew form here, the Hebrew has no specific pluperfect form. In English

we say he did it or he had done it. In Hebrew there is no specific pluperfect form. The perfect can be translated as a pluperfect, and it is a proper translation in a sense in this chapter, in English, after you say that the Lord formed the man, to say the Lord God had planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there he put the man whom he had formed. You see, this whom he had formed, there's no form had formed in Hebrew. Hebrew does not have a pluperfect. (11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Whom he had formed was a correct translation and was equally correct as given in the first part of the verse. The Lord God had formed, <sup>had</sup> ~~formed~~ planted a garden, and there out of the ground he had made to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and there he put the (11 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) (student. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

orchard

but to plant means God caused these things (12)

and begin to grow. It does not suddenly come into being, you would use other terms for that. So that we are justified ~~and~~ in fact required to say that the Lord God planted means he had planted. Now you don't have to say had planted. It is possible in most languages, and I believe in English--except in most extremely precise English, to say planted and mean that this event took place before the other event. Yes? (student. 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, that is a (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) similar case where

translation. The Lord had said to Abraham, they could we'll just take it the Lord said. I don't believe (12 3/4) but the "had said" would be entirely justified. It is required by the sense if they prefer to make it said

And so you don't have to say had planted but you have to understand that this event took place before the other. Yes? (student. 13 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

The verses 5 and 6 would be after the original creation but it would be a situation a little before man was created. (student. 13 3/4)

Yes, probably. A little while before man was created. Yes? (student. 13 3/4)

Oh, well, the authorized version is "the Lord had said to Abraham", in Genesis 12:1. The King James version is "had said", verse 1. (student. 14 1/4)

Yes, that's so. In other words, the RSV, even though they will insist in verse 1 that it must be "said" they will ~~stick to the imperfect~~ <sup>make it has said.</sup> They will stick to the imperfect if they can make a contradiction, but they do use the imperfect occasionally.

But the order of the planting of the garden is not tremendously important to our present observation, but it lays the ground for something that is important. Let us look at the creation of animals now. This...

## O.T.History 42. (3/4)

...I would think that verses 5 and 6 probably apply to a very large portion of the earth. They simply point back to the fact that after God separated land, dry land, from the water, then the dry land was too dry for vegetation and when he created vegetation he caused the mists to come, he caused water to come from the place where the water was into the dry land, (1 1/4) . This may even go back as far as the third day. (1 1/2)

for the vegetation to be in full, the best position to need a man to till the ground, but we have our jungles today where there's no man and they're filled with the most vegetation, but it's rank, it's uncontrolled, it's all mixed together. It's not much good as far as production. (student. 1 3/4)

Well, water; yes, but it's to separate the dry land from the water and he put all the water there and all the land here, there's no water for them to grow, so he had to provide a way to get water for them to grow. It's like this word mist, it's not a very good translation of the word, a rather uncommon word, some <sup>(r)</sup> think it's derivative, but it means, it's hard to establish exactly what the word means, it means that God provided a way to get water to the land. You can find plenty of places in the western United States where there's practically nothing growing. It's absolutely desolate, and yet in the spring it rains, and

after the rain you go over that place and you can't step without stepping on a flower. It's so covered with the most beautiful wild flowers, every square inch is covered with flowers, and then within a couple of weeks they're all gone and it again is absolutely rank desert, you wouldn't dream to look at it anything had ever grown there in years.

(2  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

Now there are many parts which get water by other ways than rain, but there are also parts which, not having another way to get water, get no growth whatever. I'd say that in general an arid (3)

Now you take in Mesopotamia, there's very little growth in Mesopotamia now. Most of it is just wild and inaccessible but the two great rivers come down from the mountains (3 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

and the people take the water from the rivers and they irrigate the land and have most wonderful growth. Several spots (3 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

but nothing grows when they take the water out that just a little ways . Yes? (student 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, but chapter 2 is the creation of man and the creation of woman. (student. 3  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

The explanation of how he created man and woman. (student. 4)

No, I would think that verse 7 of chapter 2 is the creation of God's forming man out of the dust of the ground. Man was not man until God had formed him. (student. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Chapter 1 tells of the creation of the whole universe, chapter 2 takes a little small part of it, the creation of man, and tells that in more detail. An exposition of that takes part. (student. 4  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

Yes, it's summarized in chapter 1 but given in more detail in chapter 2. Yes? (student. 4  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

Yes, that would doubtless be involved in it, and that man was created to order (5 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Well, I want to stick to this main point. Does Genesis 2 contradict Genesis 1? It does not as far as the beginning of it is concerned. Because, though it begins in an opposite way, it's at a different time. Yes? (student 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, we're just getting to 19 now, we're just closing. Does chapter 2 contradict chapter 1? Chapter 2 says that, it started with dryness, chapter 1 with wetness, but they're

different parts of the story. Aren't you glad there's no contradiction there? Now as to the order of creation. The creation of vegetation is not described in a different order because the creation of vegetation isn't described in Genesis 2, but the planting of a garden is, and even that is before the creation of man. Well, now how about the animals? The critical books, those which recognize that chapter 2 does not describe the creation of vegetation but this is just the planting of a garden, will say the order of chapter 1 is animals, man and woman, male and female created he them. The order in chapter 2 is man, animals, woman. That's what they will say. Well, the creation of animals is very definitely mentioned in chapter 2. Verse 18, the Lord God said it is not good that man should be alone. I will make him an help suitable for him, and out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them, and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And the Lord created Eve, took the ... (student. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, verse 26 in chapter 1 he says man and woman were created. In chapter 2 it says man was created in verse 8 and it says woman was created in verse 22, and in between them it mentions the creation of animals. In chapter 1 it mentions animals in an earlier section and man and woman both in verse 28. (student. 7  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

Everybody recognizes that verse 26 in chapter 1 includes both man and woman because it says male and female created he them. (student. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

It is, chapter 2 is an elaboration on that verse. (student. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

I don't know what you mean. If you say, if you were to say that a man built a house and you were to say that a certain man at a certain time built a house, and then a little later you were to say that this man dug a foundation into which he put a cellar, he built two stories on the house, he put a chimney on it and he painted it red, you would be telling the same thing twice, first telling it in brief form, secondly in longer form. You have told the same thing twice, and that's what is done here. It says the creation of man, male and female created he them, and in the second chapter it says he created man, and then it refers to animals, and then it says he created woman. So the critics say there is a contradiction because the order in chapter 1 is animals, man and woman, and in chapter 2

the order is man, animals, woman, and that we want to look at. Now, does he create animals between the creation of man and woman in chapter 2, while in chapter 1 he puts the two in one verse, man and woman. That we want to look at and the place to look at it is verse 19 which says he formed every beast of the field ~~and~~ of the ground, and every fowl of the air, and brought them to Adam. That is the allegation of the critics, and just as the plain man would read it, as it stands here in the English, there is a contradiction (10 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

But I hold that in interpreting the Bible, as interpreting everything else you have to do more than just read, you have to interpret to see what it means. The plain man would simply say God made man and God planted a garden. He might say that means he took the man and put him up on the shelf for a hundred to dry while the garden grew big enough to put man in. But the intelligent man looks at it and says no, it means that God had planted the garden before man was created in order that it would be ready. I had a friend who was a student once at the University of Chicago Divinity School for a year and he got thoroughly disgusted there so he left and went to Moody Bible Institute for a year and he got just as disgusted there, he couldn't be happy anywhere, and I got a letter from him, or no, I saw him when he was at Moody Bible Institute and oh, he was disgusted. He says, you know, these fellows here, he says, they'll pray for money when they need money, they'll pray for money and then they'll go right to the post box and pull out a letter and there's the money right there, and they'd just prayed for it a few minutes before. That is, it seemed to him absurd that a person should pray and should get the money immediately in answer to <sup>his</sup> ~~their~~ prayer. It seems to me that anyone who believes in God would recognize that God could answer last week the prayer I make today. God knows perfectly last week <sup>about the</sup> ~~the~~ prayer I make today and can answer it in advance so the answer reaches me at the time after I pray, and it would be a pretty poor concept of God to say that God had to make man and then he had to wait awhile before he could plant the garden. Now I'd rather not stop unless it's right directly on this verse, for anything now because I want to make progress. If it's something right on this verse, let's take it, otherwise let's not. Yes? Do you have something right on the verse? (student. 12 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

Yes, you mean the contradiction could be resolved by saying the verse is a later addition,



not original...(student.13)

Yes, there is a close logical relationship, as Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ points out, between verse 18 and verse 22. Mr. Welch, do you have something right on this verse? (student.13 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

I believe so, yes. That is to say, I don't think there need be a contradiction to the intelligent man, even in English, because in English you say he did this and you say that, if you say that so-and-so got married and he rented an apartment and took his bride there, if you say that in English I don't think it necessarily means that after they got married, they then went to a real estates company and asked where they could rent an apartment. I think the implication would be that the renting of the apartment took place before they got married and he had it ready so that when he was married it was right ready. But in precise English we would use the pluperfect form, we would say he got married and he had rented an apartment and he moved into it. Now in Hebrew there is not a pluperfect. (student.14 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

The word what? (student) Yes, well, now let's leave that, that's an entirely different question. The question we're interested in now is is the order of creation man, animal, woman, here. That's the question we're looking at now, is the order man, animal, woman, and if so, it contradicts chapter 1. I think the answer to that is that the order here is not necessarily man, animal, woman, because just as in verse 8 the Lord God planted a garden and describes something which happened previously to something in verse 7...

O.T.History 43. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...the first half of the verse is leading up to it. It is telling of the preparation previously made before 7, and that here I believe we can take the exact meaning intended, that in verse 18 God said, it is not good that man be alone, I'll make a help meet for him and the Lord, out of the ground, the Lord has formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, and he brought them to Adam, the Lord brought to Adam what he had previously made, and so the implication is that the order of chronology is different from the order of statement here, just as back in verse 8 and in English we can make that evident by using a pluperfect, but we don't have to, it would be understood if it was without a pluperfect.

That is the vital point, that actually there is not necessarily a change of order. Mr.

(student. 1 1/2)

Where's that? I don't see it. You have the King James version? Well, I mean who uses the now? (student. 1 3/4)

Well, now, that English word now is a very bad word, because the English word now has two meanings. It may have the meaning "at this time" and it may have <sup>just a</sup> the meaning of "here's something that happened." The word now in English <sup>does</sup> ~~is~~ not necessarily mean time. It is (2 1/4) in service as, now let's think about this. It may not necessarily mean time at all.

But the word now does not occur in this verse in the Hebrew. (student. 2 1/2)

Yes, in other words, a pluperfect is <sup>implied</sup> inferred by what we have here. And that's what we have here. We have an inference that the formation of these animals was made he brought them to Adam, but it does not say how long before and <sup>we</sup> learn from verse 1 that it happened a long time previously.

Now chapter 1 says that God said, let the earth bring forth the living creatures, cattle and creeping thing and beast, and chapter 2 says out of the ground the Lord formed every living thing, the one says earth and the other says ground. (3)

(student.3)

animals, land animals? No where that I can see. It says, let the waters bring forth fish, it doesn't say let the waters bring forth land animals, it says let the earth bring forth land animals. (student. 3 1/4)

Yes, those are fish, but this is talking about the land animals. Well, look at chapter 1, verse 24, the Lord said, let the earth bring forth. (student. 3 1/8)

Oh, that's on verse 24, let the earth bring forth the living creature, chapter 1;24.

(student. 3 3/4)

Not at all. Suppose I say let the water be filled with living creatures, and then I say let the earth be covered with living creatures. Well, it's contradictory if I mean the same living creatures but if I mean fish in one case and land animals in the other...

(student.4)

No, I'm saying exactly the (4)

(student.4)

Sure, the Bible does. If it says let the waters bring forth living creatures, it doesn't mean let the waters bring forth every kind of living creature there is, it just means let them bring forth some things, because then it goes on and says let the earth bring forth living creatures <sup>it means</sup> of different kind than those which the waters brought forth. Notice (4 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

one says earth and one says ground, terms quite identical. Now, of course, it might be as Mr. Welch suggests that in verse 19 when it says out of the ground the Lord formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them to Adam, that he also brought the fish to Adam to see if they would make a help meet for him, and if they did, of course, they weren't made out of the ground but out of the water so there would be a contradiction. But I think that it may be that the general statement, out of the ground he made these, could be used in a general sense to include the waters, and thus the fish also were brought to see if they made a help meet, or he might have just left the fish out and just taken the land animals. We don't know. Mr. Myers?

(student.5)

No, verse 19 says the Lord brought the animals to Adam, verse 20 <sup>says</sup> but for Adam there was not found a help meet for him. What it means is that the Lord demonstrated to Adam his need of a help meet by showing him that none of the animals was satisfied (5 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

but that doesn't mean that he had just now made the animals, it means that the animals had been made but now he demonstrated.--It doesn't mean that God said, now man needs a help meet now let's make him a help meet so he proceeded and made a lion and brought him to Adam and Adam said that wouldn't do for a help meet, so then he made a crocodile and then he made a hippopotamus and then he brought all these things and they didn't do, so then he created woman, and all the animals had just been made for this purpose but they wouldn't do so he just let them keep on living. That is not what it means at all, it means God had created the animals but now he's demonstrating to Adam the need of a help meet by showing that no~~o~~ne of the animals (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

and so there is no contradiction, if it is intelligently understood, but if you take the words, one, two, three, exactly as they stand and insist on taking them in the simplest

possible way instead of interpreting them, you do have a contradiction as the critics say you do because you cannot take anything that anybody ever wrote that way. You have to interpret its meaning, rather than simply to take the words exactly as they stand. You get contradictions out of anything that anybody ever said. Mr. Chase? (student. 6 3/4)

Chapter 1, verse 24, says let the earth bring forth the living creature, chapter 2:19 says out of the ground the Lord formed every beast of the ~~field~~<sup>earth,</sup> there's no contrast there. It is true that chapter 2:19 mentions the fowl also and in chapter 1 the fowl are placed with marine life, they belong with the fish which came out of the water. But there's no contradiction there, there's just a brief statement there. Yes? (student. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes. I think there's no question that God did (7 3/4)

but the Holy Spirit used the power (8)

process which the Lord established

by a

Our time is up. I fear we have time for no more questions. I'm anxious to avoid getting confused with multiplicity of small points of interpretation here. There are small points on which we could spend months studying, it would be interesting for you to do, but the vital thing is to get the big points, that the order here does not contradict the order in chapter 1, that it does not here <sup>say</sup> that animals were created between man and woman, but that the animals which God had created were brought to man <sup>to</sup> and demonstrated his need for a help meet. We will continue with this next time.

(9 $\frac{1}{2}$ )...and under B I think I gave number 1, is this another creation account? And we examined that and saw the difference and the similarities between the two, between chapter 1 and chapter 2. It is another creation account, it is not another account of the whole creation, but only an expanded account of a very small portion of the creation, so the two do overlap but the overlapping is such as you might expect anywhere where you discuss a big subject and then you discuss a smaller subject more fully.

Now, number 2 is, does Genesis 2 contradict Genesis 1? This is point 2 under B, and under I want to give a sub-point <sup>b</sup>. Sub-point <sup>b</sup>, the order of the events of creation.

The order of the events of creation, no that should be b. a I already gave you. a is, the beginning, the difference in the beginning. The difference in the situation at the beginning. Now, what is the difference in the situation at the beginning of chapter 1 and the beginning of the section that runs from chapter 2:4 on? What is the difference there, Mr. ? (student.11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, one is wet and one is dry. Now if you were to have an account of Mr. Rice on a vacation trip last year and he said it was a little wet, why you might think he had just come out of a swimming pool, whereas you might read another account of his experience as he started for the pool and say that he was very dry, and you would figure that he had not yet gotten into the pool. The two accounts do overlap, but the beginning may not be the same unless the accounts are accounts of the same thing exactly. Overlapping accounts don't have to start at the same place. That's quite obvious, I should say. This question then is decided by the first question, do we have two accounts of a complete creation? The answer is no. We have an account of complete creation and an account of a portion of creation. Consequently this is not a contradiction. Frequently it is said that it is, but it is not. Now we won't go into such a matter as to whether there is a difference in manner of creation of mankind. Everybody <sup>I think</sup> ~~ought to~~ recognizes that it's given a very general form in Genesis 1, a detailed in 2. That is not, by anyone I've ever heard of, (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) of a contradiction. But b, as I just gave you, the order of the events of creation. And the order is alleged to be a contradiction. As you already know, that some say the order here is man, vegetable, animal, woman. Others say the order is man, animal, woman. So for sub-point under b, we will put (1) there is actually no mention here of the creation of vegetation. There is actually no mention here of the creation of vegetation (13 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) that he planted a garden, and every time every one of you plants a garden and somebody takes it as a creation story, we'd have all sorts of contradictory names <sup>(13 $\frac{1}{2}$ )</sup> for creation stories. It just says he planted a garden, that's all it said.

(2) anyway, the planting of the garden precedes the creation of man. Now, that, of course, is an inference. Ever hear a commentary, I was just reading a critical commentary in which he said that it's perfectly clear that the author thought ~~that~~ <sup>of</sup> the garden ~~was~~

planted after man was created. Now how did he know it's perfectly certain. What (14)

? I mean, to my mind, that is a ridiculous, absurd statement to make, it is perfectly certain that the author expected that, unless you are convinced that the author was a lunatic. And if you are convinced he was a lunatic, even then you can't predict what he will do, so you can't be sure then that he will (14 1/2)

the preposterous, absurd sort of thing. God created man, and then he planted a garden, and in this garden he put the man. Well, if he created the man, then planted the garden that day, and the next day he put him there, it would have been a long time before there were any trees to give them shade or fruit or anything else. And in the passage, garden isn't a particularly good word...

#### O.T.History 44. (1 1/2)

...it's not a garden used in the sense of a vegetable garden, it's more like a park, and we think of a park as a place simply for recreation and music. This is more than that. This is a place, a sort of combination of garden and park, the place which is ideally suited for people to live because it has got what they need, the trees providing all the fruit they need for food and providing the shade and the shelter and all the other things. And to create man and then put him aside to dry for several decades until the garden had grown (1 3/4)

the original had intended to say that God made the garden after he made man, it stands to reason he would have said, and God caused a garden to suddenly come into existence. That God could have done. But that's not what the account says. It says, he planted a garden. And thus the planting was done before the creation of man (2 1/2) assuming that the author of the account was talking sense instead of nonsense. (2 1/2)

And there is not a pluperfect in Hebrew, but you don't even to have a pluperfect. In English we can make it specific and clear by making a pluperfect but we don't have to do so. I might say, I have taught at this seminary 19, no 21, years. I have taught at Westminster

Seminary 8 years. Now if I make those two statements, my second statement is followed by the first but you can be (3) you know I'm teaching here now, the 21 years comes after the 8 years, but it wouldn't be necessary to state it chronologically when you're listing the facts. <sup>I</sup> ~~See~~ do not state the order in which they occur, the one might be after the other, it might be before the other. (3 1/4) and certainly he is arranging them, not in the order of chronology, but in the order of logic. You might say President Eisenhower appointed so-and-so as secretary of this and then go on and tell whom he appointed later and then you might say whom he appointed to a different office/ (3 3/4) in which you're taking the officers in order instead of giving them in chronology order. It is dogmatically stated by certain critical commentaries that the planting must ~~have~~ come after but there's absolutely no ground on which to base it. The planting of the garden actually precedes the creation of man.

Number (3) it does not state that the animals were created after man. You see, the reason why the critical commentaries are so anxious to insist the planting is after the creation of man is because he insists that the making of the animals was after the creation of man in order to get a contradiction, but read the passage and see what it's talking about you find that what it's talking about is bringing the animals to Adam in order to demonstrate that no one can be satisfied without a help meet, and it is assuming, not merely that this is an uninspired story, not a story of truth, when it is assuming that the author of the story was a man of sub-moronic intelligence, to assume that he pictures God here as making man and then saying now we've got to have a help meet for man, what'll we do, all right, I'll make a giraffe, bring him to man, well this is not a help meet, All right, we'll make a crocodile, see if this works, and God makes all these complicated animals, a tremendous variety among them, and very, very complex, and very wonderful kinds of species that these animals have, and God makes them one after the other and brings them to see if they fit and they don't, and they're already made, so they're still in existence but that's what they were made for. Perfectly obvious that the author of it, even if he made up the story out of his head, and it was a purely human story, would have had more intelligence than to imagine such a thing. He is saying that God brought before man these animals, that

God made them, but it doesn't mean to say that God made them right at this moment. In English we could put in the pluperfect to convey the idea. Hebrew does not have that particular device. You don't have to have such device, even in English. It would not be necessary to make it a pluperfect in order to indicate that (6 1/4)

Now, then, the three facts noted as to the order of the events, we can draw our conclusion fairly from them, that the order is not contradictory. It is stated in Genesis 1, God created man, male and female created he them. It is stated in Genesis 2 that God created man, and then a little later that he made the woman. There is no contradiction <sup>between the two accounts.</sup> Genesis 1 does not say they are created the same instant necessarily. Genesis 2 does not say that others are <sup>^</sup> created <sup>^</sup> between the <sup>^</sup> two. (?) So much then for this subject, does Genesis 2 contradict Genesis 1. I think these two together, is it a different account of creation, does it contradict, are extremely important because if you ever are going to have to do with college students who take any courses in Bible whatever, in almost any school, you're going to find that this is stated in an off-hand manner as that of which there is no question at all, that the Bible begins with two contradictory accounts of creation, and if you don't have a reasonable <sup>understanding</sup> of the situation you either make extremely unwarranted statements, which doesn't work out <sup>^</sup> (7 3/4), and naturally destroy <sup>^</sup> their confidence in everything else that you say, or else you accede too much beyond what the background (7 3/4). But you see what the situation is, that you find that this widespread statement is completely false and an attack of the enemy.

Well, now we go on to matters of interpretation, number 3, the garden of Eden. In Genesis 2 here we have the garden of Eden established, God plants the garden and He puts man in it, and under that we will Q, the question of the geographic situation. Where was the garden of Eden? Well, we read here about a river which went out of Eden to water the garden, and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads. If you take that as going downstream, it certainly is a very unusual arrangement, a river which divides into four parts. (9) The <sup>^</sup> Pison is one that had become four. It's quite the usual thing with rivers today that if you go up them you will find a big river, you will find a Mississippi



River, falling into the Gulf of Mexico, a tremendously big river and as you go north you will reach a point where it divides into two parts. And I forget which is further south, the division of the Ohio or the Missouri. Think it's the Ohio, isn't it? Or is it the Missouri? Well, anyway it divides into two and where you divide with the Ohio, the Ohio is a tremendous big river but not nearly as big as the Mississippi. Where you divide with the Missouri, the two are so close together in size it's pretty hard to say which is the <sup>^</sup>real river, and the Missouri you have from there on, is a much longer river, it's generally considered (9 3/4) and should be called the Missouri-Mississippi, and the Northern part of Mississippi gives it another name. Well, that's just a matter of names. But here you have three heads. You come north up the Mississippi and it becomes three heads. There's the Ohio, there is what we call the Mississippi, there is that long big river which we call the Missouri which reaches clear out into Montana. That's not our usual terminology today. Usually you divide, when you say the rivers became, we would think of it going down rather than going up. But now if this means going downstream it's different from any river anywhere in the world that I ever heard of. If it is going upstream then you have a river here which is formed by four rivers coming together. Now, we have a river today in Mesopotamia formed by two rivers coming together, formed by a river called Hiddekel and the river called (10 3/4) <sup>^</sup>Curas. Hiddekel was the Hebrew for Tigris, <sup>^</sup>Curas was Hebrew for Euphrates. It's rather strange in the King James Version here, it does not translate Hiddekel, it leaves it Hiddekel, the Hebrew word for Tigris, but it doesn't say <sup>^</sup>Curas, it translates it to our English form Euphrates. That's rather inconsistent, but then no translation ever made is entirely consistent. It's impossible to be so. Could they have been a little more so here, it's hard to say. But at any rate these two today come together into one river, the Euphrates and the Tigris, come down through Mesopotamia. But what about these other two rivers? The river Pison is the river that compasses the land of Havilah where there is gold. We know nothing about it. And the river Gihon compasses the whole land of Ethiopia. What we call the land of Ethiopia today is in Africa. How would a river go down to Africa, and then join with the <sup>Tigris</sup>~~Pison~~ and Euphrates?

Now there are two possibilities to my mind. One possibility is that the world is entirely different at the time of the garden of Eden than it is now. That's entirely possible. And that at that time the Nile River coming from Ethiopia, a river going to a place where there is much gold called Havilah, don't know where it is, and the Tigris and the Euphrates, the four of them would have come together somewhere in the region where, south of Asia, and northeast of Africa, which is now the Red Sea, or the Persian Gulf, what is now the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean, somewhere in that area these four rivers would have come together. And that would be the place where the garden of Eden was, at that time, but it is entirely different now than what it was. Now that is a possibility.

Another possibility would seem to be perhaps, to be more likely, and yet I'm not at all sure about it, is that these names were numbered and later were applied to other rivers, and that the actual garden of Eden might have been up in Alaska or down in Patagonia or over in the heart of China, or most anywhere. We don't know. Now as between the two, it doesn't make a great deal of difference, much, because we know that at the end of chapter 3 man, the people were driven out of the garden, and they remained out of the garden of Eden until the time of the flood, and where they went, where they wandered, how far from the garden of Eden they got before the flood, we don't know, but then they were in the Ark for about a year, drifting around the world, and when that Ark landed they might even have been halfway around the world before the world could be got into, and so it's pretty hard to say much about conditions today in relation to the actual garden of Eden. I would incline to think we know nothing about where it was, nothing about the meaning of these rivers, except that there is so much detail given about the rivers it just makes you wonder whether it might be that we do have here a trace of knowledge of something which today is very different but yet somewhere related to where those places are today. We just don't know. Yes? (student. 14  $\frac{1}{2}$ )

There is a great (14  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) which runs down through Palestine, to make the Dead Sea, with the Jordan River goes on, can be traced down into Africa, so that it is true that there have been great cataclysms and changes in that area, and it is highly possible that the garden of Eden might have been there and then, with great cataclysm, have been covered up with water...

(student:  
Now we want to go on to this. ~~Q~~ said that one possibility that we have a repetition of names of rivers (1)

Well, the thing is the names we have are Hebrew. These are the names which the Hebrew gave to their rivers, that is two of them, Tigris and Euphrates, in the region where Abraham came from. Well, I would think these names came from Abraham. Did Abraham have the four names passed down, had the two from the garden of Eden been remembered and given to these two later? We don't know. That would be a possibility.

Another would be that these are the actual rivers but the place where the garden was is under the water. We just don't know. But what we do know more about, ~~than~~ <sup>and</sup> yet even here we have much ignorance, is the trees, so we want to go into that.

Q was the question of the geographic situation, now B is the trees of the garden. The trees of the garden. Now we are told here that ~~the~~ trees of the garden would give them food that was to eat, from all of the trees of the garden. One commentary I was looking at today said one reason for this stress on the trees is because in Eden they were allowed to eat the fruit of trees but after they fell they had to eat herbs. It says in verse 18 of chapter 3, thou shalt eat the herb of the field. I don't think that's quite a true statement. My guess is that they ate herbs also in the garden as well as from the trees. But what is stressed (2 3/4) . It said that they are to, of every tree of the garden, the Lord said; thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of life and of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of either of these two trees. Is that what it says? I thought that most everybody would immediately be up in arms at that quotation because it is not what it says at all, but it calls attention to a very interesting problem about these trees. What does he say about the trees here? Verse 17, in every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. There's no mention here of the tree of life. But up in verse 9 it says, out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for

food, the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Now why does it mention the tree of life up here, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Mentions two of them, doesn't it? Down below he said, of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it. Then we get over to chapter 3 and the serpent says, is it true you mustn't eat of the fruit of any of the trees, and she says no, we can from all of the trees except the tree that's in the ~~midst~~ <sup>midst</sup> of the garden. What does she mean, the tree of life or the tree of the knowledge of good and evil? Well, the serpent <sup>says</sup> the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened, you will be as gods, knowing good and evil, and they ate of it and we read in verse 22, the Lord said, the man is become as one of us to know good and evil, and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life and eat and live forever: Therefore the Lord sent them forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken. Yes? (student.5)

Well, become like gods, like gods ( $5\frac{1}{4}$ )

but not immediately, but we do want to go through that. I think that's rather important.

But, first, the trees of the garden, we have two mentioned specifically. The two mentioned specifically are the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. And he commanded not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, but in the end he is driven out of the garden so he won't eat of the tree of life too. Well, why didn't he eat of the tree of life before? The critics have a very simple solution, they say that these are two different stories which have been combined. They say in one recension of the story it was the tree of life they were forbidden to eat of, and another recension said it was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and whoever combined the two didn't iron out these fact that he had two different stories to combine. So we're told that it <sup>was through</sup> ~~in creating~~

of the <sup>tree of</sup> knowledge of good and evil that they fell, but then they're driven out because they won't eat of the tree of life, and so they say, actually, the story originally had only one tree in it. That's what they say. Well, the only reason for saying it is that they don't get sense out of it this way. There certainly is no reason why God shouldn't have two trees, there were ( $6\frac{1}{2}$ )

we're told something about

them. Mr.

? (student.  $6\frac{1}{2}$ )

Some of them, some individuals, but when I say the, it will probably mean most of them.

(student.6 3/4)

Yes. Thank you, that word critics is an unfortunate word because a critic properly is one who studies it in order to understand it correctly. There's nothing wrong with the word critic. But those who have studied it with a viewpoint, examining it and come out with conclusions against it and dividing it up into all kinds of sections, they have given so much attention to it and they say this is the result of criticism, that just in a loose way we often refer to them as the critics. But it's a common (7 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) and I don't think there's any harm in it but it's not strictly an accurate . We think of the critical scholars as though we mean the destructive scholars, and the believing commentaries will not say these particular things that I've mentioned. It is a term which I think it is good for you to have in mind what we mean when we say it, I don't see any harm in using it but to speak more correctly we should say the destructive critics. But properly anyone who studies this carefully is a critic--the word critic, one who studies carefully--it doesn't mean one who is opposed to (8)

Well, now the, we can simply say we believe this is God's Word, what it says is true, it says there~~of~~ were two trees and we accept it. We don't know much about them but there were two trees and that's that. Well, that's perfectly all right. We take what God gives us and we believe it. But it is helpful I think to have some idea about the problems the critics raise, and to note where they are based upon specific evidence, where they're based purely on theory, as this one is, and it is also worthwhile to have something of an idea of at least a tentative suggestion for the explanation of matters which some destructive critics may, it just doesn't make sense therefore you have to change the text or throw it away. If we have an idea of a sensible suggestion of it, I think it is helpful that we should label it, make a careful distinction between that which the Scripture specifically teaches and stand upon it, and that which is our suggested interpretation.

Now ~~what~~ about the tree of life, what about the tree of life? Well, I would say that the tree of life is given a name which would indicate that it is of very considerable importance. That would surely be a reasonable conclusion from the name. But that doesn't

say a great deal. You could call any tree<sup>the tree</sup>/of life but you wouldn't pick up some little tiny shrub which was not at all important and call it the tree of life. You wouldn't be apt to do that, you'd be apt to have some reason of importance. What was the reason for calling it the tree of life? We are not told in chapter 2 anything about it except that there was a tree of life. That's all chapter 2 says, and so for our present purpose we might just say there was a tree there called the tree of life. But the Lord considered this of <sup>(10)</sup> tremendous importance to mention it specifically here in chapter 2, the tree of life, that there was one. That's (10 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) all in Genesis 2. Now it's anticipating to look ahead to 3 but I don't think there's any harm in doing that now, just from this particular point. We don't want to get into the interpretation of 3 till we get there, but the interpretation of this one point, now, why is it called the tree of life? Well, chapter 3 starts in talking about the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, it doesn't have anything about the tree of life, as you will all agree, till you get near the end of the chapter. But near the end of the chapter we read that the Lord said, behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil. He's eaten of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: therefore, the Lord sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken. And this has caused great difficulty to interpreters. And they say, if man could take the tree of life and eat, that he would then get immortality, well why was God so concerned about his not eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, why didn't he tell him he mustn't eat of the tree of life? If man (11 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) gets so stupid that he didn't have to eat of this tree. Here was this tree that would give him immortality and man didn't have sense enough to eat of it. It was just there. God didn't even have to mention it. But suppose man had happened to stumble on it and eaten it, it would've upset God's whole plan, wouldn't it? Man had already eaten of the tree of life, he was immortal, now if he eats of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, there's nothing God can do about it, is there? Because he has already eaten of the tree of life. Well, of course, we think that's ridiculous, we think that even if man had eaten of the tree of life, God could've caused him to die. But then why is God so concerned to drive him out of the garden

lest he eat of ~~the~~ <sup>it</sup> now? If he didn't think to eat of it before, well, if he hadn't ~~well~~ before God could've done away with it, well, if he ate it now God could do away with it, God could take the tree out of the garden as far as that's concerned. Why is it necessary to drive man out of the garden unless he eats of the tree of life? What is the point of the tree of life? Well, every commentary that I have looked at has considered it from a magical view that the tree of life is a tree that you eat once and you have immortality, it just makes you so that you never die, and that's that, and it seems to me that it is quite unnecessary to interpret it that way. Now I'm not dogmatically stating that another interpretation is correct, I'm not saying that, but I do say dogmatically that that interpretation is not required by the context. There is nothing in the second chapter to say that it'll make him immortal ~~except~~ <sup>to eat</sup> of the tree of life. In addition, I would say there is nothing in the second chapter to suggest there is anything wrong with their eating of the tree of life, at this time. There is nothing to suggest that God ordered them not to, or that he didn't want them to. If he didn't, why would he say you may eat of all of the trees, if he meant all except the tree of life, in addition to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil? So, you cannot say dogmatically that this tree of life is a tree which eating from it once confers immortality. That we cannot say. Now I don't say it's wrong to say it, if somebody wants to say it, it's within the bounds of proper interpretation, but it's not within the bounds of required interpretation. What other proper interpretation is there than that?

Take verse 22, the Lord said, behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil, and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever, it is certainly a possibility that verse 22, when it says take from the tree of life, and ~~live~~ <sup>eat</sup> does not mean take once and eat once, but it means keep on taking and keep on eating, and keep on living forever. It certainly ~~would~~ <sup>is a</sup> be perfectly possible interpretation of it. A man could say I, here is a pond here and everybody that comes by is apt to go swimming in it, I am going to put a big fence around it so that no one will swim in this pond. And then one day he's talking to some people, he says, come on in here and take a swim in the pond. He has put up the fence about it so that nobody will swim in the pond but he doesn't mean necessarily that he's against anybody ever swimming in it. He

means he doesn't want people to be able to make a practice of coming in any time they feel like it and swimming in his pond.

O.T.History 46. (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...regularly swim in his pond but only when he permits them to do so, so he put the fence there. Now God says, let man take of the tree of life and eat and live for ever, and there is a possibility that that means keep on taking, keep on eating, and keep on living for ever. It is a possibility. And in support of that possibility, I would call attention to the last chapter of the Bible, because in the last chapter of the Bible you find in the, chapter 22, you find the Lord describes what is perhaps the re-created garden of Eden. Chapter 22, verse 1, and he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life. Well, how could it be on either side of the river? Does he mean he doesn't know which side it's on? Or does he mean you have to look here at this side, and you have to look here at this side? How can a tree be on either side of the river? I might say to you, you go and plant a tree beside the river and you say do you want it on the east or on the west, and I say I don't care, plant it on either side. But I wouldn't say after you will find the tree is on either side, I wouldn't say that, it would be one side or the other, if there was one tree. This on either side of the river certainly means on both sides. It is certainly a description here of a river which has a tree of life on both sides of the river. Now how can one tree be on both sides. Certainly it means that the word tree is here collective. It means the trees, some are on one side and some are on the other, the trees of life are there. We're not told trees of life in Genesis 1, we're just told one tree, but here we are told of various trees, but what do these trees do? The tree of life bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month, and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. Now, if the leaves were for the healing of the nations, what was the fruit for? The fruit was to eat and live, but there's no suggestion here that one eating makes a person live for ever.



The suggestion is that they eat and eat and eat, and there are twelve different kinds of fruit. My own personal feeling as to the meaning of the tree of life, a theory on which it would be very foolish to be dogmatic, I'm~~erely~~ merely dogmatic on this, that there is no statement that this theory is invalid, that there is no statement that the tree is a tree which is once for all, eat of it and you're immortal, there's no such statement. So I say the other interpretation is just as probable and a great deal more probable in my opinion. You take a person today and why do we die today? We die because our system does not build up everything that <sup>is</sup> ~~we~~ torn down. A little child, three, eight, ten, twelve, fifteen, sometimes more hours a day, and it builds up all its tissues that have been torn down and builds up additional tissues and it grows, and as we get older we are growing, we are rebuilding the tissues that we use up, but after a certain age, we only re-build part of the tissue that we use up in the course of a day. They say that in seven years our whole body is made of different matter than it was seven years ago. As we're constantly taking in, we're constantly sloughing off, we are getting new matter into us all the time, but the tissue are not wholly re-established, or rebuilt, for what we lose and what we wear out. Well, they are now telling us that if we take certain vitamins and certain preparations, that our tissues will last longer, that it will rebuild a larger amount of what is torn down, but nobody says that we will live for ever because we cannot stop the process. But it seems to me that it is entirely reasonable as a conjecture that the tree was a tree, or perhaps a group of trees, which had fruit which produced those vitamins, those minerals, which contained those minerals, produced those vitamins, produced those chemical substances, which the body could use to entirely replace what was used up, in such a way that one who had them would not need to become old, would not need to wear out, to decay, and eventually die. That it was not that the matter of immortality was not simply you take a man here he is immortal, here he is going to die, because we are continually (5 3/4) but if you give the material which makes the process go on forever, the life continues forever, or you withhold that and it does not continue forever, it wears out. Well, if that is the case, then, in chapter 2 the tree of life was in the midst of the garden, these trees which had these particularly valuable vitamins and other substances for continuing

life and they were available to man and man used them, but after God said that man was going to die it was no longer his desire that he have access to this particular material and now that he had eaten of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and had an understanding far beyond what he had before, if man remained in that area it would have been only natural that he would have taken advantage of that which he had not understood before. And so one reason, certainly not the only reason why God drove man out of the garden of Eden, was to break his connection with the tree of life because it was God's will now that man should die, that his body should gradually wear out, Adam lived hundreds of years but he finally died, and all men since that time have died. Yes? (student.7)

No, I would think it was a distinct tree. (student.7 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

Yes, I think one reason why the tendency to think of the tree of life as a sudden once-for-all thing is that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil seems to be pictured that way, but that doesn't mean the tree of life would necessarily be that way. Now we want to take up the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Yes? (student. 7 3/4)

Oh, that's a very interesting theory, it might be because we don't know, it's another possibility, that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil had something in it which would combine with what was in the other, to produce results that neither would alone. Highly possible, we don't know. Yes? (student. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

No, we could get from this that the continuance of Adam would have depended on it, but as far as Revelation is concerned, Revelation here has a tree which is called the tree of life, which bare manner of fruits every month, and the leaves of the tree are for the healing of the nations. There's a situation here in which healing is needed. Is this a situation where you just have the same, who need no healing, who have no pain, or are there others who do.

If so, (9)

I don't know.

But it has its possibilities. Yes? (student 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

Yes, there's no reason we can't. Absolutely none. It's entirely possible that that's what it was. But it's not inspired by the (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) that it was. And to my mind, in the whole situation, the other hypothesis is more probable. I would not be dogmatic about it, I would just say one can't be dogmatic on that either. The fact that the tree of

Knowledge of good and evil was displaced <sup>in this place</sup> wouldn't mean that the other was displaced too. <sup>In this place</sup>  
 Yes? (9 3/4) student)

No, well the word midst can easily be used in two different senses. The, it would seem that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was in such a central position in the garden, that it was so singled out <sup>that</sup> by Eve said that this is ~~thee~~ tree you mustn't eat of, that when Eve said, yes we may eat of all the trees except this tree that's in the midst of the garden she would mean that, there's no question of the context, that's what it means, she wasn't referring to the tree of life, unless as the critics say there's only one tree there  
 (10 1/4) (student. 10 1/2)

Yes, the word in the midst can be used for anything that's <sup>inside, or it can</sup> ~~in-the-garden~~ be used for that which is in the very central portion. Where she singles one, surely she means, she either means the tree that's in the very <sup>most</sup> central part, or she means one particular tree from among those (10 3/4) is the one

Mr. Deshpande? (10 3/4)

Yes, some say that it was originally a tree of life and then this concept crept in later, but I personally don't think it's necessary to hold that.

Well, now the other tree. The trees of the garden, the trees in general, many, but there was the tree of life, one that is specifically named. And then we have another one that is specifically named, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and here again in, or here even far more than it was previously, there are certain things that are definitely proper, we can stand upon those things. There are other matters on which we can only conjecture. What <sup>is</sup> ~~was~~ definitely taught in this Scripture? We are definitely taught that is is a tree to which the Lord gave the name, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. He calls it that, verse 9, the Lord made the tree to grow which is the tree of knowledge of good and evil. That is an appropriate way to describe this tree, the tree of knowledge of good and evil. We find in verse 17 that the Lord forbade Adam to eat of this tree. And he told Adam that the day that he ate thereof he would surely die. How long was this particular day, the day in which he ate of the tree he surely would die. Well, this is, we are told in advance, it is very, very long (12 3/4) We are not told that it

is a poisonous tree which will kill, we are not told that. That could be an interpretation couldn't it? Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die, might mean this is a poisonous tree, <sup>don't eat of it</sup> ~~because if~~ because if you eat of it it will kill you, but we know from what follows that it did not have that effect. The death that came was God's punishment not caused by the eating of the tree, it is caused by God's judgment upon them. So the eating of the tree did not, in itself, bring death, though this verse might be interpreted to mean that. But the eating of the tree brought God's condemnation and God gave the death as a result of the condemnation. So this is a tree, then, which is of tremendous importance. Now what happened about this tree? This is the only tree man is forbidden to eat. The serpent said to Eve, in chapter 3, is it true you mustn't eat of any tree in the garden. Eve, says, no we may eat of all of them, except one, the fruit of the tree in the midst of the garden, there's one particular one you mustn't eat. The serpent says, you won't die because God knows that in the day you eat thereof your eyes will be opened and you will be like gods, knowing good and evil. Now we cannot take this verse as the truth, because we don't know whether the serpent is lying or not. Mr. \_\_\_\_\_, do you think that the fact the serpent said this means it's true?

## O.T.History 47. (1/2)

...it is a suggestion the serpent made, he says to them, no, he says, you won't die if you use this, this isn't a poisonous tree, and I think he was right there, no evidence that it was poisonous. But he says, God knows the day you eat thereof your eyes will be opened and you will be like gods, knowing good and evil. Was the serpent speaking truth or telling a lie when he said this to them? Which was it? It was truth. We know that because pounced on them <sup>it says</sup> and/when they ate, their eyes opened. That proves the first part of what he said was true. We know that further because it says that God said, now man has eaten of the tree and has become like one of us, knowing good and evil, so we know that

what the serpent says here is true, that man would be like gods, not that man would be identical with God, not that man would have all the power of God, not that man would be immortal, but that in some way man would be made more like God that he was already, in some ways, because of eating of this tree. We know that was a fact because God said that it had happened. So in some ways man became more like God when he ate of this tree, and then we find that after he ate of it, his eyes were opened and certain things happened and God gave him a punishment and God, after having given (1 3/4)

God said, behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil, and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life and live for ever, therefore the Lord sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken.

Well, those are the facts, what we've looked at now, and those facts are clearly taught here and we should know them, and we should stand upon them, they are what it teaches. But as to the interpretation of those facts, at certain points there is great difference of opinion, and most particularly on what the name indicates. One very common theory is this, among good conservative people, one very common theory is this, God calls this the tree of the knowledge of good and evil because it is through this tree, by means of this tree, that God would know whether Adam would choose good and obey God, or choose evil and turn away from him. Therefore, it is the tree of the knowledge of good and evil because it is the tree by which God would know whether man chose good or evil. That is a theory which gives a very reasonable interpretation to the meaning of the name. And it could just as well, according to that theory, have been instead of being this tree, have been any tree. They could have picked any tree at all and said now here's a test whether man will obey God. If you will obey God you won't touch that tree, you won't eat anything from that tree. If you eat from that tree, it is proof that you are turning to wickedness, you are disobeying God, that tree is the test by which God knows whether you choose good or evil, and therefore, the title, according to this theory, proves nothing whatever about the intrinsic nature of the tree. That is a theory which some hold. And it is a theory which <sup>gives</sup> ~~is~~ a very reasonable explanation. C. S. Lewis has written a book called (3 3/4) which is an account of a re-enactment of the fall and in this re-enactment man stands the

test, but it is similar to this and I think has a very great value in putting the thing in other terms to show its reasonableness. But according to that story that Lewis writes, as he describes him, man/lives on an island, they have floating islands, and then there is a fixed land and man can go on the fixed land all he wants but he's never to stay on it overnight. That's a command, and if man stays on it overnight he has broken God's command. And then there comes a being from this earth, possessed of the devil, comes there and talks to Eve and tries to persuade her that she should go and spend a night on the fixed land. After all, why shouldn't she, it would be <sup>very nice,</sup> much more comfortable there than on this land that's jumping around all the time, floating island, but God had told her not to, and she stands the test, thus according to that story. Well, you see there's nothing moral, right or wrong, about sleeping on the fixed land instead of on the floating island. It is purely just something arbitrarily selected to see whether man will obey God or not. That is a theory which some take as the meaning. I see our clock is 24 and ~~27~~ 27 after so we will save that for tomorrow morning at 8 sharp and will continue a consideration of this. You might think a little bit about it whether this theory of the meaning of the name is a satisfactory one or whether there is any reason why <sup>it</sup> there cannot be a fully satisfactory one.

O.T.History 48. ( $\frac{1}{3}$ )

...here's a tree that's any tree. God makes this a test. Will man obey God, will he carry out a simple test, or will he choose to turn away from God? So this simple test, just take any tree and you say here's this tree, it has fruit and looks very nice, but don't eat of it. And we call it the tree of the knowledge of good and evil because it's the tree by which God will know whether man will choose good or choose evil. That ~~is~~ would be very satisfactory as the name of it, and it would be an explanation of the name of it and, after all, that is what is important from our viewpoint because the important thing is that man disobeyed God. The important thing is not what the tree did to him but that he disobeyed God, that's what matters. And <sup>(14)</sup> whenever he disobeys God, he put his own desire ahead of God's desire, his

own will ahead of God's will, followed Satan instead of following God, and consequently fell and what the tree amounted to is not, as far as we can see, of any great importance if the major central theme is that he chose to disobey God. So this is what is most vital and on this we can be dogmatic, that the tree did fulfill the function of a tree which would give God knowledge of whether man would choose good or evil. Well, if you don't like the term give God, because God knew everything from the beginning, say would give the universe which would demonstrate to us, which would be the means by which a result would be secure, which would cause that man would proceed as God's child, following him, developing a (2 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

or that man would (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

as would be necessary to redeem any who might be saved. Since that is the primary thing, the thing that's significant for us, that's important to us, the thing on which we can be dogmatic, that this tree has this function, and therefore it would be altogether proper to follow this knowledge of good and evil from this viewpoint and be satisfied with it and my guess is that as far as 99% of your dealing with Christian people is concerned, this is all you need to know about it. As far as 98% of your talking, with your presenting this, your dealing with the matter, you don't need anything more. But if you're going to get into the passage and see its problems as well as its great central teaching, you immediately do find that there is a very definite problem which comes up in the third verse, that Satan said God knows in the day you eat thereof your eyes will be opened and you will be as gods, knowing good and evil, and we find that when they ate of it, it immediately said that the eyes of them both were opened and they knew that they were naked. And then we find that God said, behold the man is become as one of us to know good and evil, and now, lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life. And why was man's knowing good and evil make him more apt to put forth his hand and take of the tree of life? And how did man become more like God. He couldn't become more like God through (4)

It must <sup>be</sup> mean something (4)

(student)

I would think it unlikely here. My guess would be that he means that man is becoming more like the superman. That would be my guess. (4 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

that is to become more like supernatural, but he wouldn't become more like a heavenly being to know evil. So we do have this problem which should not blind us to the <sup>major</sup> ~~basic~~ thing which is that it was a simple test by which man showed whether he would obey God or disobey God and fall in sin. But this problem is there in the (5)

The eating the fruit seems to have made actual change in man. Not merely because Satan says so but as soon as it happened it says his eyes were opened. Well, were his eyes opened simply because he had sinned or were they opened some way as a result of the eating of the tree. I think we could say perhaps, just because he sinned, regardless of what it was he did (5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) this other verse where the Lord said behold he has become as one of us to know good and evil, therefore, lest he put forth his hand-- yes? (student. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

I think God has been speaking of supernatural beings there, of <sup>heavenly beings, that would</sup> ~~supernatural-beings-th~~ be my guess. Yes? (student. 5 3/4)

For this particular purpose, yes. Like the, you take the President of the United States, if the President of the United States said I will become like Him, it would be a rather absurd statement, because his position is so far above mine in so many ways, but if the President of the United States said of a boy in Africa who had learned to speak English why he's become like one of us, we would mean like an American. Now you see what I mean, if the President of the United States, without lowering his position in the least, could simply consider himself as one of us in learning, and I would believe that the Lord could say like one of us, referring to the way in which man had become more like them. (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Well, eating the fruit seems to have made an actual change in man. And it is not called knowledge of evil but knowledge of good and evil. It does not say man has, by eating this fruit man secures knowledge of evil. It says knowledge of good and evil. And it's hard to see how knowledge of moral good would be in any way contrary to God's will, <sup>God</sup> ~~but-it~~ says man becomes like one of us to know good, therefore lest he put forth his hand. Yes? (student. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

Well, as God said that when <sup>Naman</sup> ~~Nasum~~ dipped seven times he would be cured of his leprosy. Yes.



And God had certain power in different things in the world. God has made a world, which if we eat sufficiently good nourishing food we grow, if we don't we deteriorate. This could be either way. God said in the day you eat of it you will die. I don't think that was anything he put in it, I don't think that was a poison. I think that was God was going to punish him by killing him. But when God says man has become like one of us in knowing good and evil, does that man because God has made him like one of them as a result of eating, or does it mean because God has put something into them which would cause the result (8 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

(student. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, that is suggested, that the act itself produced a certain effect on man and the act of disobeying God, regardless of what he did, might have given him a certain knowledge of evil. But I don't think it would have given him the knowledge of good and evil. Yes? (student. 9)

Yes, well we discussed that two or three (9 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

(student. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

There is a possibility of that. I incline to the view that you've just expressed but I'm not dogmatic. Don't be dogmatic certainly because the other is a possibility.

I think it is a problem and the simplest way out of it, ~~if~~ if you can do it, is just to say the tree which had no ill effects upon <sup>him</sup> but through it God knew whether he would choose good or evil. Well, then having committed sin, man then knew something about evil, from personal experience he didn't know before. But how would that make him like one of the gods? Unless there was something God had put in it that would make man different (10)

How would it? How would the knowledge of evil make man more like God and how would knowledge of moral good be in any way contrary to God's will? It is an interesting problem and I don't think we can be dogmatic. Yes? (student. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

I don't think (10 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) the analogy

(student. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, that's right. (student)

I would feel very strongly that Mr. Shellabarger is quite right. That man's becoming a sinner was not a result of something in the fruit, that man became a sinner because he disobeyed God, and that is what made him a sinner. <sup>I would feel that definitely.</sup> And yet I would feel that the other statement, man has become like God to know good and evil, therefore lest he put forth his hand. Now maybe that ~~means~~ just means man has become a sinner. But how does man's having

become a sinner make him become like one of us. It seems to me it would make him become less like us rather than more like us. (student. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

From that viewpoint then we can say that when Satan fell he became more like God? (student. 11 $\frac{3}{4}$ )

Maybe so, but I can't quite imagine God saying Satan has become more like me now that he is fallen than he was before, though it is true that (12)

What did you have in mind, Mr. Taylor? (student. 12 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

That man, by becoming a sinner, has become more like God in being able to discern between good and evil, therefore we better drive him out of the garden. I don't think it's impossible, we can't be dogmatic, but it doesn't quite satisfy me. Well, I don't want to take too much time on this particular point. Let me go on and give you one (12  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

but we should not be dogmatic on it because the thing we must be dogmatic on, is, man became a sinner when he disobeyed God. That's vital. But this is a matter of the interpretation of these two or three verses. And it would seem to me that one thing we should note about is that these two (13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) Hebrew words \* and \* good and evil, do not necessarily mean moral good and evil. That we can say dogmatically. The words do not necessarily mean moral good and evil. Has everybody got that noted down? That is a matter we can say dogmatically. So everybody have it in mind. Yes? (student. 13  $\frac{3}{4}$ )

All right. Very good. That gives a point to examine. Mr. Welch says he does not conceive of any good or evil except moral. Now that's very good but unfortunately the question that's before us is not what does Mr. Welch conceive of, but what does the Bible teach. And I'm only giving him as one example. It isn't what I think of it, it isn't what you think of it, it isn't what any man thinks, it is what does the Bible teach. And when you speak of what the Bible teaches, again you we must distinguish between two things. Not what are the concepts that we gather out of those things, but what do these words mean in the Bible. I would thoroughly agree with what I think Mr. Welch is meaning to say, that the difference between moral good and moral evil is so important that it warps every other consideration. I would thoroughly agree with that. But the question of whether...

...needs all of its moral thrust and whether the Hebrew word (1/3) \* which is translated evil always means moral evil is a different question and that's the question I'm dealing with now. Yes? (student. 3/4)

Yes. Absolutely. I agree with you thoroughly, that moral good and evil is the most important thing in the universe, and whether an action is good or whether it is evil is so important nothing can compare with it, but what I'm saying is that this particular Hebrew word (1/4) \* and this particular Hebrew word (1/4) \* do not necessarily mean moral good or evil, that these particular words can have another significance. And I'd just like to, if somebody will just dogmatically say they can never mean anything but moral good <sup>or</sup> moral evil then it would be very interesting to look at one or two passages and see what light the passages would throw on the question. Now you notice I'm not saying these words do not mean moral good and evil, I'm saying they don't necessarily mean that.

We will readily agree that they must often mean moral good and evil, but I'm saying that these two Hebrew words do not necessarily mean moral good and evil. Now we look at Jeremiah 24. Now Jeremiah takes this word (2) \* and in one case, instead of translating it evil, he translates it naughty. Well, that's a moral word, isn't it, to say a little child is naughty, that's moral evil, isn't it? I don't mean Jeremiah translates it naughty, I mean the King James translator translates it naughty in Jeremiah, but in Jeremiah 24 we read the Lord showed me and behold two baskets of figs were set before the temple of the Lord, <sup>verse 2,</sup> one basket had very good figs, that's (2 1/2) \* . You see, these were highly moral figs, very good figs, one basket had very good figs, even like the figs that are first ripe. The other basket had very naughty figs, morally bad, very naughty figs. They could not be eaten they were so bad. You wouldn't want to eat figs that were morally evil, would you? The English translates it naughty which, in my opinion, is about as bad a translation as anybody could possibly give for that word in its context. Now, that doesn't mean that a bad translation was made. Probably not, three hundred years ago, it did not mean moral evil, but today it does, and so we say it's a very, very poor translation.

Then said the Lord unto me, what seest thou, Jeremiah? And I said, Figs: the good

figs, very good; and the evil (here it doesn't say naughty, it says evil) are very evil (I mean the English translation doesn't say naughty), that cannot be eaten, they are so evil.

Well, there he could have (3 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

which he held up were figs

which were good and figs which were bad, or as the English here translates it, evil, or

(3 3/4) \*

. But there was nothing moral about the figs. This was physical evil, not moral evil, which was involved here in the figs. Now another example of that is found in Genesis 41. There are many which might be given.

But another is in Genesis 41. In Genesis 41 we find that Pharaoh had a dream and Joseph interpreted the dream to Pharaoh, and there were two kinds of corn that grew, and two kinds of cows that were in it (4 3/4). They are described as the good cows and the evil cows, and the good ears and the evil ears, and in that case they represent years of famine and years of prosperity. And the cows are not good morally, and the corn is not good morally, but they are good physically. Yes? (student. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

I don't think so. I think the word has (5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) its different meanings..

Now

that would be an interesting question to look through and see if you could find evidence.

I took this good and evil and went all through the Bible this morning and I looked at all the usages and I found that in perhaps four-fifths of the cases good and evil are used physically rather than morally, in the use of the word. But it would be interesting to look through and see whether there are cases of a moral being in a physical sense. My guess would be you would find the word, but I just happened to think of it, it did not occur to me. Mr. ? (student 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Yes, these particular words. Now there are other words used for moral wickedness which have never any physical connotation. There's a word righteous which has not a physical connotation. There are these other words, but the words used here are the words good and bad which are used generally in a physical sense. Now anything that is good in the great bulk of cases is that which is productive of building, prosperity, or to expand, that which is physically good, and that which is evil is that which is destructive that which tears down, that which is not effective for a certain purpose. Now if you apply these terms to the plan of God then naturally these physical terms take on a moral connotation,

that which is good in relation to Hitler, is morally bad. Hitler has a good bomber which can drop bombs and kill thousands of innocent people, that was good physically, because it can carry out his will and accomplish his purpose and enable him to make progress in his war, it is good from Hitler's viewpoint, but it is morally bad. That which is evil physically is bomb which destroys. That which accomplishes is good, that which destroys or tears down is bad.

Now we find an interesting verse with this very word (7  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) \* which is used in Isaiah 45:7. There in Isaiah 45:7 we find that the Lord said, I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil:--this word (8 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) \* , this very same word that's translated evil in Genesis (8 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) . I make peace and create evil: I the Lord do all these things. Now in our Westminster confession it says that God is not the author of evil. But <sup>in</sup> Isaiah that God says I create evil. Does that say my confession is wrong, that God does do the evil? No, it proves that this word evil here is not a word that represents moral evil but physical evil, God says he creates prosperity and he creates destruction. He says when the Israelites obey him and do his will he gives them much blessing, that when the Israelites turn away from him he sends them into exile, he brings evil upon them. It is physical evil not moral. It is done from a view, for moral purposes, but the word in itself means that which is physical. Now that being the case, I have not said that these words always mean physical good and evil, not at all. But I have said that they do not necessarily mean moral good and evil. They are very frequently used of physical good and evil. I think myself a case can be made out that the word in itself means physical good and evil and that when they take on these particular words to mean moral good and evil, it's only because they are then applied to God and his mercy. And that which is physically good as far as God's purposes are concerned would necessarily be producing moral good. It would depend on who, in relation to whom, this was physically good or evil. But it raises the question, is it possible that in this particular case, the tree was called the tree of knowledge of good and evil, because it was a tree which has a quality in it, eating of which could give a man a great step forward in his knowledge or ability in relation to physical good and evil. That is to say, which would make him able to build up

and tear down, able to accomplish things in a way which he could not have done previously. If that is the case, then we could say that it was God's purpose man should have this knowledge eventually, but that it was not yet his purpose he should have it and therefore that he used this tree for the test which would give him the knowledge whether man would follow him or would become independent, but that the reason for the name would be this other reason rather than the reason of the result of the test. Now I certainly don't want to be dogmatic about it. I only give it as a possibility, but to me it is a possibility which makes (11 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) makes sense. The Lord said man has taken a step forward in his <sup>ability</sup> ~~approach~~ to see possibility of his advancement or the disadvantage of others, possibilities of building up or tearing down, he now would see the advantages of taking from the tree of life in a way he would not have, and we must remove from him the possibility of doing harm with this knowledge he has. In a way it's similar to what many people think of as the primary problem of our present day, since technical ability has gone, they say, ahead of his moral ability, that man has acquired tremendous power of construction and of destruction without having developed morally to the point where he is able to use it in a proper way. Like giving, some people say that the advances we've made technically are like giving a child a big sharp razor which is a very fine thing for one to use when he's developed enough to know how to use it rightly and not to use it wrongly, but that many think that our present civilization is going to destroy itself, and these who do not have a Christian background on it simply say it is because they have not yet developed more as far as they (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) should have. Now of course, God intended, as long as man was true to the Lord, was not a sinner and was following the Lord and was developing as the Lord wanted him to, the Lord would give him increased knowledge (12  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) to build

But if the eating of this gave him a step forward, gave him a knowledge of good and evil in a physical sense, then it would be true that it would open his eyes, it would make him like one of us in the sense that he had greater physical understanding and power, like one of them. But therefore he should be kept from having that advantage over created life which God would only give to those who are righteous, and not to those who are sinners. Now, you see, this is simply a matter of the interpretation of these couple of verses. It does

not affect the major problem here, which is that man became a sinner by doing that which was contrary to God's will, and that the great bulk of the results would come, comes from the fact of his being a sinner rather than from anything in the fruit and that that was the thing that has brought the evil upon us. There, using it in the physical sense, brought evil upon us, ever since has made us suffer, endure misery every since, is because we became sinners, not because of whatever advantage might come from the eating of the fruit.

Now, I don't want to take long on this, as I say, it's quite a minor thing. It's only a matter of the understanding these two or three verses. But, to me, those verses used to be a puzzle, and, to me, when I saw that this was a possibility, in fact the most common ~~one~~ meaning of these particular words, to me it gave a satisfactory understanding of these verses. But it should never be detract our attention from the primary problem that man became a sinner because he didn't obey God, regardless of (14 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

Now... Mr. Shellabarger? (student. 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

O.T.History 50. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...I would think that in this day he took a big step forward in knowledge. I wouldn't think that he gained all knowledge right away but he gained what (3/4)

But that in doing what God told him not to do, he didn't obey, he stepped forward also, or else I don't see how God could mean like one of us. Becoming a sinner would mean to make him even less like God (3/4)

Mr. Myers? (student. 3/4)

I donot think it was morally wrong (1 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

I would think that man in a state of righteousness, there would be absolutely nothing wrong. Man in a state of righteousness, man in a state of innocence, but to my mind I would think that man, having acquired this knowledge of good and evil, would see potentialities, not only of that which was right but of that which was just as wrong, and therefore, it would become (1 3/4)

and therefore that he would acquire an embarrassment which under innocent conditions would be entirely (1 3/4) and unnecessary!

God said who told you that thou wast naked, hast thou eaten of the tree? Well, it wouldn't seem to me that the tree gave him the knowledge (2 1/4) it would seem to me that the tree gave him the knowledge of the potentiality involved, it would not (2 1/4) the potentialities of good and evil, that is potentialities of that which would be advantageous and of that which would be (2 1/4) That is, to me, it fits with that (2 1/4) more perhaps than the other, although even there the moral might fit all right. As man would then see moral potentialities. But as far as that particular verse is concerned (2 1/4)

Well, I think we'd better go on to the next point. This was the meaning of the trees. The major point is, that this is the fruit by which God learned whether man would continue to follow him or turn against him, but these verses seem to me to suggest (3 1/2) that as far as the names are concerned, the actual effect, the (3 1/4) immediate effect would be, that the words would be taken in their most usual sense, in this case as (3 1/2) But that doesn't detract from the most important point, which is that it was (3 1/2)

Well, now the number 4, the creation of woman. Number 3 was the garden of Eden. Number 4 is the creation of woman. And that, of course, is the major thing in this chapter. And under that I'd put three heads under that. Small a, the needs demonstrated, The chapter devotes a number of verses to tell us of God's bringing all the animals before Adam but there was no help meet from the man. It is demonstrating the need. God had said it is not good for man to be alone, I will make a help meet for him. It is not just an arbitrary action of God, but it is an act to fulfil a need in man as man is created. So a number of verses are given here to demonstrate this need. It is the normal condition in which God has created man, the condition in which he is incomplete by himself. Yes? (student. 4 3/4)



The word for good in that verse is the same word (5) \* and it raises a very interesting question. Is the word here used physically, or morally? Is God saying it is immoral for man to be alone, it is not morally good for him to be alone? Or is ~~he~~ saying is is not **physically good**? And I'm not using physically just in the sense of that which is material, but in the sense of that which makes for well-being, that which causes prosperity, or happiness, or aside from moral connotation. I think in this particular verse there is ~~some~~<sup>no</sup> question that the word good here is used consistently (5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) it is not good for man to be alone, man is better off with proper companionship. That, I think, is his meaning here, and he says I will make him a help suitable for him. So, he proceeds to demonstrate that the attempt of various people today to take animals and make for themselves a satisfactory companion is **wrong**. That animals are a good companion up to a certain point, but that for help that is suitable for man, that an animal will not do for that purpose. Before I was married I used to say that a man ought to have either a stick, or a pipe, or a dog, or a wife, and I not having a pipe or a wife, nor a dog, I (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) always carried a ~~watch~~<sup>walking stick</sup>. But, of course, when I first went to Germany to study, a man wasn't considered a gentleman unless he carried a ~~watch~~<sup>walking stick</sup>, they all carried ~~watches~~<sup>walking sticks</sup>. Now they don't. But then everybody did. And when I came back here, I got the habit and I enjoyed it, and then when I got back here nobody else was carrying them here, outside of someone who was lame, so I had to think of a rationalization to explain it and that was the one I gave. Since I got married it's not necessary. But God brought the animals to man to see and there was found no help meet for man. So the need is here demonstrated. It is the normal way in which God made ~~man~~.

I remember one time speaking of the (7 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

of the courage of the Pilgrim ~~settlers~~, how they came to Plymouth and how they succeeded in establishing a colony which was successful, and that, of course, was of great importance what was done, not that a hundred people came to Plymouth and made a little colony and eventually was absorbed by other towns, but that they proved that it could be done. They came from England, poor people, without much training, without any resources, but they came over and they settled there, and half of them died the first year, but in the next 67

years only two or three of them died. They succeeded in carrying on and establishing a home way across the ocean in the wilderness and the result was that well-to-do people with the same ideals they had, followed them afterward. And starting about 8 years after the Pilgrims came you had in the next few years tens of thousands of people, whole towns, coming over, with capital and resources. They brought everything with them, they established New England in a comparatively brief time but the Plymouth colony proved it could be done. They were poor people but they came with their families. I mentioned this to my friend

(8 3/4) they ventured this with their families. There were some other settlements that had been made where they had, they were just strong men, they had come over and they got to fighting and confusion and difficulty and they hadn't amounted, and this man pointed out to me that this was the normal way that God made to be with man. And even though the men alone might seem to have more strength and more stamina for a brief undertaking that over the long period, this was what was more apt to be, was the carrying out along the line in which God had created man as described here in this verse.

Now the Roman Catholic Church, of course, takes a position contrary to this. It teaches that the state of being unmarried is a more holy state and a better state than the state which is carrying out the teaching of the ~~present~~ <sup>second</sup> chapter <sup>of</sup> Genesis, the state of man with a help meet. And I personally think that it was this attitude that Paul had in mind when in 1 Timothy 4, Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils: speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats, and when you find the Roman Catholic Church with their emphasis on their ministers not being married, and they are commanded not to eat meat on Friday, well, you hate to think of applying the first two verses to them, they are so strong, yet certainly this verse points to a tendency which is certainly not the teaching of the Scripture involved. Naturally, there are particular circumstances under which this would not be carried out, as when our Lord said in Matthew 19:12. In Matthew 19:12 he said that, there are some eunuchs which were so born from their mother's wombs, there are some eunuchs which were made eunuchs of man, and there are eunuchs which have made them-

selves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. There are particular circumstances under which it is the Lord's will that people should abstain from marriage for the sake of dealing with a particular emergency, a particular situation, and such a thing may be the matter of one's getting an education, under the particular artificial conditions of our present civilization, I've known many people to hamper themselves by getting married before they were able financially to carry a property, they've been in such a condition that they could carry it very nicely if nothing went wrong, and then maybe they've had children sooner than they expected, maybe health problems have come up and they've spent the rest of their lives as street car conductors or something like that, doing a good service to the world, perhaps, but not getting the education that the Lord desires them to get, because they did not postpone this for a time in order to carry out this particular need. In such a case, of course, the person was doing wrong, but certainly as a general rule it is the Lord's will that the individual should live in the way which God planned that a human being should live.

In Germany, previous to World War I, they had a custom which has much to be said for it, the custom of the (12 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) dowry ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~. And everyone there of any means or education it was the custom to save money for a dowry for his daughter. So the, a man there, who was training for a profession, whether for ministry, for law, for medicine, was married at the normal age and it was expected that his wife's parents would give a dowry which would be sufficient to carry them through the additional expenses during this time of education. World War I swept away the resources of the German professional class and made it impossible for this to continue, but with that custom it was possible to have marriage and a more normal life, a more normal age, than under our usual American system. But the teaching that there is anything holy about ~~the state of remaining unmarried~~ <sup>married state rather than an unmarried state</sup> is certainly definitely contrary to the teaching of Paul and to the teaching of Genesis. And so in Genesis 2 here we have quite a bit of space devoted to the demonstration of the need of the woman, so that would be point a.

And then b, is the supernatural creation. The supernatural creation. When I was to enter seminary, I went to Princeton Seminary, which at that time was a very orthodox

Seminary, the faculty was divided into two groups, those who wanted to take a strong stand for the truth, and those who were ready to ride along with conditions as they were developing in the denomination, but practically all of them, the teaching was quite thoroughly sound. But there were tendencies beginning to come in. And I remember in my class in Old Testament History within the very first month I was there, hearing Professor Davis say that Adam went to sleep and he had a vision. God gave him a dream and in this dream he saw God taking a part out of him and using it and making it into a woman. He woke up and he saw the woman there, and God had (14 3/4)

Now it is true that there...

## O.T.History 51. (1/2)

...it may be more important, the lesson to us, for us than the information that is given about the method of the creation of the woman. Yet, I felt when he said that that he was getting onto very, very dangerous ground, and I feel so today, very, very strongly. If you can say, well, it doesn't sound reasonable to me, I think it's a dream. If you can do that with Genesis...? There are cases where God gave people dreams and they are not, do not represent reality, they represent dreams. Peter was on the housetop and he saw a ~~big~~ sheet come down from heaven and it was full of all kinds of animals and God said, kill, eat. Did Peter see a sheet or did Peter have a vision in his dream? I think most likely he had a dream. I think he dreamt he saw a sheet and he dreamt he heard God say that. I think that was a vision rather than an actuality. But here we are given nothing in the context to say it was a vision. It doesn't say that Adam dreamt that he saw God do this, it doesn't say that God taught him lessons through a vision, nothing of the kind, it says that when he went to sleep, woman was not there, and when he woke up she was there, and it says that God caused a sleep to fall on Adam and God caused to take a portion of his side and ~~clothed it with~~ <sup>closed up the</sup> flesh and said it (1 3/4) was man made into a woman, and it seems to me important that when there is a specific definite

statement like that in Scripture that we take it as a statement of fact, rather than a  
 (2) dream that somebody had.

Adam certainly didn't see it happen. Maybe God gave him a dream to show him how (2)  
 maybe God told him afterward what had happened. We don't know how Adam knew, but he cer-  
 tainly doesn't say that this was a dream. Adam said this was bone of his bone. (2 1/4)  
 And it certainly (2 1/4)

that God is-able-to made the woman by a very definite specific act, that there was, that  
 God took this portion of his side and God made woman, and that she is a definite, specific,  
 separate creation. It's one of the great problems, it seems to me, in a simple evolutionary  
 theory, is the matter of separate (3) entity. The present evolutionists have largely  
 given up the idea that there was a little gradual change, gradually, gradually, gradually,  
 so imperceptibly you couldn't see it any year but perhaps a thousand years you could see  
 it, and eventually it changed so that the monkey changed into a man or something which  
 the chain had evoked changed into a man by little, little gradual changes, they've largely  
 given up that, and today the tendency is to say that once in a billion years, certainly  
 not oftener than one hundred years, a strange freak of nature happens, and a certain egg  
 maybe produces (3 1/2)

. This strange thing happens which some of the great  
 scientists today say. Nobody could see it because it happens so infrequently. Once in a  
 million years, something like this happens, a sudden great change which is the next step  
 in evolution. Well, that takes more faith to believe than Genesis. But if you do believe,  
 well, let us say that from the viewpoint of a pure mechanistic (4)

let us say that the chances of one <sup>in</sup> ten billion that this would happen, that suddenly out  
 of a clear certain egg would come a bird, or like that, there would be this sudden change  
 which would be able to carry on and live in an entirely different type of creature than  
 that which it was before. But that it could happen not merely once but happen twice in-  
 creases the miracle a thousandfold. And that it should not merely happen twice so that  
 you have a male bird comes into existence <sup>this instant</sup> and then a million years later a female bird  
 comes into existence, but they both happened the same year, at least within ten years of  
 each other. Why it's just, it just increases the improbability of it, to the point of

utter impossibility. The idea, for instance, that a fish<sup>was</sup> swimming in the dark and the light came and there was a need so it gradually developed eyes to see with and he responded as the reaction to the light. Well, to think that that could happen up to a certain extent, but to think that the very differences between the sexes, the tremendous number of differences perfectly adapted to each other, would by accidental development or purely mechanistic development, come into being, requires far more faith than simply to take the Bible account as it is. And this is one of the things which is in the Bible, which is difficult for us to understand, that out of the (5 3/4) humanity that God created, that God created man (5 1/4)

a certain portion

and that portion he molded and formed and God made the two sections. It required, we can't understand it but we can't understand creation. And I think that we must recognize that it is very specifically and definitely taught here that it is a supernatural act, the creation of woman and act of divine power and intervention which is very difficult for natural human mind to understand but certainly no more difficult and perhaps not as difficult as any other way that we could hatch in which it would have come into existence. And so that is a deed of supernatural creation and to see the meaning of it, and Matthew Henry's Commentary has a very beautiful statement here about this verse that God took a portion of his side and closed up the flesh thereof, he says, "not from his head to lord it over, and not from his feet, for him to lord it over, but from his side, to be an equal and a companion and a helpmeet." It's a very beautiful statement which he has made and I think that we can thus take lessons from these things, we can take the lessons God wanted to give us and that is what is most vital (7 1/2) but we must never make the specific statements of the Scripture as to what happened into mere allegory, into mere pictures. There are pictures<sup>in Scripture</sup>, there are allegories, very few of them, there are many pictures, there are figurative statements, but we must try the literal interpretation first, and recognizing figurative statements here and there, we must recognize that it must be mainly literal or you can just make anything out of it. I think that is extremely important

as a rule of interpretation. It must be mainly literal taken so except when there's clear evidence to be taken. I like the example of figures of speech, that figures of speech are like salt. We sprinkle a little salt and it improves food tremendously. And the same is true of figures of speech. The Bible ~~has~~ everything else that ~~was~~ ever written, has figures of speech. That is, nobody could possibly take the whole Bible literally (8 $\frac{1}{4}$ )

it contains figures of speech.

They are like the little salt sprinkled over. But if you take the whole thing figuratively, it's like pouring a bucket of salt over your food and it just actually wrecks it, it reduces it to nothing. When you take it all figuratively it means nothing. And some people call spiritualization, or allegorization, some people by those terms mean they can get all things when you do that (8  $\frac{3}{4}$ ), you just don't have anything left.

Well, we'll continue there tomorrow morning. We will not meet this afternoon.

### O.T.History 52. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...now the assignment for today, I am just going to give you an hour so I won't expect you to get it in prior to class. It will be sufficient if you have it turned in by Friday morning at nine, which gives you two days before today's assignment is due. But it will take a little dictation to tell what it is, and do the best you can on it, it's the first of this type of assignment and if you have difficulty understanding it, don't worry, do the best you can, because we will explain easier after you've started than we could in advance. But I trust that I've made it clear enough that most of you will be able to get it right. Please write down then, assignment, 4 o'clock, October 22, to be handed in by Friday, October 24, 9 a.m. Please have it in the office, in the place there for it, by 9 am/~~m~~ Friday morning.

This assignment deals with 1 Kings 14:20 to 16:34. Small a. list all kings named in this material, noting particularly verses containing chronological statements. That's a. Now this is not an assignment to study the material here, in these two chapters. The narrative in it, the events and so on, are of no interest to us as far as this particular assignment is concerned. Most of you have doubtless read this material many times before.

You are familiar with the general run of the narrative. If you are not it does not matter for this assignment. All you have to do is run your eyes over <sup>it</sup> and notice all kings' names in it and notice particularly in the statements, chronological statements, like if it says that Henry Jones became king in the fifth year of William Smith, that's an important thing, that's a chronological statement. We're interested in chronological statements, nothing else, and names of kings, any king, no others. This is a very aristocratic assignment. Then b. made a table with three columns, put the kings of Judah's names in this section in the first column. Those of Israel in the second column, those of other nations in the third. Put kings who reigned at the same time next to each other. A very brief illustration of what I mean--if you're told that King Henry reigned for 22 years, you give the reference, you're to tell he reigned for 22 years. If you're told that his (5) King Charles reigned here for 9 years and then you're told that in the 10th year of King Henry, King William began to reign over here, you put William about here, you see. Then if William reigned till this year, and George began to reign over here, you see, in William's sixth year then you put George over here. Now that does not have to be exact, that's a general thing, see. And if you read that in the reign of King William, Queen Elizabeth of Egypt sent her troops up into the country, you put Elizabeth over ~~here~~ here, with the reference. So it's just a general rough thing to show how they fit into one another, not a precise thing, in fact your data is not sufficient to make it precise, but a general thing to give an idea of how they worked together.

Now then if you would draw a line across, that was the lesson for today, now I want to dictate the lesson for next Monday. The lesson for Monday, I thought of putting all this on the board, but then you'd all have to stand out here and copy it, and it's probably less trouble to write it here while I dictate it. Lesson for next Monday, which will not have to be turned in until Monday, 12 noon. Lesson for next Monday deals with a book which I'm going to call TANE, if I said it in full it would be The Ancient Near East (that's just to save time). Here it is, it costs \$5.95, and 35 of you have ordered this and can purchase it in the book store immediately. The rest of you can use the copies in the Library, and you have until Monday so those who don't have it would be wise to start reading immediately,



Now if the copy in the Library is in use, you could also find this particular assignment in ANET, that's an abbreviation which means Ancient Near Eastern Texts. The assignment is in TANE, p.76 to 80, or in ANET, p.1 to 3, less pages but bigger pages in ANET. Text is I believe identical in both. One or two copies of ANET and one copy of TANE in the Library. Now the assignment for Monday. First I make a statement, adaca, Adaca is a man (guess you sometimes wonder how he can be a man, but he is a man) serving Ea. You all remember Ea, but in case anyone's forgotten, I'll say Ea; the god of wisdom. Adaca is a man serving Ea the god of wisdom. Now that's a bit of information because this tablet, the first part's a bit broken and as you start about Adaca you don't even get his name for ten or twelve lines, and the first few lines of the tablet are not of any great importance to our assignment. Giving you this information will cover most of what we find in the first few lines, that is in a good part of the first pages. But now here are some questions, I want the answers to written out and turned in by Monday, 12 noon. The first one can be answered in comparatively few words, what occurred in §9) Baldy, Adaca and the South Wind? Anything the South Wind did that related to Adaca, anything Adaca did that related to the South Wind. If the South Wind wouldn't blow so Adaca's boat wouldn't go and Adaca cursed the South Wind as a result, then all you have to say is the South Wind refuses to blow and Adaca curses the South Wind, that would be sufficient, if that was what the story told. Just see what it does/tell and briefly answer it. This will, maybe ten lines will tell about this but it will center your attention on the vital thing in the assignment, to get them, so figure this out and write it down, it shouldn't take you over six minutes. Then under 2, second question. What did Anu god of heaven do about it? You had Anu in Enuma Elish also, but I remind you of him, we didn't have a great deal about him, did we? Number 3, what did Ea advise? Anu made a decision, you could just tell us, he made a decision, what it is, what he did. But then when Ea heard of his decision he gave Adaca some advice, what was it? You can give that, that'll take maybe three sentences. Then, number 4, what were the things that happened to Adaca after he followed Ea's advice? You notice that that question needs to be read carefully. What were the things that happened to Adaca after he followed Ea's advice? If Ea said to Adaca you go and, you go to Philadelphia and visit

the City Hall and then go to San Francisco and see the mayor there and then make a trip to Brazil, why you can state that as Ea's advice. Then if you have quite a passage telling how Adaca carries it out, you don't have to say anything about it, you see, I'm assuming he followed the advice. You can look and see if he did, but after he followed his advice, as you will find it here, then other things happened, and that's what I want to know. What happened after he followed the advice? And I just want the answers to these questions, rather briefly but correctly, figured out from these tablets, and written down. I don't want to discuss these tablets today, we will discuss them later. If there's any question about how to do this, why we'll take that now, but no discussion. Mr. Myers? (student.12)

O.T.History 53. ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )

...for making that point clear.  
~~Thank~~ thank you, Mr. Myers. Let's say what did Ea advise Adaca? Having spent years studying Babylonian, I'm apt to overlook something that wouldn't be obvious to somebody who doesn't know about it. Ea never advised Anu. Anu wouldn't have listened to him if he'd tried. But Ea was always advising human beings, and that of course you wouldn't know, so putting in the word Adaca makes it clear. What did Ea advise Adaca? And then what did Adaca do? I mean what happened to Adaca, that would involve what he did and what others did, after he followed the advise? Now that's the assignment for Monday, now for Tuesday. For next Tuesday, October 28, this one need not be handed in till noon Tuesday. This is a very brief. This will not take you a fourth of the time as either of the other two assignments. Briefly discuss this question. <sup>Hand</sup> ~~and~~ in the paper in which you briefly this question. Perhaps I was wrong when I said it would take a fourth as long, perhaps it takes a third as long. Briefly discuss this question, what does the material in TANE, page 187 and page 219, show regarding anything in the assignment for Wednesday, October 22. This can also be found in ANET but I'm not going to give you the pages because it's quite brief. (student.2 $\frac{1}{2}$ )  
 No, it's the assignment that's for today that's to be turned in Friday. (student.2  $\frac{3}{4}$ )  
 No, (2  $\frac{3}{4}$ ) I meant Wednesday, the 22nd, that's today. See, the first assignment I gave you is today's assignment, which is due Friday.

Then next Monday's assignment <sup>which</sup> is due Monday deals with a different subject, and Tuesday's assignment which is <sup>due</sup> Tuesday has nothing to do with Monday's assignment but relates to today's assignment, you see, and I don't think you'll find it difficult. I think you'll find it quite easy, those of you who have TANE will do it very quickly. Those who don't can do it very quickly with a copy of TANE. It will take so little time that it's not worth my giving you the pages. Yes? (student.  $3\frac{1}{2}$ ) It is in the other, but rather than give a long description to show which part ( $3\frac{1}{2}$ )

( $4\frac{1}{2}$ ) Now we were speaking of, about number 4, the creation of woman, if I recall correctly and we will discuss c, the meaning of it. I believe I actually discussed the meaning of it pretty well under a, but it's worth giving separate headings because it's very important, and now we'll go on to 5.

5 is a very interesting question, what about evolution? Under that small a, meaning of the term. Meaning of the term, evolution. A young budding scientist said to me one day he said, it's perfectly silly to deny evolution, why he said anybody can see evolution of a child into a man. Well, that is an entirely <sup>proper</sup> ~~possible~~ way to <sup>use</sup> ~~view~~ the word evolution, <sup>in</sup> ~~be-~~ fact it is proper to use any word in any way you want, you ~~want~~ can use the word white to mean black if you want, provided you make clear what you're doing, so people know that that is what you're doing. In the King James Bible, when it says ( $5\frac{3}{4}$ ) science, <sup>it</sup> ~~it~~ means what we today call philosophy, when it says philosophy it means what we today call science. The two words have exactly reversed their meaning since the time the King James Bible was written. They've changed sides. You write a book a hundred years ago on Physics or Chemistry or anything like that and the publisher would entitle it, Natural Philosophy, and yet it would be exactly what we'd call Physics or Chemistry today, and if you buy a book on The Understanding of the Theory of Knowledge, a hundred years ago, it probably would be called the science of knowledge, because the two words have just exactly reversed. So any word can mean anything. And a great <sup>cause</sup> ~~part~~ of misunderstanding is in language so often people are arguing, using the same word in different senses. The <sup>in</sup> Russians have called themselves, their various governments, the people's democracy, the Eastern part of

Germany, its official title is The German Democratic Republic. There's nothing in the world that is democratic about it in our sense. It is an absolute dictatorship, but they use the word democratic meaning exactly opposite to the way we mean. Well, anybody has a right to use any word any way you want, but you should indicate how you're using it to avoid (7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ) in discussion. Otherwise there's hopeless confusion. Well, now this is one word about which there is tremendous hopeless confusion, this word evolution because it is used by so many people and used in many, many different senses. And it is a good word for the idea for the development of a boy into a man because it is not merely a development in which everything gets larger but things change. In Evolution fundamentally means, a development in the course of which some change occurs, and it's a very good word for that idea. But unfortunately the word has come in the last hundred years to be used for a very particular kind of development. It has been used for a very wide ranging development. It has been used for the theory that all life, that everything developed by natural progress from the simple to the complex. That is fundamentally what Darwin presented. Darwin was faced with a lot of people who held the view that every single individual thing on this world was a separate creation of God, that everything was absolutely different and distinct from every other one, and it all, that God had made everything exactly this way and that (9) is exactly the way it is now, and Darwin said no, we find certain forces, certain laws in all of nature, and that was a very good correction to an extreme attitude which is contained in the Scripture. God did not say let the earth be covered with trees, God said, let the trees grow up, let things come into being. There is great amount of development in the Scripture, unquestionably. But the theory, as Darwin and his associates presented it, was that all things are conditioned by natural processes, and the result of this on the average person was simply to push God out of his universe altogether, and to leave it like a watch which has been made and wound up, but which would continue to grow indefinitely because it has a spring that will last forever. It is a theory which resulted in a tremendous lot of atheism and of complete materialism. I don't say the theory in itself necessarily <sup>influenced</sup> is-wrong, but it resulted in that, and the reaction to it one hundred years ago

on the part of many Godly people, and some others perhaps who weren't quite so Godly but who had good positions in the established churches that were threatened by the spread of unbelief, was to attack the whole thing, head on, it's utterly wrong, everything is just made this way, and God made it, and that's that. And it is foolish to think of changes or development occurring. Thus you had two extreme positions at extreme opposites. As if someone were to say is it light in this room, or is it dark? And one person would say, who wanted to sleep here, would say I can't sleep, these lights bother me. And another who wanted to write would say, with that light not going, I can't see clearly enough to write plainly as I would like to. One would say it was dark, the other would say it was light. There are some things in life that are absolute. You are either a man or a dog, you are one or the other, there is a sharp difference between them. There are other things that are relative as a rule. Absolute darkness is rare. Absolute light is rare. Everything nearly is somewhere in between, and whether you call it lightness or darkness depends on where you're standing in between. And so many, many things are relative, and some things are absolute. There are many, many things that are absolute. But on a theory like this you have people say no that is absolutely wrong, there's nothing true about it whatever. Here is a simple explanation of the universe. God created all things and that means that every little detail of everything he made was exactly the way it is now, and that's the way it is, and there's no development. And over here you have some people who said this idea of God creating the universe is (12 $\frac{1}{4}$ ) all done, because everything has developed according to a natural process from a little simple beginning, that complexity has naturally come, and you have two extreme opposites facing each other. And Bishop (12 $\frac{1}{5}$ ) <sup>Wilberforce</sup> Walveford, a great (12 $\frac{1}{5}$ ) bishop, excellent debater, able in handling theological problems, faced the great scientist Huxley and Wilberforce said, I'd like Mr. Huxley to tell us whether he was descended from a monkey through his mother or through his father. Which was it that you came from a monkey. Personally, I am not descended from any monkey, and what's that got to do with it, it is casting ridicule upon a thing which is not the way to define truth. And Huxley, very cleverly, took advantage of the situation. He said, personally, I would much rather be descended from a simple monkey that walk along, laughing

and gibbering and using what he has from God, which isn't much, than to be descended from a learned gentleman who refuses to examine new knowledge but has everything absolutely fixed and set and who refuses to face any facts but just casts ridicule instead of examining things fairly. And the students just clapped for him and he turned many of them to his views, when actually neither of them was dealing with the point at issue. But there was a great deal of that argument that way and you had two extreme attitudes which developed, when as a matter of fact, the question isn't which is right, this theory that we built up here, or this theory we built up here, but what are the facts as to what the Scripture teaches and what are the facts as to what we find in nature?

O.T.History 54. (1 $\frac{1}{3}$ )

...that everything in the universe is exactly as God made it, he produced it just this way and did not cause any development to occur in it, but made them just this way and that's the way it is. And on the other hand, the amount of scientific fact that would be necessary to establish a theory that everything developed by natural processes from a simple beginning, simple to the complex, it would require about a thousand times as much good evidence as it ever did to prove so far-reaching a theory, or any point, as that. And so, you have some people taking the Scriptures on way beyond this, and you have some people taking a few facts of science, or perhaps quite a lot of them, to build a theory that went far beyond them. When I was a student at Princeton Seminary, there was a series of lectures on the dogma of evolution at Princeton University, by Professor Moore, a noted Physicist from Ohio, and Professor Moore said in his theory, in these lectures, that the Physicists had worked out definite laws of what we observe to occur. And he has worked out these laws in systematic order and Physics, by virtue of the fact that it involves so much experimentation and that it deals with general principles of the trend of events rather than of a continuing series of things like history, that Physics had much that is very solid and definite, and then he said the Biologists take the viewpoint of the Physicists, and he

carries it over, and builds a complete system of evolution in biology, based on the assumption that the precise system of Physics is applicable to biology. Then he said the Sociologists and the Philosophers take the view of the biologist and carries them over into those areas, and so he said the philosopher and sociologist sits on the head of the biologist, and the biologist on the head of the physicist. And the biologist would like shake off the philosopher and the sociologist, and the physicist would like to shake both of them, and there's a lot truth in what he said, that actually the real conflict is between a philosophy based on certain scientific facts and a philosophy based on metaphysical statement, and when we get the actual facts of science and the actual statements of the Bible, you do not have this conflict.

But the situation has naturally developed from it, in which in many Christian circles the very word evolution signifies something that is terribly wicked and blasphemous, and these circles are much smaller now than they used to be, but it used to be quite widespread. One Baptist I heard say, he said, when I was a boy, the circles I was brought up with, he said evolution was just a dirty word, and there is that tendency and if evolution is interpreted in its strict sense, it seems to me that it is a proper attitude to take toward it, an all-embracing theory that everything has developed from simple beginnings by natural processes, there is no evidence to warrant such a conclusion in science. And it is fundamentally atheistic and destructive of Christian faith, such an extensive theory, but most first-class scientists recognize that the evidence is far short of being sufficient to prove any such extensive theory, and many of them will <sup>attach</sup> attack all sorts of (4 $\frac{1}{2}$ )

On the other hand, there are many of them, much lesser, who consider, to whom evolution is almost a god. I had a friend, told me of being in a class in which they had had some discussion and he had presented some Scripture which the members of the class were quite interested <sup>in</sup> and quite impressed by, <sup>some</sup> ~~the~~ material against certain aspects of the evolution theory, and he said that the next day when the class came together the Professor had put up pictures of Charles Darwin, accounts of the man's brilliance and of various events in his life, and he made it, he put it on a sentimental basis of glorifying this great man who had brought this in, and there are many today, mostly not the great scientists, who take